

1 ST. AUGUSTINE - ST. JOHNS COUNTY AIRPORT AUTHORITY

2 Regular Meeting

3 held at 4796 U.S. 1 North

4 St. Augustine, Florida

5 on Monday, December 14, 2009

6 from 4:03 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.

7 * * * * *

8 BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

- 9 WAYNE GEORGE
- JOHN "JACK" GORMAN
- 10 KELLY BARRERA, Chairman
- JAMES WERTER

11 BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

- 12 CARL YOUMAN, Secretary-Treasurer

13 * * * * *

14 ALSO PRESENT:

- 15 DOUGLAS N. BURNETT, Esquire, St. Johns Law Group, 1301
- 16 Plantation Island Drive South, Suite 302-B, St.
- Augustine, FL, 32080, Attorney for Airport Authority.

17 EDWARD WUELLNER, A.A.E., Executive Director.

18 BRYAN COOPER, Assistant Airport Director.

19 * * * * *

20

21

- 22 JANET M. BEASON, RPR, RMR, CRR, FPR
- St. Augustine Court Reporters
- 23 1510 N. Ponce de Leon Boulevard
- St. Augustine, FL 32084
- 24 (904) 825-0570

1	I N D E X	
2	PAGE	
3	2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	3
4	3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES	3
5	4. FINANCIAL REPORT ACCEPTANCE	3
6	5. AGENDA APPROVAL	4
7	6. COMMITTEE REPORTS	4
8	7. REPORTS	6
9	8. PROJECT UPDATES	63
10	9. ACTION ITEMS	
11	A. Annual Audit Presentation	80
	B. County Wide Taxation Update	93
12	C. Future FAA Projects	97
	D. Release of Retainage - Taxiway "B" North	122
13	10. HOUSEKEEPING	124
14	11. PUBLIC COMMENT GENERAL	None
15	12. AUTHORITY MEMBER REPORTS	128
16	13. NEXT BOARD MEETING	131
17	14. ADJOURNMENT	131
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: If we could all stand for
3 the Pledge of Allegiance.

4 (Pledge of Allegiance.)

5 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Go ahead and call our
6 meeting to order.

7 A P P R O V A L O F M I N U T E S

8 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: The approval of the
9 minutes. Do we have any additions, deletions, for
10 approval of the meeting minutes from our last
11 meeting?

12 (None.)

13 MR. BRUNSON: No whispering.

14 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Do we have any? Hearing
15 none, the minutes will stand approved.

16 F I N A N C I A L R E P O R T A C C E P T A N C E

17 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Financial report
18 acceptance. I think we all received a copy of the
19 financial report and we received the following
20 e-mail to be read into the minutes.

21 "Fellow board members, I have reviewed the
22 November financial statement and recommend they be
23 accepted by the board. Thanks and have a safe
24 day. Carl Youman."

25 I also went through the financial report, and

4

1 do we have any additions, deletions --

2 MR. WUELLNER: No, ma'am.

3 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: -- to the financial
4 report? Then we'll let the financial report
5 stand.

6 AGENDA APPROVAL

7 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Agenda approval. Has
8 everybody has a chance to go over the agenda? Any
9 additions, deletions, or revisions to the agenda?

10 (None.)

11 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. Hearing none, the
12 agenda will stand approved.

13 COMMITTEE REPORTS

14 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Committee reports. We're
15 expecting Denise Bunnewith with the TPO.

16 MR. GORMAN: I went to the TPO, but I was
17 counting on -- I kind of defer to her. I just had
18 a couple of questions and --

19 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Do we want to move hers to
20 the -- to the committee reports to after all of
21 the regular reports and then at that point, if she
22 hasn't -- if she's not here --

23 MR. GORMAN: We might as well. I can kind of
24 cue her up a couple of things that I'm going to

25 ask her anyway and then we'll go on from there.

5

1 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. Do we have -- are
2 all the board members in agreement with that?

3 MR. GEORGE: Sounds good.

4 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. EDC.

5 MR. WERTER: Meeting was this past Wednesday,
6 December 10th. The guest speaker this time was
7 Joseph Gordy. He's the president of Flagler
8 Hospital.

9 He addressed mainly the proposed health care
10 program in front of the House, so I won't make
11 comment one way or the other about that. Other
12 than that, he was just talking basically about how
13 his hospital was doing with MRSA and
14 pneumonia-related infections with respiratory
15 people. So there's not much there really on that
16 other than we have a very clean hospital here to
17 use.

18 But the interesting fact is that they do have
19 1600 employees, which I think might put them in
20 number one contention for private employer in the
21 county at 1600. I think that outdoes Grumman,
22 doesn't it?

23 MR. WUELLNER: It's --

24 MR. GORMAN: Grumman's 11-.

25 MR. WUELLNER: They're the largest

6

1 not-for-profit employer in St. Johns County.

2 MR. WERTER: The hospital is.

3 MR. WUELLNER: The hospital is.

4 MR. WERTER: However --

5 MR. WUELLNER: Grumman is the largest

6 for-profit.

7 MR. GEORGE: Excludes government.

8 MR. WERTER: Okay. All right.

9 MR. WUELLNER: Excludes government. Yes. I

10 know, I got caught up in that one time, too.

11 MR. WERTER: Other than that, nothing else

12 really new.

13 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. Thank you.

14 Intergovernmental, buzz?

15 MR. GEORGE: Intergovernmental did not meet

16 this month. They meet in January.

17 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. The Aerospace

18 Academy. Jim?

19 MR. WERTER: Did not meet this month.

20 REPORTS

21 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Mr. Sanchez, did you want

22 to give us a report on the County Commission?

23 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: Good afternoon. Just

24 a couple of things. We are having a ceremony

25 tomorrow in our meeting for Mark Miner, who is,

7

1 excuse me, going to leave I think the early part
2 of January for his active duty in Iraq. And we
3 have -- we haven't received a copy, but we have
4 received word from Tallahassee that Ray Quinn has
5 been named his replacement, which is the person
6 that Mark recommended to replace him.

7 So, I was asked last time about Cordova
8 Palms. Is that -- that's the big one over here?
9 They did come in and meet with me and I asked if
10 they had met with the airport yet. They made some
11 drastic changes to their development, and I
12 referred them to Ed.

13 I told them need they needed to -- to meet up
14 with Ed and discuss and make sure everything was
15 all right with the airport, that I knew there was
16 some problems last time. So, anyway, they're
17 supposed to do that. But they have -- they have
18 made some drastic changes, they really have.
19 So -- okay. Any questions, I'll be glad to answer
20 them. All right.

21 MR. GEORGE: We've got some --

22 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: Oh, no, here's one.

23 MR. GEORGE: -- Cordova Palms stuff in our --

24 MR. BURNETT: I'm going to go through it.

25 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

8

1 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: Okay. So they did
2 call, then.

3 MR. WUELLNER: Yes. We will be meeting in
4 the next couple of days.

5 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: Good.

6 MR. GEORGE: Thanks for sending them to us.

7 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. Mr. Slingluff with
8 Galaxy. I don't see him here. Move on. Northrop
9 Grumman? I don't see Mr. Nehring. Mr. Roderick
10 with SAAPA? Vic, will you be stepping in for
11 that?

12 MR. MARTINELLI: Yeah. SAAPA had an election
13 for the new board this past Saturday, and our new
14 president is Michael Slingluff, and our treasurer
15 is still Paul Huggins. Secretary is still Millie
16 Huggins.

17 I'm now the liaison to the Airport Authority,
18 so I'll be taking John Roderick's place. There
19 are a couple of other offices which I can't
20 remember. I think Pat Miceli is in charge of
21 excursions, and -- I don't know. Maybe you can
22 help me, Buzz. But anyway, that's essentially it.
23 And we're off to a great start and looking forward
24 to a great year.

1 much, Mr. Martinelli. Mr. Burnett?

2 MR. BURNETT: I don't have anything to report
3 other than I've got some slides that I wanted to
4 go through related to Cordova Palms. I think it's
5 important to bring you up to speed on what we
6 understand is going on related to Cordova Palms.
7 So if I might, I'd like to take five minutes to go
8 through this.

9 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Please.

10 MR. BURNETT: Ed, if you would go to the next
11 slide. Cordova Palms is the property that is
12 designated on the County's Future Land Use Map as
13 Industrial. It's immediately north of our -- the
14 airport's industrial property to the west of U.S.
15 1. Thank you.

16 The FEC Railway has a development arm that
17 they call Flagler Development. For all intents
18 and purposes, it's -- it is a company that is a
19 wholly owned subsidiary by the railroad. Although
20 FEC's been bought out, I still will refer to it as
21 FEC, and I think they refer to themselves still as
22 that.

23 There's been two basic properties that FEC
24 owned, Lemberg South and Lemberg North. The

25 original plan of development was to locate a DRI

10

1 on this property that you see completely outlined
2 in red here. They've come back and scaled it down
3 some to where it would just be the solid red line,
4 and this portion of the property would not be
5 included within this DRI to the north.

6 Presumably, later we may see this parcel developed
7 as a DRI as well.

8 You can see on this drawing the 313 road,
9 which is the extension of 3 -- 312. 312 currently
10 terminates, as we all know, at 207 and does not
11 continue on north. But this really is a picture
12 that shows what the DOT has been working on.

13 The County has done extensive plans for this
14 roadway. It's -- it's -- I want to say last time
15 I checked on it, it was at about 40 percent plan
16 set for being completely planned. They know what
17 right-of-way is required to do 313 all the way up
18 through. And this section from 16 -- from State
19 Road 16 down to where it terminates at 207
20 currently has -- has been pretty well engineered.

21 The funding, I'm told by the County -- Joe
22 Stephenson at the county, the director of public
23 works, the big issue for them is making this
24 acquisition of the right-of-way to secure this

25 right-of-way down here and to continue 312 to

11

1 State Road 16. And then somewhere in the future,
2 they'll build this segment and then turn around
3 and build the segment to the north. What you see
4 here shows the airport and the relationship of the
5 two FEC properties, Lemberg South and then what
6 they call Cordova Palms.

7 The thing to note related to Cordova Palms
8 and the thing that you may recall in previous
9 discussions related to this is you can see 13 --
10 Runway 13/31 right here, which aircraft will fly
11 over this property. It is in the flight path.

12 So, a concern that your professional staff has and
13 that I've heard expressed by this Authority is
14 related to this flight path and its impacts
15 potentially on the airport.

16 What the FEC planned -- one thing, they've
17 changed the plan related to Cordova Palms, but
18 this one aspect hasn't changed, and this is one
19 that we think's important to you to know about,
20 which is they -- the red shows the direction of
21 the 313 road going north of 16 all the way up to
22 U.S. 1.

23 In red here, this is the DOT version. In
24 yellow, this is the Flagler Development version.

25 And what it does is it helps the County and the

12

1 State get this right-of-way, because obviously
2 they own Lemberg South so they can have the
3 roadway go across the right-of-way and dedicate
4 that right-of-way. And of course from this point
5 to U.S. 1, they can dedicate the right-of-way as
6 well because they own that property. Obviously
7 bringing the road closer to touch their property
8 probably also helps their property out from a
9 valuation standpoint.

10 The concern, though, that the Authority has
11 had and the concern that I think Mr. Wuellner has
12 related to this is that your master plan has a
13 runway over here. And as I understand from Ed,
14 and you're welcome to ask him, this relocation
15 makes it to where a runway over here is not
16 feasible. It impacts that potential runway. And
17 that would be a northeast/southwest direction of
18 the runway. So that's one of the -- one other
19 concern related to this. Oops. I think I got the
20 wrong --

21 MR. WUELLNER: I'll --

22 MR. BURNETT: I need to go the next.

23 MR. GORMAN: Excuse me. Can I interrupt for
24 one second?

25 MR. BURNETT: Yes, sir.

13

1 MR. GORMAN: A bit confused here. We -- this
2 board needs to have the -- to make an overlay
3 of -- this board needs to have an overlay of what
4 we own versus this Lemberg South versus this
5 10-year plan that was published before with all of
6 the different traffic patterns, to be able to see
7 in clarity what we're talking about, because some
8 of the property adjacent to that Lemberg is owned
9 by this -- by the Airport Authority, correct?

10 MR. BURNETT: Absolutely. You -- this -- for
11 example, this is Big Oak Road coming through here.
12 That parcel right there is the old racetrack owned
13 by Usina. And so, as I recall -- we don't have it
14 overlaid here on the map, but the Airport
15 Authority owns land in this area and in this area.

16 MR. WUELLNER: Perhaps the little blue box
17 located inside the bigger blue box there is ours,
18 too.

19 MR. BURNETT: This is a history -- the
20 project started back in 2005. It went away in
21 February of 2008. They withdrew the application,
22 I guess, and were sitting on it. And not much has
23 gone on.

24 They have in some ways downsized the project

25 from the original plan from, as I showed you on

14

1 the map, the 581 acres to 382 and they've reduced
2 the number of residential units. They've
3 increased the -- the retail office stays about the
4 same and they've eliminated the industrial. I
5 don't know that all of that is all that important,
6 but --

7 MR. WUELLNER: And part of the reason for
8 reducing the -- or eliminating the industrial is
9 that it's currently zoned Industrial. That whole
10 big tract is already Industrial, so it doesn't
11 require inclusion in the DRI.

12 MR. BURNETT: Yeah. You can see this is
13 the -- this is the Lemberg South, not the portion
14 they're looking to develop. This is the southern
15 parcel. But it's important to know what's going
16 on related to this parcel.

17 Currently, half of it is designated on the
18 County's Future Land Use Map as Industrial.
19 Actually -- and has the airport designation. And
20 then this portion here is Residential B, which
21 means it would allow for residential development.

22 Their proposal is -- now you can see the
23 roadway coming through here, 313. Their proposal
24 is to take this portion of the property that's

25 currently Residential and turn it into Industrial.

15

1 The reason for that is when you go to what's going
2 up on north, this is the main Cordova Palms
3 property. This is it.

4 You can see this portion's been eliminated
5 from the DRI. Just this solid red boundary here
6 is the DRI. It's currently on the Future Land Use
7 Map Industrial. Their plan is to turn it into
8 Intensive Commercial, leave the portion out of it
9 that's already Industrial, and then turn this into
10 Residential C.

11 They're calling it a transfer of development
12 rights related to the residential. It's been
13 unpopular in our county for residential
14 development to be approved additional units. We
15 hear comments related to that quite a bit coming
16 out of the constituents that are speaking at the
17 County Commission meetings.

18 And so, what they've done is move the
19 Residential that you saw on the Lemberg South
20 property to the Lemberg North property. And what
21 you need to know about that is it puts residential
22 units in the flight path.

23 The benefit to the county that I think you'll
24 see a lot of talk about is that this is creating

25 the right-of-way through here. Their plan is to

16

1 construct part of the 313 roadway down to
2 Woodlawn. If you're on Woodlawn Road and it makes
3 that hairpin turn around to go around right past
4 the tech center, they're going to connect the road
5 all the way down to that point, is part of their
6 plan. So it will be a functioning road. You'll
7 be able to get off of 16, go on Woodlawn, and go
8 straight on up to 313. That's part of their plan.

9 The -- an added portion of it is that as the
10 plan stands right now, and this is the County and
11 the State's plan for building 313, there has to be
12 a flyover over the railroad tracks, which then has
13 ramps coming down on both sides over here, which
14 to do that then requires some eminent domain
15 powers by the County or the State to get that
16 done.

17 With FEC being the parent company to Flagler
18 Development, they can do an at-grade crossing. So
19 their proposal is to do an at-grade crossing and
20 have a new railroad crossing right here at this
21 connection point. And this is just a better look
22 at what the Residential and Commercial looks like
23 on the property. They at one point did have a
24 drawing that we saw that had a -- a school or some

25 sort of public use building up here.

17

1 MR. GEORGE: Right in the flight path.

2 MR. BURNETT: Yeah, which was right in the
3 flight path. Which that's been done away with
4 from the plan, so that's obviously a good step in
5 the right direction.

6 Order of magnitude, just so you have an idea
7 of what this residential, they're proposing 750
8 multifamily units. If it was developed all as
9 standard apartment-type dwellings, your typical
10 apartment complex that you see that's the new
11 modern newly built apartment complex, a lot up by
12 The Avenues in Jacksonville, they're 250-unit
13 complexes, typically. So it's about three of
14 those stand-alone type apartment complexes. Or,
15 if it were to be some sort of multifamily,
16 that's -- obviously it could be a duplex under the
17 County's plan for multifamily or that kind of
18 thing.

19 MR. WUELLNER: Townhomes.

20 MR. BURNETT: Townhomes, those sorts of
21 things, which takes up a little more land mass.

22 Here is their timetable. From what we
23 understand related to the time period, it's pretty
24 aggressive to go through and get this approved,

25 but they're moving forward with it. It will be

18

1 going pretty fast. That's why we thought we would
2 bring it to your attention.

3 They're talking about from -- from today to
4 final approval, you're looking at Board of County
5 Commission adoption hearing in July. So, six or
6 seven months, it being to the Board of County
7 Commissioners for final approval of a DRI-sized
8 project.

9 That's an aggressive schedule. I don't know
10 if they'll be able to keep it. I don't think
11 we've seen one kept to that schedule, but -- or
12 have that kind of an aggressive schedule, but that
13 is why we figured we'd go ahead and make you aware
14 of it now. So...

15 MR. GEORGE: Doug, just as a point of
16 information, about the time that our master plan
17 was finalized, Ed invited me to go with him to the
18 railroad to talk about where that second runway
19 was going to be.

20 At that time, they said the only thing we're
21 using that land for is mitigation on the other
22 development things that we've got. So therefore,
23 yeah, we don't have a problem, and -- because, you
24 know, we can -- we can put a runway and still have

25 some -- some wetlands, you know, adjacent to it.

19

1 MR. GORMAN: Now it's commercial and
2 residential property.

3 MR. GEORGE: That's right.

4 MR. GORMAN: So that changes the entire
5 flavor.

6 MR. GEORGE: Well, yeah. But it also changes
7 our master plan.

8 MR. GORMAN: Completely.

9 MR. GEORGE: Yeah. And we have the need to
10 get in some recommendations from Ed and Doug on
11 what they think we as a board should be doing,
12 because if -- if they do go ahead with this, we
13 instantly have to do another master plan.

14 MR. GORMAN: Let me continue with what --
15 this -- along the same vein, is that when we look
16 at these -- these plans and we look at these
17 overlays, we also need to look in depth at what we
18 own, because it's a patchwork quilt.

19 And it -- it's a complicated issue, because
20 we've got our patchwork quilt of land that is
21 going to be a little bit to the east of their
22 properties and then our property that's inserted
23 into this one piece that is that -- there's the
24 southern portion. So, it's -- it's a complicated

25 issue. And like Mr. George says, this is all

20

1 brand new. This has nothing to do with what our
2 10-year plan was going, you know, include.

3 So I wish we could, for future purposes, make
4 sure we have overlays that can be flipped back and
5 forth to see what we own now versus what they're
6 going to develop, which just makes common sense to
7 me, versus what they said they were going to do
8 when we made a 10-year plan, so we can look at all
9 of the aspects of what we've got.

10 MR. GEORGE: That includes putting the
11 runway, proposed runway that we have out there.

12 MR. GORMAN: Sure.

13 MR. GEORGE: That's a good idea, Jack.

14 MR. BURNETT: A couple of other just sort of
15 informational things, because it has been now
16 probably a year and a half. It was the -- I think
17 in mostly the end of 2007, so maybe two years now
18 from when we were discussing the project before
19 meeting with the air -- the railroad
20 representatives of Flagler Development.

21 Some of the issues -- and it was much fresher
22 at that time, too, for the Ponce development. But
23 one of the things that we had discussed with them
24 that they at best we know are still agreeable to

25 is to give the Airport Authority an avigation

21

1 easement over this land for Cordova Palms so that
2 the folks who do wind up locating there that are
3 under the flight path don't later complain to the
4 airport that they didn't know or try and sue the
5 airport for noise or vibration and the like.

6 So they're agreeable to the same form
7 avigation easement, at least that's what our --
8 our direction was two years ago from the Authority
9 was, you know, look to the same form avigation
10 easement like is on the Ponce.

11 MR. GORMAN: Their principals have already
12 said that they would sign that with you?

13 MR. BURNETT: They had some changes to it the
14 last time.

15 MR. GEORGE: Changes to the wording.

16 MR. BURNETT: You know, it always comes down
17 to putting it in ink. I think they're prepared to
18 do that, from what I heard. We're meeting with
19 them in the next couple of days.

20 MR. WUELLNER: It's either tomorrow or
21 Wednesday.

22 MR. BURNETT: Wednesday, I believe. And so,
23 we'll have a better idea of what exactly it is
24 they're offering at this stage.

25 One of the other points from two years ago

22

1 that was being talked about was some authority to
2 be able to -- that they would agree to the
3 relocation of the railroad tracks along U.S. 1 and
4 put that in writing in perpetuity. That way, if
5 the Airport Authority ever got the funding to move
6 U.S. 1 over and move the railroad over to make
7 13/31 fully functional to the way it could be,
8 that they would agree to it. So...

9 MR. GORMAN: Like I said before, without
10 being able to look at what we own, the complexity
11 of this issue is not clear.

12 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah.

13 MR. GORMAN: But I understand the avigation
14 easement. That was a good job you did before.

15 MR. GEORGE: Well, you could have several
16 iterations showing what we own, and then iteration
17 one is the other runway. How is that impacted?
18 Iteration two is Grumman business gets better and
19 we need a bigger runway. How does that impact it?

20 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. There were a number of
21 items in play the last time.

22 MR. GEORGE: Exactly. Right.

23 MR. WUELLNER: And I think the meeting
24 Wednesday, if that's when it is, will shed some

25 light on where their current thinking on some of

23

1 that is.

2 MR. GEORGE: Yeah.

3 MR. WUELLNER: It certain -- you know, I
4 can't argue that it's certainly an improvement in
5 terms of the total residential units that would be
6 under that approach, but it's still not good.
7 It's still not something I -- you know, I get
8 really warm with.

9 MR. WERTER: How far is it -- I'm sorry. How
10 far is it to the -- from the end of the runway to
11 the approach -- to the development now with that
12 buffer zone?

13 MR. GORMAN: About a runway and a half, Jim.

14 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. It's --

15 MR. GORMAN: I mean, just call it a runway
16 and a half, not very far.

17 MR. WERTER: Half mile?

18 MR. WUELLNER: I think you had one exhibit
19 there that --

20 MR. BURNETT: This one is a good picture.

21 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, that one shows pretty
22 well. You're literally -- there's your runway
23 end. Originally, it was within about --

24 MR. WERTER: Oh, that's not much.

1 that. It's a little further now. Keeping in mind
2 that the Authority has the majority of this piece
3 here. So we own the closest end piece. If
4 they're indeed putting that in conservation or at
5 least not developing it, you're creating, you
6 know, a little more distance space there.
7 Probably in the vicinity of 5,000 feet, I'm going
8 to guess, to the edge of that.

9 And then, as you recall, the other exhibit,
10 it starts off with the Intensive Commercial after
11 that and eventually I would say at about a mile,
12 I'm going to guess, or getting -- I'm sorry, about
13 a mile and a half probably, it gets -- that's when
14 the Residential component would stick in -- begin
15 to stick in there.

16 And it -- you know, the character of that's
17 going to multifamily. The only -- depending on
18 how they're proposing that, you know, what form of
19 multifamily, you know, we would be way less
20 concerned if it remained in perpetuity a
21 lease-related arrangement with, you know, folks
22 that occupy that property. That is, if they're
23 apartments or things like that, with an agreement
24 not to convert it to condos.

25 But we've watched that trick play out

25

1 multiple times in St. Johns County where they come
2 in, build it as apartments, in a couple of years,
3 they're back in for what would be a fairly minor
4 change to convert it from apartments to condos or
5 some other ownership interest, townhouses,
6 whatever, and now they're property owners and
7 they're directly under it.

8 So we've got to be very careful. You know,
9 if an easement ends up being acceptable at the end
10 of the day, it's got to be very carefully worded
11 to make sure it transfers every time with the
12 property.

13 MR. GORMAN: Let me ask the director. How
14 about the noise envelopes? In other words, we've
15 always had the different dB levels and the noise
16 envelopes and --

17 MR. WUELLNER: Technically it's outside of
18 the --

19 MR. GORMAN: Technically, it's outside, but
20 in reality you do not have a problem?

21 MR. WUELLNER: Well, there's no way you make
22 the statement there's no noise exposure there just
23 by virtue of where it is. Now, does it meet the
24 technical definition of a property that should not

25 be residential? It probably is going to fall

26

1 short of that just by virtue of the distance.

2 MR. GEORGE: Part of our -- part of our
3 working with our neighbors, we changed some of our
4 procedures, where the recommended procedure now is
5 you stay on the runway heading until you get to a
6 certain altitude.

7 MR. GORMAN: But it's still -- it's still an
8 airport, though. It's still noisy.

9 MR. GEORGE: Oh, no, I mean we -- we've
10 changed it to go right over them before you make a
11 turn.

12 MR. WUELLNER: We're running out of options
13 in other words.

14 MR. BURNETT: Yeah.

15 MR. GORMAN: You're right. I'm sorry. Yeah.
16 It's there.

17 MR. BURNETT: And I will tell you for what
18 it's worth that they've got their work cut out for
19 them from the county standpoint because they've
20 got a couple of obstacles to overcome, which is,
21 right now to service this development, without
22 this portion of the road being constructed, if
23 they were to come in here and develop tomorrow
24 with this at-grade crossing, Station 12 down at

1 MR. WUELLNER: County.

2 MR. BURNETT: -- the courthouse and the jail
3 back there, Station 12, it actually has to go
4 across the railroad crossing, up U.S. 1, and
5 across the railroad crossing again. So it's got
6 two crossings to make, twice the chance that a
7 run -- I guess a train could be coming through at
8 that point in time. And it's not until this
9 roadway is built that they'll have access through
10 Woodlawn Road from the station that's at the tech
11 center there to go backwards this way.

12 So they've got that issue. And then they're
13 trying to do something that's I guess I think some
14 way novel in our county that hasn't been done
15 except for when the county did it on its own, that
16 to my knowledge is they're moving development
17 rights from this parcel to this parcel.

18 So -- but I mean, it -- the big carrot that
19 they have is making this connection point here for
20 a tremendously important roadway because this
21 roadway 313 is supposed to have a face much like
22 9A, limited access. There's not going to be
23 driveways all along it. It's going to be a major
24 bypass roadway to --

25 MR. GORMAN: It will actually be a reliever

28

1 for traffic. That was the idea. Right. Got a
2 question. How about -- and I'll let Jim -- I'm
3 sorry, Jim. The height of this thing, is this
4 thing going to be height restricted as -- to the
5 rest of the county if this is multifamily? It's
6 one of these big --

7 MR. BURNETT: I haven't looked at that issue
8 specifically. I know the tradition -- the trend
9 in the county for most everything that's been
10 approved in recent times has been 35 feet with an
11 additional 10 feet for parapet walls, elevator
12 shafts, and those kinds of things. So you're
13 really looking at a 45-foot tall structure.

14 If they made a deviation from that, it may go
15 to 55 feet. I don't think you see a structure
16 taller than that other than like World Golf
17 Village, something like that, something along
18 those lines. But also they have a tremendous land
19 mass, and depending on the amount of uplands
20 that's on there for -- you can put 250 units on 10
21 acres. So it only takes 30 acres to do the 70 --
22 the 750 units that they're talking about if it was
23 an apartment-type project.

24 MR. GORMAN: Why I asked was World Golf

25 Village, because certainly it does not meet the

29

1 height restriction, you know, and so c'est la vie.

2 What happens next?

3 MR. WUELLNER: Well, it does for the
4 residential units.

5 MR. GORMAN: Yeah, but not for the --

6 MR. WUELLNER: I mean, there are structures
7 on the property that exceed that.

8 MR. GORMAN: Right. But they got a variance
9 for these commercial -- for the commercial hotel.

10 Could they not get a variance? This is where I'm
11 going with it.

12 MR. WUELLNER: Well, that's really --

13 MR. GORMAN: And its impact to the airport.

14 MR. WUELLNER: Doug, could you speak to the
15 difference in this case -- the difference between
16 the development rights associated with that
17 property and the approval process being entirely
18 legislative?

19 MR. BURNETT: That's true.

20 MR. WUELLNER: I think it's an important
21 nuance in understanding the latitude that the
22 county has relative to the project.

23 MR. BURNETT: Currently, the project -- the
24 property has its existing land use in place. So

25 if you look at Lemberg South, the top portion of

30

1 it's Industrial. The bottom portion of it's

2 Residential.

3 If someone came in tomorrow and said, "You
4 know what? I've got a warehouse project I want to
5 put here, an industrial warehouse project I want
6 to put here, and I've got a subdivision I want to
7 put here," the County has to approve some form of
8 a subdivision basically here.

9 They can control it whether it's compatible
10 to the neighbors. They can control it as to a
11 lot -- many number of things, but ultimately at
12 the end of the day, they've got to allow some
13 development to go here because that's what their
14 comp plan says. The same thing with Industrial.

15 But as far as making this change of turning
16 this into Industrial, it's completely legislative.

17 And it's really to a large degree no different
18 than if they pass -- passed an ordinance that says
19 you've got to have a leash on your dog or don't.
20 They can do it they if want and they can do it if
21 they don't want to. It's pretty analogous,
22 although there's some exceptions to that.

23 So making this change from the current
24 Industrial designation of this property for

25 Cordova Palms to -- whoops, from this one to this

31

1 one where you get Residential C and Industrial --
2 Intensive Commercial here, you know, it's a
3 legislative act. But it's completely within the
4 County's discretion. And again, they've got this
5 huge carrot of getting the right-of-way and
6 getting this railroad crossing.

7 As far as the uses, Residential C is -- you
8 have Residential A, which is the least dense
9 residential designation, Residential B, Resident C
10 and then Residential D. But they're moving the --
11 the units from down below at Lemberg South where
12 they can do 750 units potentially, up to, they're
13 moving that to this area. That's the trade
14 they're making. And then the Intensive
15 Commercial, they're substituting for Industrial.
16 Which Intensive Commercial, a big reason to do
17 this is it will allow a big box user. So it will
18 allow your Lowe's, your Home Depot, your Walmart,
19 Target, those types of big users.

20 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: Olive Garden.

21 MR. BURNETT: This is true.

22 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: I'm only kidding.

23 MR. BURNETT: Yeah, it's the more -- it will
24 allow all of the uses that you would normally have

25 in commercial plus some of the more intensive

32

1 ones. And the County's Land Development
2 Regulations are pretty strict when it comes to
3 where you can locate a quote unquote big box. You
4 can't just put a big box everywhere.

5 MR. GORMAN: You'd to wonder where all of
6 these people are going to go. It looks like
7 they're going to go out on U.S. 1 with the rest of
8 us.

9 MR. WUELLNER: In terms of access, you mean?

10 MR. GORMAN: In terms of access. Oh, yeah.

11 MR. WUELLNER: Foreseeably. You know, in
12 terms of compatibility with the airport, you know,
13 in a strict interpretation, we -- we really
14 probably don't have issues with industrial. We
15 probably don't have issues with commercial-related
16 uses, and in certain circumstances, could buy into
17 multifamily-type residential uses in certain
18 circumstances. But again, I would emphasize only
19 if they're going to remain in a lease-related --
20 you know, they're not an owner in the stricter
21 sense. And that's not -- you know, we wouldn't be
22 thrilled about it, but at least it -- it's a less
23 onerous position that the individual occupier's
24 in.

25 But residential in and of itself's, you know,

33

1 not -- not something we would be happy and
2 supportive of and the like. And, you know, I just
3 don't see us rolling over and, you know, letting
4 the residential go quietly and easily and directly
5 under the approaches.

6 MR. BURNETT: And at least the school's been
7 eliminated, because that was a major issue
8 before --

9 MR. GEORGE: Yeah, right.

10 MR. BURNETT: -- the concern of a large dense
11 group of people in one small area.

12 MR. WUELLNER: We will -- you know, obviously
13 we'll be reporting back in January based on our
14 meeting. They'll have made a submission to the
15 County. They'll be looking for agency comments at
16 that point.

17 We will be able to provide comments at that
18 point. We'll be able to weigh in continually
19 through the process with the County Commission,
20 and others. So, you know, there's plenty of
21 points there to find something that is either
22 tolerable to us or just simply can't be made
23 tolerable and we'll have to take a position in
24 opposition of it. So just see where it goes.

25 Does that pretty well summarize it?

34

1 MR. BURNETT: Yeah.

2 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: And this aggressive time
3 line is because?

4 MR. WUELLNER: I can tell you why. You
5 have -- there is a -- if you -- if you're paying
6 attention at all, there's a proposed
7 constitutional amendment in Florida that would
8 make these kinds of developments -- if it passes,
9 would make it subject to the voters in your
10 individual counties. Their attempt is to get this
11 through that process with the Board of County
12 Commissioners, get an approved development prior
13 to the voters speaking on that methodology.

14 I don't know that we're all warm and fuzzy
15 about the proposed amendment, but at the end of
16 the day, whether it passes or not, could hugely
17 affect what their future use of that property
18 could be because it would be potentially subject
19 to voters.

20 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: And that would be --
21 excuse me if I may. That would be government
22 property also, so it would affect anything the
23 Airport wanted to do.

24 MR. WUELLNER: Everything, everything.

1 anything the County or School Board or anyone
2 wanted to do. It would take voter approval.

3 MR. WUELLNER: It's going to require huge
4 amounts of money on all people's parts just to
5 educate the general public about a project. And
6 you could have literally dozens of these things at
7 every election cycle for voters to look over.

8 MR. BURNETT: And --

9 MR. WUELLNER: A real cumbersome process.

10 MR. BURNETT: Yes. So to make this change
11 from Industrial as we -- oops, Industrial as it
12 sits here to this, would take a referendum under
13 Hometown Democracy.

14 Now, if you came in and you had -- and this
15 property's all designated on the comp plan
16 Industrial, and currently its zoning I think is
17 Open Rural, which means some very limited housing;
18 but, you know, you can have farming activities and
19 those sorts of things in Open Rural.

20 To come in and rezone it to an Industrial
21 Warehouse is really a no-brainer. You don't have
22 to do anything. But if you want to change it from
23 Industrial to this designation, it would take a
24 referendum under Hometown Democracy. And so their

25 time frame is set up to come in ahead of when the

36

1 November election would be for the voters to vote
2 on Hometown Democracy.

3 MR. GORMAN: Is it a -- do you believe they
4 beat that deadline? Because that would --

5 MR. BURNETT: The deadline they're proposing
6 would beat the November elections.

7 And, you know, there's a lot of concern that
8 it does get passed, because it could impede what
9 local government wants to do that makes good
10 sense. But it also sounds really good and not
11 only does it sound really good, there's some good
12 merits to Hometown Democracy. And it sounds
13 really good, and so it very well may get passed
14 because it sounds, Hometown Democracy, "I want to
15 vote on everything that goes on in my county,
16 okay, I'll vote for that constitutional
17 amendment."

18 MR. GORMAN: I think they relabel it on the
19 ballot, though, don't they?

20 MS. BUNNEWITH: Amendment 4.

21 MR. WUELLNER: It's Amendment 4.

22 MR. BRUNSON: It's not on the ballot as
23 Hometown Democracy. It's Amendment 4.

24 MR. GEORGE: Change it to health care.

25 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah.

37

1 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: But it is Hometown
2 Democracy.

3 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. It's a -- from a
4 governmental standpoint, it's a pretty ugly piece
5 of --

6 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: Well, from my personal
7 standpoint, I don't think it's functionable.

8 MR. WUELLNER: It's what?

9 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: You -- it's not
10 functionable.

11 MR. WUELLNER: No, it isn't.

12 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: You can't get voters
13 out to vote for senators that are running. You
14 know, you can't get them to vote on other things,
15 then how are you going to get the paperwork that
16 can be an inch and a half thick on one comp plan
17 change?

18 MR. WUELLNER: And extremely technical
19 anyway.

20 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: I mean, you know, you
21 just -- it's not functional. I don't see how it
22 would ever work.

23 MR. WUELLNER: I don't think anything's ever
24 going to be passed anywhere from that point on.

1 questions for Doug or Ed about Cordova land use?

2 Vic?

3 MR. MARTINELLI: Can I?

4 MR. WUELLNER: Get you a mic.

5 MR. MARTINELLI: The comment is regarding our

6 master plan. And I guess the exercise that

7 you-all went through, which was very thorough and

8 very comprehensive, was for our own edification.

9 Apparently it's not binding anyplace. And it just

10 seems that we're going in a direction which

11 benefits obviously aviation and the airport, but

12 we're kind of alone in this. And I'm just

13 wondering -- and, Commissioner Sanchez, I would

14 like to ask a question.

15 If the County Commission adopted the master

16 plan as it was presented and as it exists, would

17 that then carry some weight? And I'm thinking

18 particularly the Lemberg South development, which

19 actually encroaches on a future runway, crosswind

20 runway, which is in the master plan. Is there

21 anything that can be done -- and, Doug, maybe you

22 can answer this -- to give our master plan --

23 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: I think your

24 attorney's a better one to answer that, I think.

25 MR. MARTINELLI: Okay. But to give -- to

39

1 give the master plan some stature in the
2 community, in government, rather than having it be
3 just an exercise that we go through here, which is
4 all very good as long as nobody else wants to do
5 anything. But if somebody else wants to do
6 something that impinges on that master plan, we --
7 we're stuck. So is there anything we can do?

8 MR. BURNETT: There will be several
9 opportunities to weigh in with comments,
10 Mr. Martinelli. You can go to the Planning and
11 Zoning Board meetings. You can go to the County
12 Commission meetings. It will get transmitted to
13 the Regional Planning Council and the Department
14 of Community Affairs.

15 MR. MARTINELLI: I understand.

16 MR. BURNETT: All of those, you can make
17 comment on.

18 MR. MARTINELLI: Is there anything we can do
19 to make it more than just a commentable situation?
20 Is there -- is there something the County
21 Commission can do which basically says, you know,
22 we've -- we've cut this parcel out in conjunction
23 with the Airport for aviation and so any future
24 development that comes before the County

25 Commission for approval has to cross that hurdle

40

1 before it happens?

2 I mean, comments, we can make comments till

3 we're blue in the face, but that's not very

4 effective -- well, I shouldn't say very effective.

5 It's not as effective as something which is cast

6 in stone as an ordinance by the Board of County

7 Commissioners.

8 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: I don't think the

9 County Commission could do anything unless the

10 Airport comes to us and presents that plan to us.

11 I don't think it's just something that we can make

12 an ordinance over, unless we have a request to do

13 that.

14 MR. MARTINELLI: Good. Can the Airport make

15 a request to the County Commission to do it?

16 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: We're not going to be

17 able to assume that we can do other developments

18 based on your plan, because I think your plan

19 would have to be considered. But it's hard to

20 turn down a development because of something you

21 want to do as an airport. Unless we have already

22 approved all of that.

23 MR. GEORGE: Right.

24 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: And you're looking at

25 a lot of work.

41

1 MR. MARTINELLI: Maybe that's what we need to
2 do, is try to get prior approval. That's really
3 where I'm going.

4 MR. WUELLNER: Okay. Yeah.

5 MR. BURNETT: There is an Airport Overlay
6 District. The boundaries of that could probably
7 use updating, and I know the County has been
8 working on its EAR Based Comp Plan Amendments,
9 which is when those sorts of things would happen
10 potentially.

11 Mr. Martinelli, when you put me on the spot,
12 I'll answer the question also with this. The --
13 there is the potential -- let me -- let me not say
14 there's the potential. Let me -- let me rephrase
15 it.

16 Florida law allows challenges through the
17 court systems to land use amendments and
18 rezonings. And it allows neighboring property
19 owners or those with standing, as it's called, to
20 make those challenges. I have no idea whether it
21 we'll be in one of those positions or not, but to
22 answer the question fully, that's the answer.

23 MR. WUELLNER: Secondly, part -- part of
24 this rests in the LDRs, the Land Development

25 Regulations of the county. The -- the Airport has

42

1 some very baseline protections in there.

2 There are some identified holes in the
3 language within those LDRs that we need to begin
4 working very carefully with the County on
5 plugging. The intent of that LDR language was to
6 afford the Airport I'll call it maximum protection
7 from incompatible land decisions close in to the
8 airport.

9 We have found through a couple of rezonings,
10 small -- very small parcel things that staff at
11 the County doesn't necessarily -- or has made the
12 statement that the language does not reflect what
13 the intent was. So we may need to get in there
14 and work with the County and tweak that to
15 something that works.

16 The other piece of this, as Doug alluded to,
17 is that the Airport Master Plan is supposed to be
18 collected into the comprehensive planning process
19 of the county. We provide that information to the
20 county.

21 I'm not sure there's been any real follow-up
22 on either party, be it the airport or the county,
23 to make sure that the current master plan's future
24 airport boundary is -- is reflected as the Airport

25 Development District as it's supposed to be.

43

1 So, it's very possible, based on what I'm
2 seeing here, is the Airport Development District
3 that's shown up on the screen here appears to
4 reflect the old master plan, not the current
5 master plan. So, somewhere we've got to get
6 engaged in that process with the County and make
7 sure that the Airport Development District
8 reflects the current airport Future Land Use Map.
9 And that's the intent.

10 The comp plan language specifically says that
11 relative to the master plan. I think it's just
12 been a case it's not -- not quite made it through
13 all of the steps and the initiative's not been
14 there to get it done right. And this is a good
15 example of why it needs to be in place. You've
16 got one behind you.

17 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: So staff will be working
18 on making sure all of those i's are dotted and t's
19 are crossed.

20 MR. WUELLNER: And we will take some of these
21 graphics for next meeting and put on there some of
22 that airport development information, some
23 baseline stuff.

24 MR. GORMAN: Just like to actually see a good

25 graph of what we own --

44

1 MR. WUELLNER: It will help you understand,
2 yes, exactly.

3 MR. GORMAN: -- in a little -- and we can
4 discuss it.

5 MR. WUELLNER: We should be able to do that.

6 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: We had another public
7 comment you said?

8 MR. LOPINTO: Thank you. It's a question for
9 the counsel. To what extent if any, and it's
10 something I think is the other 500-pound gorilla
11 that's in the room, would the Airport Authority be
12 subject to be a defendant in a Bert Harris act --
13 Bert Harris suit by the developer?

14 MR. BURNETT: If the Airport Authority
15 challenged the County's approval.

16 MR. LOPINTO: Okay.

17 MR. BURNETT: Is that -- is that what you're
18 asking?

19 MR. LOPINTO: Yeah. I mean, could there be a
20 scenario that's developed at the Authority level,
21 a developer sees an impingement or a taking of
22 their rights and therefore the Authority becomes a
23 defendant in a Bert Harris suit.

24 MR. BURNETT: It's not the Authority's action

25 that's approving or denying.

45

1 MR. LOPINTO: Okay.

2 MR. BURNETT: The added thing is, as I was
3 talking about earlier, the difference between a
4 rezoning and a land use amendment, a rezoning, if
5 those areas up there that are industrial --

6 MR. LOPINTO: Right.

7 MR. BURNETT: -- if you wanted to do an
8 industrial park in here tomorrow and you show up
9 and you have a plan for an industrial park and the
10 County denies you and they deny you on a basis
11 that maybe is less than reasonable --

12 MR. LOPINTO: Uh-huh.

13 MR. BURNETT: -- you can very easily maintain
14 a Bert Harris action against the County.

15 MR. LOPINTO: Right.

16 MR. BURNETT: But if you show up in this
17 industrial land and you want to change it -- well,
18 actually here's the situation. If you want to
19 change this residential land to industrial, it's
20 legislative.

21 MR. LOPINTO: Right.

22 MR. BURNETT: So highly unlikely that you can
23 maintain a successful Bert Harris act.

24 MR. LOPINTO: And the master plan would not

25 kick in that potential, either, the Authority's

46

1 master plan?

2 MR. BURNETT: Well, here's the thing. Since
3 it's a comprehensive plan amendment, the County
4 can deny it or approve it for whatever reason. To
5 a large extent, it's no different than someone
6 trying to sue the county saying, "You know what?
7 You don't have an ordinance to stop people from
8 putting their dogs on leashes. You need an
9 ordinance to stop people from having dogs running
10 around wild."

11 MR. LOPINTO: Right.

12 MR. BURNETT: The County can pass that
13 ordinance or it cannot. It's -- it's in its
14 power.

15 MR. LOPINTO: Okay.

16 MR. BURNETT: So the -- there's a difference
17 between the quasi-judicial rezoning and the
18 legislative land use change.

19 MR. LOPINTO: Understand. Thank you.

20 MR. GORMAN: When we see, at the next meeting
21 I hope, an overlay of grids with this 10-year plan
22 and what we own, you will see that the whole
23 thing's completely incompatible, that the
24 airport -- the placement of our runway, the whole

25 thing needs to be reengineered, rethought. The

47

1 land use rethought, everything.

2 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Well, that's for a later
3 date, though.

4 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, we'll try to get the
5 graphics up there for you --

6 MR. GORMAN: Would you -- not to be pushy,
7 but I am, I'm being pushy, I know --

8 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Yeah.

9 MR. GORMAN: -- wouldn't it be nice to see
10 that as soon as possible because they're on a fast
11 track?

12 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: We've saw -- we've seen a
13 couple of reiterations on that. Obviously with
14 these changes, that will be something that we can
15 look at again. But that is something for -- to
16 look at for the next meeting.

17 MR. GORMAN: Thank you. Okay. Just checking
18 on a time line.

19 MR. WUELLNER: We'll update your graphics for
20 the next meeting.

21 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay.

22 MR. BURNETT: You know, the only thing --
23 while I'm speaking so much tonight, I'll comment
24 on one other thing.

25 There's a tower up over there, and as you

48

1 recall, that was one of those matters that we
2 requested the County to help the Airport Authority
3 related to, and they did. And so, anyways, just
4 wanted to make that comment the tower's up and
5 it's the airport tower, and I believe Ed's gotten
6 the first check out of it.

7 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. And I've got it under
8 housekeeping to actually share with you.
9 Tower-related data --

10 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Yes.

11 MR. WUELLNER: -- operational-related data.
12 For the year over year, you're about 8,064
13 operations under where you were the previous year,
14 or about 9 1/2 percent. That's actually
15 significantly lower than most airports are
16 experiencing at this point.

17 For month over month, meaning the November --
18 excuse me, October -- no, it's November.
19 November-related data over the previous November,
20 you can see we're actually ahead. We actually
21 have come up by 8 -- 812, takeoffs and landings
22 for comparable months.

23 But if you recall last year, we were just
24 really starting to get that deep sinking feeling

25 of where it was all going for the next four or

49

1 five months after that. So hopefully that's an
2 indication of some general improvement over all.

3 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay.

4 MR. WUELLNER: It's not all bad. Okay.

5 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Before we move on to
6 project updates, I would like to invite Denise to
7 come up and talk about the TPO. And I'd like to
8 remind members of the public, if you would fill
9 out the comments cards if you'd like to speak. So
10 we can get those in.

11 MS. BUNNEWITH: I have a couple of handouts
12 for you. The first is the update on the AMTRAK
13 project. And there's some extras that we can
14 pass -- pass to the public.

15 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

16 MS. BUNNEWITH: And this is on the highway
17 program funds for our leftover stimulus funding.
18 I'd like to begin by saying that at our meeting
19 last week, we did adopt a resolution opposing
20 Amendment 4. And the reason we did it is we feel
21 that -- that Amendment 4 will prohibit us from
22 doing our job in the future.

23 We are tasked with beginning to draw a close
24 relationship between transportation and land use

25 planning, and Amendment 4 will basically get in

50

1 the way of us being able to do that in the future.

2 One of the things I was asked to do today was
3 to look at an update on the AMTRAK situation. So
4 I -- I contacted Kim DeLaney with Treasure Coast
5 Regional Planning Council. They were tasked by
6 DOT with looking at station locations. And so, I
7 won't go through the whole thing, but here's an
8 update on what they've done so far.

9 And you can see that they have identified
10 three possible locations. They are expecting to
11 hear -- we are expecting to hear back from D --
12 from Washington on the status of our applications
13 for the ARRA funding for -- that's the stimulus
14 funding for rail projects here in Florida -- early
15 winter. That's January/February time frame.

16 Now, we do have a tremendous advantage in
17 that the legislature last week passed the rail
18 bill. And that clears up some of the hurdles we
19 had with Washington and our legislators there.

20 First, we have the liabilities issues --
21 issue was resolved for commuter rail. Second, we
22 have some funding issues resolved with Tri-Rail
23 and the -- and the commission down there. So I
24 think those two issues resolved, it puts us in a

25 better standing. So hopefully we'll be successful

51

1 and we'll get funding for -- for high speed rail,
2 for Sun Rail, and for the AMTRAK project. So I'm
3 very helpful.

4 In the long-range plan that we adopted last
5 month, as you know, we did fully fund a commuter
6 rail project from Jacksonville to St. Augustine.

7 And so, hopefully now that we have the liability
8 issue resolved, that's one project that we will
9 be -- somewhere in the 20-year time frame be able
10 to move forward with. We did have some other
11 commuter rail projects in there as well. So I'm
12 very anxious.

13 Now, D -- JTA is doing a commuter rail study,
14 and we don't have -- know anything about station
15 locations, but certainly a station location here
16 for commuter rail makes a lot of sense.

17 The other thing I wanted to talk about is
18 when we did our first -- we had just under \$23
19 million in stimulus funding. That's the American
20 Reinvestment -- Recovery and Reinvestment Act
21 funding that was awarded for our region. And we
22 funded originally ten projects.

23 They came in under bid. And we knew we had
24 additional funding, please excuse me, and so we

25 started collecting projects for the second round.

52

1 And it was really a difficult project, turned out
2 to be.

3 We initially had five projects, and of those
4 five projects, only two survived to be actually
5 eligible. And to be eligible, they had to be on
6 the Federal Aid Highway System. They had to be
7 shovel ready. That meant that they could not
8 require any permits and they could not require any
9 right-of-way.

10 Well, that turned out to be the difficult
11 thing. The DOT had to be able to turn those
12 projects around very quickly. That meant on the
13 second round, that they could not execute any
14 joint participation agreements with local
15 governments. They -- local governments couldn't
16 chip in to fund the project. And basically
17 between the projects that actually went into the
18 State TIP this week, between now and early next
19 year, they had to be fully executable.

20 We had about 23 projects. We got down to
21 about eight or nine projects. We still needed
22 more projects. We ended up with 15. And some of
23 those projects were coming in the day of. We
24 expect to have about 7 -- between \$7 and \$8

25 million worth of projects.

53

1 We adopted a list with 10 and a half million
2 dollar projects expecting that some of these will
3 fall off the list because for one reason or
4 another, they will not be eligible. The intent is
5 we will just move on down to the next project.
6 And here you can see the list of projects that we
7 had.

8 It was not an easy time. Many, you know,
9 counties were not happy that their projects fell
10 off. It was really a determination made by DOT,
11 not by the committee. But they are in prioritized
12 order. And as I said, if a project drops off,
13 we'll simply move down to the next project. Does
14 anybody have any questions for me? Yes.

15 MR. GORMAN: Not about the project, but as
16 you know, I came to the last meeting
17 embarrassingly late, but was really happy that I
18 came there. Two things.

19 One, because -- and it's very good timing,
20 because we just had this huge issue with the land
21 use and our land use in conjunction with everyone
22 else's and then this 312/313 issue. In layman's
23 terms, what's the feasibility of actually getting
24 this built and getting it funded?

25 And I had heard you -- we talked about this

54

1 before -- I didn't e-mail you though -- about the
2 actual fundability of this 312/313, actually
3 getting it built. What kind of a time line in
4 reality do you really think this could happen in?

5 MS. BUNNEWITH: Well, in the long-range plan
6 for highway projects, we basically adopted our
7 list of highway projects because we had so little
8 funding. And basically what happens is every
9 year, we submit that list to the DOT and we say,
10 "These are our priority projects. Would you
11 please include one or more of these projects in
12 your five-year work program?"

13 And in the last year, last -- say three, four
14 years, we haven't seen projects moving. However,
15 we did see projects that we thought had
16 disappeared, had moved outside the five years,
17 starting to slowly move back forward. So I am
18 hopeful that we will see projects, maybe next
19 year, the year after, start moving off of our --
20 out of the five years and be -- be funded and that
21 we will see some of the projects start moving off
22 of our list. Which ones, I can't tell you.

23 MR. GORMAN: In other words, we had talked
24 before briefly about a State -- the State funding

25 for this 312/313. I'm just talking about relief

55

1 for the traffic on U.S. 1.

2 And then -- and then you had talked briefly
3 about the federalization of the project and how it
4 made it more complex, but it then of course
5 allowed more funds to be available. And that's --
6 is there any way you can clarify that at all or
7 see if that's even possible?

8 MS. BUNNEWITH: Right. We get about \$50
9 million a year federal funds that we use to
10 directly program projects. And we do take funds
11 off the top.

12 We take a million dollars a year off the top
13 that we give to JTA for transit. We take \$250,000
14 off the top that we give to St. Johns County for
15 transit. We take a million dollars off the top
16 that we give to -- that we fund ITS improvements,
17 intelligent transportation improvements. That's
18 signal coordination-type projects at intersections
19 along entire corridors. We're doing U.S. 1 right
20 now here in St. Johns County.

21 We also do -- starting next year, we'll start
22 \$250,000 off the top for planning activities, and
23 we're going to try to do better coordination of
24 land use and transportation. We'll be working

25 with each of the counties. And then the rest, we

56

1 fund for -- for projects. And because it's not a
2 lot of money, we usually buy -- we usually use it
3 to advance purchase for right-of-way for projects.
4 And so we start buying right-of-way for projects.

5 The project -- the problem with when you use
6 those funds, they're federal funds, and federal
7 funds federalize the project. So we -- we're
8 cautious when we use them because they are -- they
9 do federalize a project. And federalization means
10 that when you buy right-of-way with them -- now,
11 these are out ahead of time.

12 So right now, as they're sitting, we have
13 federal funds sitting on a project. They're not
14 hurting anything. By the time we can come to do
15 the project, we try if we can to switch them out
16 with local projects. And the reason that is, is
17 that when you use federal funds to buy
18 right-of-way, you have to use the federal
19 right-of-way process. If you use right-of-way --
20 if you use federal funds for construction, you
21 have to go through NEPA. All of those things
22 delay and make the project more expensive.

23 So whenever we can, if there's an opportunity
24 to swap those funds for local funds, we do. Just

25 because when you use federal funds versus state

57

1 funds versus local funds, you make the process
2 much more expensive. So if there's an opportunity
3 to swap them out, that -- then we will.

4 MR. GORMAN: Do you see a time line where
5 that actually could be funded? Because I know
6 state funds are so tight. I mean in reality.

7 MS. BUNNEWITH: I think it will. I think it
8 will. All of those projects I think will get
9 funded unless an alternative comes along that's
10 better. And we're weighing that right now on a
11 project that we're doing in Jacksonville.

12 We had planned to do that -- we had planned
13 to swap those funds out with city funds for a
14 project we're doing there, and now it looks like
15 it might be better to do them with the federal
16 funds because we might be able to get the project
17 done faster doing that -- doing it that way, doing
18 an alternate project on State Road 9A than the
19 project we had planned to do, which is off system.
20 So if a better solution comes along, we might do
21 that.

22 MR. GORMAN: One more question and I'll leave
23 you alone. What was the man's name that did that
24 five-year presentation, where he did a five-year

1 MS. BUNNEWITH: James Bennett.

2 MR. GORMAN: That was again -- Mr. Bennett.

3 MS. BUNNEWITH: James Bennett.

4 MR. GORMAN: James Bennett.

5 MS. BUNNEWITH: Yes.

6 MR. GORMAN: I'll tell this board when you
7 saw James Bennett's presentation, you got very
8 clear as to what was going to go on and you got
9 very clear as to what kind of federal funds there
10 were.

11 And I sat across from -- in my wrinkled
12 shirt, sat across from Mr. Mays the -- another
13 county commissioner over there at -- and it really
14 became patently clear -- and this is just my
15 comment, and I'll leave poor Ms. Bunnewith
16 alone -- that there's a disproportion of the
17 amount of funds going to this -- the Duval County
18 area.

19 We're talking about \$180 -- \$156 million
20 here, \$86 million here, \$46 million there. And
21 then when you look at that and you just think
22 about it just in layman's terms, just not having
23 been to a lot of meetings, not having studied,
24 well, we don't have a dog in the fight.

1 Mr. Mays' comments were related to the stimulus
2 funds. And the reason his -- his comment was made
3 is that in the state-funded -- the state portion
4 of the stimulus funds, those went to State Road
5 9B --

6 MR. GORMAN: Right. But I'm not talking,
7 Ms. Bunneworth (sic), about that. I know that
8 that was a small amount of money and that was a
9 small amount of money for the stimulus funds, and
10 even then that was a bit disproportionate.

11 But I'm talking about my own and his. In
12 other words, if you look at the total sum picture
13 of what's going to go on, I'm just talking TPO,
14 but I'm talking about the infrastructure
15 development of these counties, that it is very
16 disproportionate.

17 There's a huge amount of monies being spent
18 on the 295 beltway. And while things that are key
19 to this county like, you know, finalizing where
20 312 and 313 is so this airport can make plans,
21 it's just not being done. And I'm sorry if that's
22 caustic, but that's just my own thought.

23 MS. BUNNEWITH: There are three categories of
24 funding that we saw in the long-range plan. First

25 was the Strategic Intermodal System. Those funds

60

1 are programmed in Tallahassee, not by the MPO.

2 Those go for the interstate primarily, and look

3 where the interstate system is: Primarily in

4 Duval County. And then there's funds -- that's 75

5 percent of the funds. 25 percent of the funds are

6 funded by the North Florida TPO.

7 And when I come -- if I can come next month,

8 I will bring you the summary of funds and you'll

9 see how the -- we have a brochure that's being

10 developed. 25 percent is funded by the North

11 Florida TPO. And that basically was our list of

12 priority -- prioritized projects. And that was

13 pretty equitably distributed between the four

14 counties.

15 And remember that every day, a large number

16 of residents of -- of the three outlying

17 companies -- counties get in their car and drive

18 to employment in Duval County. And at the end of

19 the day, they get back in their car and drive

20 mostly on the interstates and on U.S. 1 and the

21 major roadways to come back to their counties.

22 The third category was for locally funded

23 projects, and the only county that really had

24 locally funded projects was St. Johns County. And

25 then we had the outer beltway. So there is a

61

1 disparity, but -- but unfortunately, most of the
2 major roads are in Duval County.

3 Now, if you look at transit funding, we did
4 fund the commuter rail line. That's the only
5 fully funded commuter rail line. We also have one
6 going out to Nassau, but -- that's -- that's
7 funded. But the one to Clay County is not fully
8 funded, mostly because it's on the CSX line and we
9 can't -- we're not sure we can get agreements
10 right now with CSX. But we do try very hard to be
11 equitable. And we cannot control the decisions
12 made in Tallahassee and we do not agree with the
13 decisions made.

14 Personally, I don't think that we should be
15 funding free capacity on the interstate system. I
16 just think we -- our money could be much better
17 spent making sure that people can get to work and
18 move within our counties than -- than the
19 decisions being made in Tallahassee. But we don't
20 have a choice.

21 If you want to, right now, you can look on
22 the interstate -- on DOT's web site and comment on
23 their SIS plan update. The one thing that they
24 did not address at all was the funding strategy.

25 It's still 75/25. They've made other changes.

62

1 They did not make changes.

2 The other thing they did not fund -- the
3 other change they did not make is that sometimes
4 it makes more sense to make improvements to, for
5 example, U.S. 1 than it does to I-95, because a
6 lot of local traffic, we can take local traffic
7 off the interstate. We could make -- we could --
8 and make changes to U.S. 1 or put -- spend that
9 money on the rail. It just makes more sense. But
10 we're -- we're competing against ourselves. And
11 in some places, our plan is competing against
12 itself. We don't have any choice.

13 So those are the comments that we need --
14 that we're sending to DOT. And if you could make
15 those same changes, it would help -- make those
16 same comments, it would help. But it doesn't make
17 sense for us to do -- to do long-range
18 transportation plans and have funding decisions
19 made in Tallahassee. So those are my comments.

20 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Ms. Bunneworth (sic), can
21 you send to Ed to distribute out to the board
22 members the web address and the area that you'd
23 like to see support for those comments made?

24 MS. BUNNEWITH: Sure. And some of them are

25 addressed in our legislative policy positions

63

1 which will be going out to members very shortly.

2 And if you want to echo those -- some of those in

3 your legislative policy positions so that when

4 you're in Tallahassee meeting with legislators,

5 you can share some of those concerns. Because I

6 think we really need to share -- share with them.

7 And we can make -- we know our regions. We know

8 our needs. And I just don't think that they know

9 them in Tallahassee. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Thank you.

11 MS. BUNNEWITH: Get off my soap box.

12 MR. GORMAN: That's all right. You made my

13 point and I appreciate it. Thanks.

14 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Before we move to project

15 updates, Mr. Zimmerman, did you want to report on

16 the IDC?

17 MR. ZIMMERMAN: No, I have no -- nothing to

18 report.

19 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. We can go ahead and

20 move to the project updates.

21 PROJECT UPDATES

22 MR. WUELLNER: The first project, just this

23 will be the last time we see a slide on it, the

24 Taxiway Bravo north is complete. It was opened

25 about two weeks ago to traffic and is now a

64

1 75-foot center full strength section with 15-foot
2 paved shoulders outboard of that, and the
3 lighting's been updated and it's now all been
4 replaced in that area. Even a few provisions for
5 future projects have been included in its under --
6 especially underground infrastructure. So it'll
7 allow that to progress as we do updates or
8 upgrades over the years.

9 You will -- I believe we also have a release
10 of retainage as an agenda item related to this
11 project, too. But after -- after today, we won't
12 have it as a stand-alone project, as it is
13 complete. As you recall, that was a stimulus
14 project, too. So that is -- was a hundred percent
15 funded through FAA.

16 Multiuse building, if you haven't been out
17 there in a while, those of you that have airfield
18 access or airport access, construction continues.
19 It is under roof now. I guess by the technical
20 definition, it is dried in. However, the exterior
21 roof application won't be on for another couple of
22 weeks, but it should come on shortly.

23 Stucco work is underway now on the outside to
24 begin the process of bringing out the exterior

25 elevation. Internally, some framing is underway

65

1 as well as the trade-related work is underway at
2 this point, too. And it should quickly -- and
3 even some windows are in and much of the metal
4 work related to doors and the like is now in
5 place. So, it's going to quickly look finished on
6 the outside, but there'll be several more months
7 on the inside. Still on track to occupy hopefully
8 by end of March, barring no major objections or
9 problems as we go forward from this point. Very
10 pleased with the progress and the workmanship and
11 the like of this one so far.

12 Aircraft maintenance facility hangars are in
13 construction. I would expect that the slab is
14 poured in the next several days. I don't have a
15 firm date. I have not heard one. But it's
16 awfully close to being ready to pour the slab
17 building. To my knowledge, has been ordered now.

18 So it should quickly come out of the ground
19 after the first of the year, and it's on track.
20 It's probably going to be a little later than
21 March getting that particular hangar occupied, but
22 shouldn't extend beyond April at this point.

23 MR. GEORGE: And who's renting it from us,
24 Ed?

25 MR. WUELLNER: We'll be talking about that in

66

1 January --

2 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

3 MR. WUELLNER: -- but we'll have the
4 lease-related things coming out.

5 ARFF facility bidding, it's out for bid right
6 now. We extended the bid date into January. I
7 believe it's January 14th now. If you've been
8 sort of paying attention on the background, if you
9 even have an interest in it, but it looks like the
10 continuing resolutions that both the House and
11 Senate now have passed will provide at least 50
12 percent of the Airport Improvement Program funding
13 right away.

14 So there's a good chance that the fire
15 station piece of this will go very quickly and
16 will be funded not long after the first of the
17 year, depending on when that money actually works
18 its way out to being able to put into grants. But
19 we'll have a good solid number ready to go when
20 FAA's ready to give us some money.

21 We have a built-in hold period on the
22 grant -- excuse me, on the bids. Once we receive
23 them, we'll be able to take advantage of that
24 price for at least 90 days after bid opening. So

25 there should be plenty of room there to make the

67

1 grant time lines work. And obviously it will move
2 into construction as quickly as possible.

3 I would remind you this is a -- what's called
4 entitlement funding, commercial service
5 entitlement funding. This is your second-year
6 funding related to Skybus. So this is the second
7 \$1 million minimum grant that you were guaranteed
8 when Skybus straddled into the second year of
9 service. You met the minimum number of
10 enplanements to qualify for the minimum
11 entitlement.

12 Next project's the environmental assessment.
13 You probably if you read your agenda are aware
14 that scheduled for the 11th of January will be the
15 public meeting related to that. It will also a
16 provide an update opportunity for you.

17 We -- that will not be your regular Airport
18 Authority meeting, but it will have plenty of
19 action, as they say. So I would encourage you to
20 make sure you're here and get the latest and
21 greatest on the environmental assessment.

22 It is now out for agency comments. The
23 entirety of the draft environmental assessment is
24 available on our web site. You can go there at

25 your leisure and there's a dedicated page to that.

68

1 All of it's there. You can read it. You can
2 download and print it. You can do whatever you'd
3 like to off the web site of that report.

4 I will caution you, before you jump into
5 printing the thing, it is about 10 inches thick,
6 in terms of the backup and the report itself, so
7 it's a phenomenal amount of paper involved in that
8 at this point.

9 We are looking forward -- I believe Andrew is
10 submitting that final to FAA for an actual
11 determination after the January 11th meeting. I
12 think it can go pretty quickly and that will
13 result in some determination of environmental
14 suitability of the projects.

15 MR. WERTER: And it's at -- the meeting's at
16 5:00?

17 MR. WUELLNER: I believe it's at 4:00.

18 MR. WERTER: 4:00?

19 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: We start with the
20 information meeting at 3:00.

21 MR. WUELLNER: We're starting at 3:00. Thank
22 you.

23 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: And then we have the
24 organizational meeting at 4:00. And then the

1 MR. WUELLNER: And that is, as mentioned,
2 already advertised. So that date is at this point
3 fairly firm.

4 MR. GORMAN: It's -- just for the public's --
5 it's amazing how many different entities are
6 involved in the micro study of this small piece of
7 property. And it shows you just in a -- it's my
8 own opinion when government gets to go a bit
9 wrong.

10 In other words, they are micro studying a
11 situation that should be dealt with in common
12 sense. And Ed is stuck with the situation and
13 Bryan's stuck with it, and they wade through it
14 and they get it done. But it's -- you'll see
15 during that meeting how involved it is. It's
16 amazing.

17 MR. WUELLNER: It is certainly not my area of
18 expertise and hopefully never will be, but it --
19 it involves three separate -- actually, three to
20 four, depending on how you describe it, projects
21 will be covered by this one environmental
22 determination, and those include the restoration
23 of the safety area on the east side that has been
24 subject over the years to some erosion, primarily

25 related to storm, tropical events. That extends

70

1 around the southern end of the runway, also. I
2 probably could point -- for those of you that can
3 actually see this, but it's this area along the
4 edge of the airfield where it meets the marsh.

5 The other piece is the extension of Taxiway
6 Bravo, which would complete the parallel taxiway
7 associated with Bravo. The last major
8 airfield-related project is related to
9 establishing approach lighting related to the ILS
10 for Runway 31. The fourth project I kind of
11 alluded to here is that it -- a part of the
12 environmental assessment will require mitigation.

13 The mitigation that's currently being
14 proposed, and we'll talk about that in more detail
15 next month, but the -- is the -- essentially the
16 elimination of the larger island that sits out off
17 the seaplane ramp. So it's actually -- well, you
18 just see the edge of -- a piece of it here.

19 But essentially, that project, if everyone
20 ultimately agrees to it, and I don't mean just the
21 Authority, but all of the environmental alphabet
22 kind of agencies all agree to that mitigation,
23 which by the way we're getting positive feedback
24 on that that's going to be acceptable, will result

25 in that largely be reclaimed as marsh.

71

1 So that original -- that island that's out
2 there which was spoiled from digging the seaplane
3 ramp way back in its origins, that material
4 will -- will largely go back down to mean sea
5 level and will be restored with marsh-related
6 grasses and will just kind of disappear from the
7 horizon if that -- if that ends up being the
8 project.

9 That is FAA eligible. It is -- you know, it
10 is probably in excess of a \$1 million project, to
11 give you an idea of how extensive that kind of
12 work is.

13 MR. GORMAN: During this whole issue, Ed,
14 will -- I'm sorry, Madam Chair, for just jumping
15 in here, but during this issue, will there be any
16 discussion of the dredgability of the seaplane
17 area?

18 MR. WUELLNER: No. It is -- it is
19 independent of this. It would require a separate
20 application.

21 MR. GEORGE: Nor will there be any
22 consideration of extending the runway into the
23 marsh.

24 MR. WUELLNER: No. That's correct. It is

25 not at all being studied here nor is it currently

72

1 anticipated.

2 MR. GEORGE: I would like to suggest that the
3 property owner there, Mr. Al Sesona, get a memo or
4 a letter from you telling him of the meeting, just
5 in case he misses it, and you might want to tell
6 him on the web site, you know, it's there if he
7 wants to download it or whatever.

8 MR. WUELLNER: We'll do that. Anyway, it
9 should hopefully come to some conclusion toward
10 the -- within the first quarter of next calendar
11 year and a determination made.

12 Once the determination's made, assuming it's
13 a favorable determination, then we will be able to
14 move those projects, I believe, fairly quickly
15 into funding. So, until that's determined, it
16 just kind of sits there and treads water, because
17 you're not going to be able to do anything until
18 the determination's made. And we're going to talk
19 a little bit more about those projects as an
20 agenda item a little bit later, so you'll have
21 some idea of what's currently being discussed.

22 Park schedule, again, I hate to keep saying
23 this, but if you haven't been out there recently,
24 you'll notice the fence is going up on the park

25 perimeter, at least where it interfaces with the

73

1 airfield. So you'll begin to get a feel for what
2 the edge of the park looks like as it -- as it
3 attaches to the airfield.

4 We are working out details to begin with
5 student volunteers, probably the third weekend in
6 January, the way it's looking, in trying to make
7 sure with a first phase to be -- to begin here
8 with the trail construction around the main pond
9 out in this general area. And then probably later
10 phases will include adding the trails in these
11 areas.

12 As we identify, we will also be applying for
13 grants under the FIND, Florida Inland Navigational
14 District, grants to be able to build some of the
15 boardwalk or observation area, those kind of
16 structures. In the event we're successful there,
17 then we'll begin those efforts and open pieces of
18 the park as -- as construction wraps up over the
19 years.

20 I don't envision this as being something that
21 opens all at once, the whole place. It's going to
22 be, you know, phased in over probably a number of
23 years as work gets accomplished, as grants are
24 identified, as different components become funded

25 hopefully through various sources.

74

1 MR. GEORGE: I would expect as it becomes
2 useful, that we could have some announcement and
3 press release that it's there.

4 MR. WUELLNER: Yes. The first phase will
5 be -- as soon as it's finished and as far as we're
6 concerned, it will be open. And then, as we can
7 open additional pieces and meaningful parts, we'll
8 open those.

9 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

10 MR. GORMAN: We aren't going to fence the
11 public off from just the ability to walk through
12 this area, are we? In other words, you're saying
13 open --

14 MR. WUELLNER: We really haven't -- you mean
15 as unimproved area?

16 MR. GORMAN: Right. In other words, should
17 be able to walk through and --

18 MR. WUELLNER: We haven't talked about that.

19 MR. GORMAN: It's probably not an issue
20 anyway, really.

21 MR. WUELLNER: We'll see -- see if we can
22 keep it safe enough for them to get through there.

23 Okay.

24 No meeting related to the citizens airport

25 group. I don't believe there's another one

75

1 scheduled until February. If somebody knows
2 something different about the dates, let us know.
3 PR committee update, anybody making that in and of
4 itself? I know they've met. I know they're
5 working on some presentations.

6 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Bryan, can you update us
7 on that?

8 MR. COOPER: There hasn't -- there was not a
9 meeting. It was canceled for this month.

10 MR. WUELLNER: Sorry. You're right.

11 MR. COOPER: Nothing new since last month.

12 MR. WUELLNER: Benchmarking numbers. Budget
13 related, you can see how revenues are down about
14 five and a half percent at this point. Operating
15 expenses up 15.4. That's a little deceiving,
16 because you have expenses that will essentially be
17 realized over the course of the year.

18 There are many up-front things that are done
19 in the first month or two of the fiscal year that
20 provide benefit for the balance of the year so
21 that you have a -- kind of a jolt. But you'll see
22 that number hopefully slowly working its way down
23 over the next several months. It won't be over at
24 all.

25 Occupancy. T-hangars are currently at 100

76

1 percent. Small corporates, we still have I
2 believe -- two units? Two units still available
3 on the corporates and all of the large -- the
4 larger corporates are occupied.

5 Jet sales, this is probably the biggest
6 telling of where the economy is relative to
7 business and thanks to the United States Congress
8 and -- slamming corporate aviation over the last
9 18 months. And you can see that it's almost half
10 of what it was the year before for the same month
11 in terms of jet fuel sales.

12 Surprisingly, general aviation, the light
13 general aviation has been pretty consistent. In
14 fact, we've had a couple of -- a couple of periods
15 of monthly growth. But hopefully we'll recover
16 that piece even better into the
17 January-through-May time line and we'll see a
18 little bit healthier three or four months there
19 than we did last year. See we did have about
20 13,6- -- 13,600 gallons in self-fuel during
21 November, which is up, you know, about 3500, 4000
22 gallons over the previous year -- or previous
23 month last year.

24 Operations numbers, you can see that we

25 actually were up about -- as I previously told

77

1 you, you're up about 800, a little over 800
2 operations for the same month last year over this
3 year. So, it's not all bad news. Not all great.

4 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Buzz?

5 MR. GEORGE: Excuse me. Back to the
6 operating expenses, is that -- I understand what
7 you're saying. Is that because we budget for an
8 annual and then just divided it by -- take 1/12th
9 every month?

10 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. It's more how it's
11 presented in the financial statements. For
12 instance, property taxes, we -- you literally
13 accrue the property tax portion monthly. But you
14 pay the bill at the beginning of the year, as an
15 example. So you see the expense come through
16 immediately.

17 MR. GEORGE: Yeah.

18 MR. WUELLNER: But you won't see that showing
19 up every month from that point on.

20 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

21 MR. WUELLNER: It's -- it's a presentation
22 issue. And -- unless I hear something to the
23 contrary, I believe we're required to do it as an
24 accrual accounting. So it's -- it would make more

25 sense as cash accounting sometimes, but --

78

1 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: The professional --

2 MR. WUELLNER: -- it is what it is.

3 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: The professional
4 memberships are all done at the beginning.

5 MR. WUELLNER: The guy who's fault it is will
6 get up and tell you about the audit.

7 MR. GEORGE: Well, on an accrual basis, if
8 you're paying something in advance, then it's an
9 asset. It's a prepaid. So you don't realize the
10 expense. But --

11 MR. WUELLNER: Every month.

12 MR. GEORGE: -- 1/12th. But then you --
13 gosh, you could drive Donna nuts back there with
14 every professional organization we belong to,
15 trying to take a twelfth every month.

16 MR. WUELLNER: Well, membership -- I mean,
17 they're just -- you budget -- you put an annual
18 budget number example as a belonging to AAAE or
19 Florida -- Florida Airports Council or something
20 like that. Well, the dues are paid in October.
21 But you won't -- so you won't see additional
22 expenditures on any of those line items over the
23 course of the year. So they in effect look like
24 they disappear over the course of the year because

25 you won't see additional expenditures. So you'll

79

1 see many line items go to a hundred percent very
2 quickly in the year, but then you won't see
3 additional expenses against them. So the revenue
4 hasn't been realized.

5 MR. GEORGE: Well, I don't know if it's the
6 government, but in businesses, you know, you take
7 those and you know when they're going to come due,
8 so you put that in the month of November because
9 that's when you're going to expend it as opposed
10 to taking 1/12th, because it does tend to give you
11 some fluctuations throughout the year to do it
12 that way. I'm not saying change --

13 MR. WUELLNER: And it doesn't apply to all --
14 obviously all our line items. There are just a
15 few significant ones that are paid that way.
16 Insurance is another one. It doesn't happen in
17 October, but you'll see that surge out in April,
18 probably. As policies are renewed for a year, we
19 pay the premium once.

20 MR. GEORGE: Yeah, right.

21 MR. WUELLNER: If we paid our property tax,
22 as an example, every month, you would just see it
23 slowly accumulate over the year.

24 Okay. That's all I have on project updates.

25 Conveniently, we end up with talking about numbers

80

1 and move on to the audit presentation if you're
2 ready for that.

3 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I am.

4 ANNUAL AUDIT PRESENTATION

5 MR. WUELLNER: I'm not sure who's -- looks
6 like Harold.

7 MR. MONK: Both of us.

8 MR. WUELLNER: Both of you.

9 MR. GEORGE: Sounds like you're doing the
10 normal introduction and somebody else is --

11 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Before you gentlemen
12 start, I just want to remind if there's anybody
13 who wants to fill out any of the speaker cards,
14 now's the time. Okay.

15 MR. MONK: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I'm
16 Harold Monk. I am a partner for the firm of
17 Davis, Monk & Company who has the pleasure and
18 privilege of serving as the Airport Authority's
19 auditors.

20 We have completed the audit for the fiscal
21 year ended September 30th, 2009, which has been
22 distributed electronically and today in paper form
23 as well, and we're here to answer your questions
24 and to report on the results of that audit.

1 audit, ran the audit on a daily basis, and he will
2 go through the detail, and then we're both
3 available to answer questions.

4 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Thank you.

5 MR. ZEICHNER: Well, good evening. It's a
6 pleasure to be here again. Again, I'm Jeff
7 Zeichner from Davis, Monk & Company. I'm going to
8 try and be as brief as I can. The time is running
9 late. But I don't know that I've ever gotten up
10 to deliver an audit report and felt my bit of
11 business was the lighter bit of business. So
12 thank you, Doug. Because after the discussion on
13 land use, this is going to be easy.

14 Before I get started, I would like to thank
15 the airport staff again. We were able to come
16 here and be very efficient, sit that down there,
17 mostly through their efforts. And I'm sure it's
18 just an effort to get us out of here, but there
19 isn't anything we ask for that they aren't
20 diligent about getting us the information. We
21 really are very appreciative and we appreciate
22 your help.

23 What I thought I'd do is briefly just go over
24 the results of the audit and then I'll sort of

25 touch on the things, the financial statements that

82

1 I find interesting. As Harold said, we're here to
2 answer any questions, is the real purpose of being
3 here.

4 One of the -- one of the things I like about
5 the government model of reporting financial
6 statements is on page 23 of the financial
7 statements. This is the schedule of findings and
8 questioned costs, and it will essentially --
9 that's not my page 23, Ed.

10 MR. WUELLNER: Well --

11 MR. ZEICHNER: But if you have it in front of
12 you, this is what it looks like. It's the
13 schedule of findings and questioned costs. And
14 essentially it will tell you everything you need
15 to know about an audit.

16 I on this page is really what I think of as
17 our primary focus, our primary purpose. It deals
18 with your financial statements. And what we do is
19 we gather evidence or we observe evidence that
20 supports the amounts and disclosures in your
21 financial statements. We evaluate your accounting
22 principles in their relation to compliance with
23 generally accepted accounting principles. And
24 once we are comfortable, we are able to issue our

25 opinion. And in that regard, we were able to

83

1 offer or express an unqualified opinion on your
2 financial statements.

3 This is the highest level of assurance a CPA
4 can lend to a set of financial statements. What
5 it means is that the user of your financial
6 statements, whether it be management, those
7 charged with governance, bankers, grantors, et
8 cetera, can rely on your financial statements to
9 accurately reflect the financial position of the
10 airport, the results of its operations, and its
11 cash position as of for the year ended September
12 30th, 2009.

13 Because it's the government, it's also
14 subject to governmental auditing standards. II
15 and III deal with that. This adds additional
16 requirements. We have to -- we're required to
17 gain an understanding of your internal controls
18 sufficient to plan our procedures.

19 We don't express an opinion on your controls,
20 but if we did become aware of a material weak --
21 or significant deficiency in your control, we
22 would be -- we would be required to report to you.

23 In that regard, we have nothing to report.

24 We are also required under these government

1 laws and regulations, contract provisions that
2 would have a direct and material effect on your
3 financial position -- or your financial statement,
4 I'm sorry. Also in that regard, we have nothing
5 to report.

6 Lastly, because the airport does receive
7 federal and state financial assistance, we report
8 under the Single Audit Act, local Florida Single
9 Audit Act and federal Circular A-133. In this
10 section of the audit, we not only examine your
11 compliance with the requirements applicable to
12 each of your major federal programs and state
13 projects, we also have to test and are required to
14 test your internal control over those compliance
15 elements. In both of those regards, we have
16 nothing to report, which is really the best thing
17 you're ever going to get from an auditor.

18 The last thing I'd like to discuss, and I'm
19 not sure if Ed's page numbers work, but I would
20 draw your attention to page 18. On 18 and 19 --
21 we're still off.

22 MR. WUELLNER: Okay.

23 MR. ZEICHNER: We tried. I told you, Ed, I
24 wasn't sure it was going to happen.

25 MR. WUELLNER: I think we may have pulled

85

1 them out of the previous version. There may have
2 been --

3 MR. ZEICHNER: That's possible. There was an
4 earlier draft.

5 MR. WUELLNER: So we're not going to have --

6 MR. ZEICHNER: But this is still relatively
7 new. And it starts on page 18. And under the
8 current auditing standards, we are required to
9 make certain communications to those charged with
10 governance. In this case, that would be the
11 board.

12 There's a number of communications that are
13 required, and in so, we report things such as
14 qualitative, you know, accounting aspects. You
15 know, if we had any disagreements with management,
16 we would discuss them here. If we felt there was
17 significant estimates or any -- any very sensitive
18 disclosures, this is where we discuss it.

19 And I draw your attention to it because these
20 are things that might not raise to the level of a
21 reportable condition for the audit report, but we
22 still think they're things that would be important
23 for you to know.

24 Having said that, I turn your attention to

25 the financial statements. And there's a few

86

1 things that I find pretty interesting about these.

2 On page 6, you'll find the statement of net

3 assets.

4 MR. WUELLNER: We've got it.

5 MR. ZEICHNER: Yes. That's all right.

6 MR. WUELLNER: One out of three so far.

7 MR. ZEICHNER: We got it right somewhere.

8 Anyway, as a reader of financial statements,

9 there's a few things that really catch my

10 attention here.

11 What I tend to look at -- and as you know,

12 the airport has been very aggressive of putting

13 assets into service. If you look there under the

14 line under noncurrent assets, under the

15 depreciable net -- depreciable net, you can see

16 the number's increased about \$4 million from 2008

17 to 2009, and that's net of depreciation. 2009

18 depreciation was approximately \$2 million. So

19 just looking at that, you can see that during

20 2009, the airport placed about \$6 million of

21 assets in service. Again, it's reflective of a

22 very aggressive attempt to grow the airport.

23 The other thing that grabs my attention on

24 the balance sheet is on the net assets section.

25 If you look down towards the bottom under net

87

1 assets, you see the unrestricted net assets number
2 grew considerably from last year.

3 Historically, we've actually run deficits in
4 unrestricted net assets and now that that deferred
5 revenue agreement is winding down, we've gotten to
6 the positive. And you really see growth from 2008
7 to 2009. It's reflective of continued financial
8 strength and, you know, stronger financial
9 position.

10 The page -- following it on page 7 -- that's
11 all right -- your statement of operations. You
12 can look at that again. You can see the total
13 operating revenue was a bit down from last year,
14 about \$2.8 million.

15 Operating, we report operating expenses of
16 about 2.4. And we report this intermediate
17 measure of operations before depreciation expense.
18 That was something we decided to do a few years
19 ago. But you can see that, again, the airport is
20 operating at a surplus, an operating surplus
21 before the noncash depreciation expense. After
22 depreciation expense of about 2.3 million, we do
23 have an operating loss.

24 Below that, you can see property taxes of

25 about 3.8, 3.9, capital grants of almost three

88

1 million, and a total change in net assets of

2 almost \$5 million positive surplus.

3 The final thing I'd like to call your

4 attention to is on the following page, page 8,

5 your statement of cash flows. For the second

6 year, under operating activities, the very first

7 section, this is your -- your cash flows from

8 operations, excluding property taxes and grants,

9 just from the operation of the airport is for the

10 second year a positive number.

11 So you have had positive cash flows of

12 \$95,000 from operating activities, even in this

13 difficult economy. I think that's something to

14 note. I -- before 2008, I'd never seen that as a

15 positive number. So it's a -- it's a real

16 encouraging trend.

17 And as the reader of the financial

18 statements, you know, it really does -- it looks

19 good. But that's essentially what I wanted to

20 bring to your attention. And if you have any

21 questions, we're more than happy to try and answer

22 them. Those are easy to answer.

23 MR. GEORGE: I'd like to make a comment.

24 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Go ahead.

25 MR. GEORGE: Go back to page 7. Notice your

89

1 net assets went up \$5 million last year.

2 Any ongoing projects that we have after we
3 get off the tax rolls next year, that's our source
4 of funds right there, because those are
5 unencumbered assets right now, unlike a lot of the
6 other airports. Jacksonville primarily. That's
7 our nest egg.

8 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: That's a good point.

9 MR. WUELLNER: You're letting him off the
10 hook that easy?

11 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Comparable to audits in
12 the past, how do you reflect on this one? I know
13 that you said that you've seen some numbers in the
14 positive that you have not seen before. And as we
15 go forward, what would your remarks be?

16 MR. ZEICHNER: You know, I need to be
17 careful. Our -- our engagement is not to make a
18 prospective financial analysis.

19 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I understand.

20 MR. ZEICHNER: You know, as a reader of
21 financial statements, just looking at these -- and
22 that's when I discuss your financial statements,
23 I'm just looking at this as any reader should --
24 what surprised me, and I drafted these financial

25 statements, and I was curious what would happen to

90

1 the cash flows this year because I knew operations
2 were down.

3 I think what's encouraging is that even
4 though it was a difficult economy, there were
5 probably rental rates, there were probably empty
6 hangars certain parts of the year. I know you had
7 to be creative in working with certain tenants.
8 I -- I didn't expect you to have positive results
9 from operations again. At least positive cash
10 flows. I was surprised to see that. So I think
11 that's very encouraging, that you were proactive
12 in reducing expenditures or at least realizing
13 where the -- what was happening in the economy and
14 still maintaining a very strong financial
15 performance.

16 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Do we have any other board
17 comment?

18 MR. GEORGE: I have a comment, that I would
19 like to commend our accounting staff for another
20 outstanding year. You've got to be the most
21 boring person for them to work with. Everything
22 is there. And I notice the time that they spend
23 here seems to be going down, too. So you've been
24 very successful at keeping the door locked and

25 keeping them out. My congratulations.

91

1 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Good job.

2 MR. GEORGE: And thank you, very much.

3 MR. MARTINELLI: I know I didn't fill out a
4 card, can I do it posthumously or what?

5 MR. WUELLNER: Let's hope not.

6 MR. MARTINELLI: Can I make a comment?

7 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I looked specifically at
8 you, too, you know that.

9 MR. MARTINELLI: I know, but I didn't know I
10 was going to make -- thank you, Madam Chair.

11 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Vic, I knew you would.

12 MR. MARTINELLI: I know that it's not their
13 job to do any prospective speculation on where
14 this airport's going, so I'm going to make it
15 because I don't have that restriction.

16 But as a stockholder, and since I am a
17 taxpayer, I consider myself a -- a stockholder in
18 this enterprise. And I want you to know that
19 based upon what you've told us, that I feel very
20 very comfortable that the value of my shares is
21 increasing, okay?

22 And if you want to talk about asset and value
23 per share or however you want to look at it, I'm
24 very happy about it. And I'd like that message to

25 get out if possible to all of those people who

92

1 think this airport is a drag on them, you know,
2 for the taxes that they do pay. There's no better
3 return in town, even in New York Stock Exchange,
4 there's no better than you get right here.

5 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Thank you, Vic.

6 MR. GEORGE: Sounds like it would be a great
7 letter to the editor.

8 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Thank you, Vic.

9 MR. ZEICHNER: Please don't include my name
10 in that letter. I couldn't take the -- I couldn't
11 take the comments that came after it.

12 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. Hearing no further
13 public comment, do we have any further board
14 comment?

15 (No further comment.)

16 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Well, thank you both. I
17 don't think this is anything we have to --

18 MR. WUELLNER: You should accept.

19 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Do we need to vote to
20 accept it? Do I have a motion to accept the
21 annual audit?

22 MR. GEORGE: So moved.

23 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Do we have a second?

24 MR. WERTER: Second.

25 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. All in -- any

93

1 further board discussion?

2 (None.)

3 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: The motion, all in favor,
4 aye?

5 MR. GEORGE: Aye.

6 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Aye.

7 MR. GORMAN: Aye.

8 MR. WERTER: Aye.

9 MR. GEORGE: Thank you.

10 MR. ZEICHNER: Thank you, very much.

11 MR. MONK: Thank you.

12 MR. WUELLNER: Thanks, guys.

13 COUNTY WIDE TAXATION UPDATE

14 MR. WUELLNER: And you're up.

15 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Mr. George.

16 MR. GEORGE: I'm up? Oh. Everybody has a
17 chart in front of them that was sent over this
18 morning from the County, and I have started
19 transposing these numbers onto the chart that we
20 did from 1999 forward. And this is the chart that
21 I've started adding to.

22 You notice we've got -- like for every one of
23 the taxing authorities, we've got what the taxable
24 value, the millage that they actually voted on,

25 and what kind of estimated tax is coming in. The

94

1 next line down is taking '99 as a base.

2 There's nothing magical about taking '99 as a
3 base. Could have been '98, but I didn't have the
4 data. But basically that line that you see there
5 starting out with '99 with the 0.0 and then going
6 across, that says that in 2000, they had a 13.9
7 percent increase over '99. And then in 2001, they
8 had a 33 percent increase over '99. So it's
9 taking everything back to a base year.

10 And what we did is we charted a few of those.

11 And, Ed, if you can --

12 MR. WUELLNER: I will do that.

13 MR. GEORGE: You'll notice the -- what this
14 basically is is each -- St. Johns County, the
15 School Board, City of St. Augustine, Water
16 Management, and also the St. Johns Airport --
17 St. Augustine-St. Johns Airport. And it's all as
18 a percentage of what it was in 1999.

19 The bottom number is where we are. And next
20 year, it will just go to zero again, which you'll
21 notice what the other taxing authorities, the
22 County, the School Board, and the City of
23 St. Augustine, you know, what theirs are. They
24 have taken a decrease, but not to the

25 significantness (sic) of ours. I think we need to

95

1 be happy of the numbers, how they've come out.

2 Now, in previous years, we were -- wherever
3 you went, you were hit with, "Why are we paying
4 taxes? The airport doesn't do any good for me."

5 And we started accumulating this to show how we
6 were doing compared to some of the other taxing
7 authorities. And it showed a good story.

8 Because we have the press behind us and we
9 have our determination to be off the tax rolls at
10 the end of this fiscal year, I don't think we're
11 going to hear much of that. But I will update
12 this chart and get the raw numbers, the Excel to
13 each one of the board members so that you can look
14 at it and as you -- if you need to use it to
15 compare to Ponte Vedra or something else, it will
16 be there. I think we can all be proud of that --
17 that bottom line.

18 MR. WERTER: If I may. Again, it comes to
19 what I've been pounding the desk about for the
20 past year and even before that, can we have a
21 graph that shows how much commerce we show --
22 bring in opposed to the other agencies --

23 MR. GEORGE: You can have whatever you would
24 like to generate.

25 MR. WERTER: -- to send in that, okay, yeah,

96

1 we're getting off the tax rolls, but we're also
2 producing most of the -- all of the other
3 agencies, our service agencies.

4 MR. GEORGE: I think that that's what Bryan
5 is doing and the PR committee. He's got several
6 projects going.

7 MR. WERTER: We've been talking about that
8 for a while, yeah. But, yeah, again, that's the
9 main thrust is, yes, it's fine we're getting off
10 the tax rolls. I -- lately, I've been using the
11 term when they pay taxes to the airport, they're
12 buying a discount from the other taxes they'd be
13 paying elsewheres because of the commerce we bring
14 in.

15 MR. GEORGE: Yeah.

16 MR. WERTER: So I think that should be pushed
17 as equally as hard.

18 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

19 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: This is an impressive
20 chart. Thank you --

21 MR. GEORGE: You're welcome.

22 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: -- for doing this. I have
23 used this. I've used the Excel spreadsheet with
24 people before, and it -- it is, it's a great point

25 of reference.

97

1 MR. WERTER: Didn't mean to take away from
2 your chart.

3 MR. GEORGE: No, no. No problem at all. I
4 wanted to get it all finished up through 2009, and
5 turn it over to Bryan, and I'll send a copy to
6 everybody else.

7 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Thank you.

8 MR. GEORGE: Thanks, Ed.

9 MR. WUELLNER: Uh-huh.

10 MR. GEORGE: Ed is Omar the chart maker.

11 MR. WUELLNER: I'm something, all right.

12 FUTURE FAA PROJECTS

13 MR. WUELLNER: That brings us to probably the
14 more interesting if not exciting part of what we
15 wanted to kind of talk to you about tonight. And
16 I would invite Andrew to come up and, you know,
17 please augment what -- what we know at this point.

18 But basically, as I was reviewing the EA with
19 you just a few minutes ago, we were talking about
20 three different projects that were out there, or
21 four if you include the mitigation. I -- we are
22 at this point very encouraged -- while nothing's
23 quite as they say carved in stone, but we're very
24 encouraged the feedback we're getting from FAA at

25 this point relative to participating in getting

98

1 some of those projects up and constructed once the
2 EA determination's been made.

3 And to that extent, we could be the recipient
4 of as much as maybe \$15, \$16 million over the next
5 call it 18 months, thereabouts, to get these
6 projects constructed. That involves probably a
7 number of grants. And in this mix is actually yet
8 another project that you've been aware of in the
9 background, but it looks like it's at a point to
10 perhaps get funded, and will likely be among the
11 first couple of projects funded.

12 First and foremost will likely be the fire
13 station, because that would come under the
14 entitlement picture. But the next likely project
15 to be funded is the Runway 13/31 pavement rehab
16 project. We have thrown up on the screen some
17 likely suggestions relative to putting the
18 projects together and getting them off dead
19 center.

20 There's a potential here over the next couple
21 of months that we may need to react quite quickly
22 in order to put ourselves in the best possible
23 position to make sure we get those -- those
24 particular grant funds.

25 Now, what I mean by that is we may need -- we

99

1 need to really begin literally today moving
2 forward with getting designs started and the like
3 so that those projects are as biddable as possible
4 as soon as possible. The criteria frequently is,
5 how quickly can you get it under grant with the
6 FAA? And that may -- there may be additional --
7 I'm not predicting this, I'm just saying there may
8 be additional funds even out of ARRA.

9 There could be -- there's a proposal floating
10 around that's supposed to be released today, it
11 was not released as of the board meeting, but a
12 suggestion perhaps that there was going to be
13 additional infrastructure funds placed out with
14 agencies such as federal highways, FAA, and others
15 to get even more projects funded over the next
16 year or so. So there -- there may be some
17 opportunities here to take advantage of, but we're
18 not going to be able to do that without plans and
19 specifications on the shelf either to ready to bid
20 or recently bid waiting on grants.

21 These are the three major projects. Let me
22 walk you through the projects. Andrew's staff's
23 been very helpful in just putting some slides
24 together to just highlight.

25 This is the Runway 13/31 project. It

100

1 consists of a couple of pieces or components. The
2 first is the rehabilitation of the center 150 feet
3 of the runway. So basically what's out there
4 today, we are making a good faith attempt here and
5 I think we're going to end up successful, to be
6 able to do hot, in-place recycling of that
7 pavement.

8 In other words, we don't need to change the
9 profile or do anything else. We did a test strip
10 of this material methodology on the extreme
11 northern end of the runway about a month ago,
12 maybe a little more than that now, six weeks. I
13 think it was early ever November.

14 We are extremely pleased with the test
15 results that came out of it. We are extremely
16 encouraged by the methodology in that it's a very
17 quick way of essentially using the asphalt that's
18 in place, removing the top two inches, using heat
19 primarily, mixing in new, I'll call it juice,
20 basically adding the fines and the things that
21 evaporate out of asphalt over the years, putting
22 that back in, and out the back end comes what by
23 all accounts is brand new asphalt at the exact
24 same grade and profile that was there in place.

1 only do we not bring in all new material and add
2 elevation to the runway and then have to tie in
3 all the taxiways to it and all of those kinds of
4 complications, but is -- one is the cost. It --
5 it -- it's done at a fraction, probably something
6 in the order of 20, 25 percent of what it costs to
7 put new asphalt down with the same results.

8 The other is the speed at which construction
9 can be accomplished. It literally appears that we
10 can do a 15-foot pull a day the entire length of
11 the runway. So, it's -- it's highly possible
12 that -- this project could be accomplished inside
13 of a week or two and have essentially a brand new
14 runway.

15 The other cool part of this is, if you know
16 anything about asphalt paving, the real problem
17 areas with asphalt paving, and we're seeing it
18 today, is where pavement joints occur, where one
19 pull adjoins another pull of asphalt. The beauty
20 of this methodology is, because they use heat
21 during the process, there are no cold joints that
22 occur. So effectively, it becomes a seamless
23 asphalt -- the appearance of a 150-foot wide pull
24 of asphalt. So, many of the problems that are

25 experienced long term with asphalt overlays and

102

1 even overlay projects hopefully are mitigated
2 significantly. We think FAA's going to jump all
3 over this. The test results show it to be brand
4 new asphalt when they're done with it. So, that's
5 a positive.

6 Add to that this project would likely be the
7 addition of paved shoulders, which I don't know
8 what that is, 15, 20 feet of additional pavement,
9 nonload bearing -- nonload strength of the center
10 150, but would permanently place the lighting
11 inside pavement, would allow for maintenance, puts
12 lighting in conduits, does some things of that
13 nature that are positive long-range
14 maintenance-related items for the airport.
15 Allows -- it's designed more like a road in terms
16 of load-bearing than a runway.

17 The next piece of this would be also as a
18 part of this is to go ahead and make provisions,
19 if not the actual installation, of centerline
20 lighting for the runway, some other things that
21 enhance the all-weather capability of that runway.
22 And we -- those are the things that are likely in
23 this project.

24 That brings it to about -- estimate, about a

25 five, five and a half million dollar kind of

103

1 project.

2 FAA's indicating they intend to fund that.

3 That would likely be, unless we were just lucky

4 and got stimulus funds for this project, which is

5 I would say not out of the question, but not -- I

6 wouldn't bank on it, is probably a 95 percent

7 funded project. It's extremely possible we would

8 get another two and a half out of the state. And

9 so we may be in a two and a half percent funding

10 range. Worst case would be five.

11 MR. GEORGE: If we became the guinea pig for

12 FAA to do one of these early-on projects, we might

13 be able to get a hundred percent.

14 MR. WUELLNER: I don't know that they're

15 going to take it as a test project, which would be

16 the method you're --

17 MR. GEORGE: Oh, okay.

18 MR. WUELLNER: I -- you know, I don't know

19 that we're trying to skin the cat that direction.

20 It involves a little different angle with FAA.

21 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

22 MR. WUELLNER: You know, obviously we'll take

23 what we can get in it. Did -- did I miss any

24 big -- big issues on that particular --

25 MR. HOLESKO: I just want to add the only

104

1 thing is that we are adding the approach lighting
2 system to this project component.

3 MR. WUELLNER: Okay. Okay. So the --
4 because it can be accommodated in the in-pavement
5 lighting to some degree on the south end, elements
6 of it can be, that it would -- we'd go ahead and
7 get those in place in that part of the project,
8 also.

9 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

10 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: From an environmental
11 standpoint, it seems that I remember that this was
12 much more environmentally friendly to do it this
13 way.

14 MR. WUELLNER: Well, it's huge. It takes
15 literally hundreds of trucks off the road. It
16 eliminates the need for most of the raw materials
17 related to an asphalt overlay. It's a very small
18 amount of -- of new material added into this at
19 all.

20 It's -- it's pretty slick. It's very
21 impressive to see done. I -- we sat out here one
22 evening and they did it, were here several hours
23 just doing a test pull on it, and it's very very
24 impressive to see done.

25 MR. GORMAN: What's the percentage of

105

1 difference in cost?

2 MR. WUELLNER: It's the -- I'm going to say
3 20, 25 percent of what it costs to overlay it. So
4 it -- it's serious money savings. And I think the
5 beauty is moving forward, if this becomes a
6 methodology that FAA can embrace, you'll see it
7 done a lot, because where you don't need to
8 physically add strength to the runway -- we have a
9 very good runway strength profile, so adding new
10 asphalt to our runway doesn't provide any
11 meaningful benefit for us. We simply need to have
12 a better wearing surface or a new -- you know, a
13 refreshed surface, if you will, on the runway.

14 MR. HOLESKO: One more item to add is that it
15 is still a test type of project, even though it's
16 not being called a test, but the process that
17 we're using must meet the exact same performance
18 criteria as brand new pavement. That's not -- the
19 bar is not being lowered for this. It's meeting
20 the same criteria as brand new asphalt.

21 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Jack?

22 MR. GORMAN: When you do that, you're going
23 to have a machine critical situation. In other
24 words, you're going to have equipment that if it

25 breaks, you're going to be down.

106

1 Is there -- does this company provide any
2 type of assurance that if their machine breaks,
3 which machines do, that they have alternative
4 machines or that they have -- the runway can be at
5 least, you know, patched and used in the interim
6 while they repair their equipment?

7 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. There's literally
8 only -- I'm going to say it's a hundred, 200 feet
9 of I will call pavement risk in the process,
10 because no matter where the machine broke down --

11 MR. GORMAN: Okay.

12 MR. WUELLNER: -- out the back end is brand
13 new finished product and the front end is what was
14 there. So it's literally only the part it's
15 passing over that's in any state of disruption.
16 That could quickly be repaired. It's only a
17 two-inch process. We're only milling out -- I
18 keep saying we're milling. It's not technically
19 milling. But they're only removing two inches of
20 material and replacing it with --

21 MR. GORMAN: So you wouldn't have to fair a
22 big lap in or anything else like that.

23 MR. WUELLNER: Correct.

24 MR. GORMAN: Just a nonexistent --

25 MR. WUELLNER: The beauty is that -- yeah, we

107

1 have not worked out or even really gotten into
2 detailed discussions about the phasing of putting
3 it in place on a -- on a hard schedule.

4 There's potential that you could do more
5 pulls in say an overnight or give them the runway
6 for a 16- or 18-hour period and get two complete
7 pulls done in that period, then they might lay off
8 for a day or two, restock, reset, do all of the
9 things, then come back, maybe close it for a like
10 period and pull two more. That's one approach.

11 The other might be it's paved -- this work's
12 done only at night, say between 11 and 6 a.m. and
13 by the morning, there's a brand new strip after an
14 eight-hour, you know, 15-foot wide strip in there
15 and we'd be looking at how do we augment it with
16 marking and things like that. So we've got --
17 there's some technical issues on how to --

18 MR. GEORGE: So there's no cure time or
19 anything like that on it?

20 MR. WUELLNER: No. It's functionally usable
21 shortly after it's there. So, you know, we're
22 very very encouraged by the process. We're very
23 encouraged by the results.

24 It literally comes back testing as though

25 it's brand new asphalt. I mean, meets the

108

1 specification as though we brought in new asphalt.

2 So, that -- that's huge. We'll see.

3 Obviously paving companies don't like it. It
4 doesn't result in new pavement, which is what
5 they're in the business for. But keeping in mind,
6 there's an element of new paving to this job, that
7 being the shoulders. That is not existing
8 pavement, so it doesn't -- you can't use that
9 process.

10 MR. GORMAN: If you don't have a down time
11 problem and you have less cost and so --

12 MR. WUELLNER: Real costs, yeah.

13 MR. GORMAN: Less real cost.

14 MR. WUELLNER: That's right.

15 MR. GORMAN: And it is FAA fundable at the
16 standard --

17 MR. WUELLNER: Well, we think so, yes. We're
18 working through that now.

19 MR. GORMAN: That's the only variable.

20 MR. WUELLNER: I think there's a high
21 probability it will be funded as that methodology.
22 If not, FAA's prepared to participate in it as an
23 overlay. So the fallback position is we add two
24 inches of new surface and, you know, do the

25 tie-ins and make it work that way. I -- I'm

109

1 excited about this because it's a whole lot less
2 intrusive, requires a lot less closure time, gets
3 you up and running much much more efficiently than
4 regular asphalt.

5 So, anyway, next piece of this that could be
6 funded is the stabilization along the east side.
7 Part and parcel to this is likely, is it not,
8 Andrew, the actual mitigation project?

9 MR. HOLESKO: Yes, the --

10 MR. WUELLNER: Which is the spoil island
11 outlined in yellow up there.

12 MR. HOLESKO: The magenta or purple area is
13 the safety area on the east side of the runway.
14 And then the island, which looks a little bit like
15 a yellow amoeba there in the upper left-hand
16 corner, that's the mitigation area that will be
17 required to be returned to a saltwater marsh when
18 the stabilization is occurring.

19 MR. WUELLNER: We know.

20 MR. GORMAN: I've got -- I've got to ask --
21 I've got to ask this. In other words, you're
22 going to take a treed area in a natural
23 environment full of little animals chirping away
24 and you're going to mush it all up and turn it

25 back into swamp with federal funding.

110

1 MR. WUELLNER: I know this is really going

2 to --

3 MR. GORMAN: I'm sorry.

4 MR. WUELLNER: This is really going to

5 aggravate you.

6 MR. GORMAN: I have trouble with that.

7 MR. WUELLNER: I had the same opinion.

8 MR. GEORGE: I'm more interested in the

9 safety area on 24.

10 MR. GORMAN: That's more --

11 MR. GEORGE: I wish that had been there about

12 three years ago.

13 MR. GORMAN: A little wider.

14 MR. GEORGE: Longer. I was four inches

15 short.

16 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Only you could have --

17 only you could have gotten by with that.

18 MR. WUELLNER: He's what we call a user.

19 And the last piece of this is of course the

20 Taxiway Bravo extension piece, which essentially

21 requires -- the mitigation's going to be required

22 because there is some impacts on existing wetland

23 area in that area.

24 I do want to call your attention to the

25 question's been asked of me privately, but the

111

1 property line's here. You own this piece. This
2 is the Sesona piece, is this triangle piece. You
3 can see -- and the majority of this project is
4 actually State of Florida property. It's not
5 individually owned. And of course the airport's
6 border is along this way.

7 So you can see the -- the vast majority of
8 this project almost -- almost exclusively is
9 within airport property. The only exception gets
10 into some approach lighting out here, which we're
11 looking at, I'll use the term phone pole kind of
12 impacts, not wholesale development of any kind.
13 It looks like dock piling kind of material out
14 there that would support approach lighting.

15 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Buzz?

16 MR. GEORGE: I'd like to point out that the
17 property that Ed just said that we own, that was
18 one of the options that we could have considered
19 for the park, and we could consider it later --

20 MR. WUELLNER: Sure.

21 MR. GEORGE: -- if you wanted to move the
22 park if there was a need for that other land on
23 this side over here. Because we own that piece
24 right there. And it would be very close to the

1 MR. WUELLNER: It's an extremely shallow
2 marsh area back there. It's -- the state
3 considers it navigable. It's arguable only
4 navigable at higher tides. You could float a
5 canoe through it.

6 MR. GORMAN: It's a ditch.

7 MR. GEORGE: What's that?

8 MR. GORMAN: Commonly referred to as a ditch.
9 And I'm a tree hugger calling it a ditch, so it's
10 a ditch.

11 MR. WUELLNER: The marshland -- to be fair,
12 the marshland around it is of good quality. It's
13 not --

14 MR. GORMAN: Yeah. It's nice marsh, but it's
15 a ditch.

16 MR. WUELLNER: It's got value.

17 MR. GEORGE: Be a nice marina.

18 MR. WUELLNER: That's it. I guess -- I guess
19 what we're trying to look in just throwing these
20 out in front of you is, if there's any -- if there
21 are issues surrounding moving these things forward
22 in a pretty -- pretty timely manner, we -- you
23 know, we're trying to identify what those things
24 are.

25 I've got Andrew's group and all of those

113

1 associated from previous slide there, which is
2 essentially everybody that we have as engineers,
3 beginning to develop the cost to do the designs of
4 these things.

5 All of those costs, just as -- if it helps
6 you, all of those costs are eligible for
7 reimbursement. So it's not that we're
8 front-ending the cost and we -- you know, we have
9 the risk here. We have the short-term risk.

10 I think with the interest FAA has in these
11 jobs, we're simply in a sense front-ending the --
12 the design element. The design element becomes
13 eligible at the point FAA funds the job. So,
14 it -- it's not money lost. It's just simply
15 you're just -- you're just planning the cash flow.

16 And you -- I don't think we're dealing with
17 any -- I don't know what the numbers are, but I
18 think it's important we get started on development
19 of these projects if you -- if you're at all
20 interested in get -- taking advantage of the grant
21 funds that are likely.

22 MR. GORMAN: All but one.

23 MR. WUELLNER: Other than the island. But
24 that's called the anchor project in this case.

1 MR. GORMAN: Really?

2 MR. WUELLNER: Without it, you won't build
3 two out of three.

4 MR. GORMAN: So we have to -- we have to do a
5 nonsensical thing and waste federal money to be
6 able to do things that have merit. How can that
7 be changed?

8 MR. WUELLNER: The direct answer is yes.

9 MR. GORMAN: Because you know there's no
10 merit in just tearing up all of those little
11 bushes to make swamp out of them. That's crazy.

12 MR. WUELLNER: I don't know how to tell you
13 that I -- you're preaching to the choir. I
14 completely agree with that position, but it
15 doesn't change the rules.

16 MR. GORMAN: Unbelievable.

17 MR. GEORGE: What kind of authority do you
18 want out of us to proceed?

19 MR. WUELLNER: I -- if you're generally in
20 agreement with that process, we will move forward.
21 We will bring you probably in January agreements
22 to consider and execute. But we need to get
23 through that development and make sure you realize
24 that stuff's going to be coming down the pike very

25 very quickly so we're not going to have -- we're

115

1 not going to be able to put it off a month or
2 another month and expect to stay in the queue for
3 funding for some of this.

4 The potential is we could -- we could
5 identify upwards of \$10 million of that number in
6 the current fiscal year, current federal fiscal
7 year. So extending into October.

8 You could -- you could realize quite a bit of
9 that money in the current fiscal year if we're
10 ready to go. So, I'm going to take the blank
11 stares to mean you want to do this unless I hear
12 otherwise?

13 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: From a board standpoint --

14 MR. WUELLNER: If you've got other
15 direction --

16 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: -- we need to discuss it.

17 MR. GEORGE: Do what?

18 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: We need to discuss it from
19 a board standpoint. Go ahead. You had some
20 thoughts?

21 MR. GEORGE: My thoughts are that, you know,
22 we -- we -- the whole future of us being able to
23 offer this county a better facility and by
24 offering a better facility, it brings in more

25 revenue so that we can pay our bills and stay off

116

1 the tax rolls requires that we continue to
2 enhance, you know, the airport facilities.

3 And you start looking at this and what we get
4 out of it, it just makes the airport more
5 desirable for any large business to come in or any
6 other traffic coming in, which is -- that's money
7 in our bank.

8 So, I think we -- I think we should consider,
9 even when you consider -- if Ed's saying \$10
10 million and we're talking, you know, 90 percent
11 from this and 5 percent from that and 2 percent,
12 that leaves 2 1/2 percent that we have to cover,
13 but I think in the long run, it's well money
14 spent.

15 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: We have to shore up the
16 stabilization of the runway area. I don't think
17 that there's any anything --

18 MR. WUELLNER: That is a driving project. It
19 is one of the only ones that is arguably a
20 compliance issue, even today, that does not meet
21 FAA standards for its dimensions or its character
22 right now.

23 In order to restore that capability and --
24 it's going to be a licensing issue into the future

25 with us in terms of being able to keep a 139

117

1 certificate. So, we need -- and we need to keep
2 that moving in order to be sure that FAA -- FAA's
3 willing to work with you on that licensing as long
4 as there's a project working to solve it.

5 But if we choose not to do that repair, I
6 think it's going to get difficult in the future to
7 get that licensed as -- under -- as an air carrier
8 runway. It could very much be downgraded.

9 MR. GORMAN: Is there any way to
10 compartmentalize some of this? Obviously runway
11 stabilization is a good thing. This is obvious.
12 This whole package of -- including this
13 tremendously nonsensical part is not a good thing.

14 Is there any way to -- to either minimize the
15 area that you have to make into marsh, which is
16 the most ridiculous thing I think I've said here,
17 or in order to get the funding to do these
18 sensible things, like runway stabilization? In
19 other words, through engineering nuances or
20 something.

21 MR. WUELLNER: I think we're going to run
22 into -- you're going to have to do or be
23 committed, either within the first project that
24 affects the environment, to doing that work

25 concurrently with your first project.

118

1 I do not see them funding a project on the
2 "We'll go back and do the environmental." That's
3 just not going to happen. That's just not the way
4 they work. They're going to need a stronger
5 commitment than "We'll eventually do the
6 mitigation."

7 MR. GORMAN: Right. There's no separate
8 funding for just, you know, runway stabilization,
9 which is a good thing. They won't just --

10 MR. WUELLNER: Oh, we -- you know, it may
11 come down as a number of grants. It could very
12 possibly come out --

13 MR. GORMAN: That's probably --

14 MR. WUELLNER: -- that there's a stand-alone
15 mitigation grant. There could --

16 MR. GORMAN: That's my question.

17 MR. WUELLNER: It could come down. Very
18 likely, they'll -- they don't like to issue any
19 more grants than necessary, so if projects can be
20 combined that need to go together, they'll want to
21 do it as a single grant in most cases. But it can
22 be. It can be packaged separate.

23 MR. GORMAN: Okay. That's my question.

24 MR. HOLESKO: With the risk of having Bryan

25 tackle me and knock me out of the way, I just want

119

1 to note that with the stabilization of the safety
2 area and the Taxiway B development on the west
3 side of the runway, those projects do impact salt
4 marsh.

5 I mean, they are -- you know, they are
6 physically going to be placed over salt marsh,
7 whether it was permitted originally a long time
8 ago or not, Bryan, but that's where Bryan will
9 come up and tackle me. But again, it is there
10 today. Your projects do affect it. Therefore,
11 when you go to do the stabilization or extend
12 Taxiway Bravo, you're having impacts to salt marsh
13 and that's what you're mitigating. You're
14 mitigating what you're trying to do today.

15 MR. GORMAN: Yeah, I understand the word
16 mitigation and I understand how a lawyer would
17 deal with the word mitigation, but then if you're
18 going to actually be a taxpayer and you're
19 actually going to vote for something you think
20 makes sense, then you wonder if the actual
21 implementation of the word mitigation makes any
22 sense at all.

23 And I understand, common sense-wise, if you
24 look at that and you've walked it like I have and

25 like many of the board members have, you

120

1 understand the runway stabilization is just pure
2 common sense.

3 You're not really impacting anything. You're
4 not even -- you're not even killing a clam. It's
5 perfect. It's nothing wrong with it. But then,
6 you know, tearing up a couple of acres of already
7 existing flora and fauna is ludicrous. And then
8 the federal government's making us doing it is why
9 I asked about whether you can compartmentalize the
10 funding. That's all. I understand your point,
11 yeah.

12 MR. HOLESKO: The runway project can proceed
13 perhaps as a stand-alone, but when you get into
14 the safety area stabilization, or the approach
15 lighting system, or the development of Taxiway B,
16 those projects can't occur without mitigation.

17 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I think we're all hesitant
18 about the salt marsh area and the existing -- and
19 understandably -- you know, I understand how it
20 came about and that it was -- you know, it's going
21 back to its original state. But, you know,
22 certainly it -- it doesn't seem to set well, and
23 it's something that's not very easy to gloss over.

24 MR. GORMAN: Yeah. If you walk it, and you

25 can see just the common sense farmer aspect of it,

121

1 you can see that the runway stabilization does not
2 hurt anything and that the other one is just a
3 waste of federal money. But I won't harp on that
4 anymore. We've already made the point of whether
5 it can be, you know, taken apart funding-wise or
6 not.

7 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: This item isn't up for a
8 vote? This is for discussion purely. Is there
9 anything else you need from us?

10 MR. WUELLNER: No. As long as I'm not
11 hearing "Don't do this," we're going to -- we're
12 going to move that direction and you'll see the --
13 you'll see agreements related to it starting next
14 month.

15 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay.

16 MR. WUELLNER: And as the funding thing
17 starts to fall together, probably pretty quickly
18 next month, we'll have a better feel on what
19 exactly is going to get funded in the current year
20 and we'll make adjustments in the program as we
21 go.

22 MR. HOLESKO: Especially for the runway rehab
23 project. That's definitely the first one in line,
24 the rehab of 13/31.

25 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: All right. Thank you,

122

1 Andrew.

2 RELEASE OF RETAINAGE - TAXIWAY B NORTH

3 MR. WUELLNER: And I think the last action

4 item I have today is just simply the release of

5 retainage for Taxiway B north. And that was

6 Halifax Paving, to remind you.

7 That project is complete. Retainage is 10

8 percent or approximately \$258,000, and it would be

9 our recommendation to release the retainage upon

10 receipt of all the final paperwork and all that.

11 But rather than hold their -- their money,

12 which -- none of which is ours, by the way, hold

13 their money until the end of January, which would

14 be the next regular meeting, they're likely to

15 satisfy the paperwork issues in the next couple of

16 weeks at the latest. So we would recommend you

17 release those retainage pending receipt of final

18 papers.

19 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: We have no public comment

20 cards on this. If we have a motion, we can open

21 it up for discussion.

22 MR. WERTER: Move to release it.

23 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay.

24 MR. GEORGE: Second.

25 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Let's open up for board

123

1 discussion. What type of paperwork is it that has
2 to be finished?

3 MR. WUELLNER: We have lien releases from
4 contractors, those kinds of -- kinds of issues.

5 Punch list items. As I said, it -- it's finished.

6 It's open. I believe we've got a few minor, I'll
7 call them extremely minor kind of things.

8 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Jim?

9 MR. WERTER: If we can -- can we expect those
10 releases and the punch list to be done before next
11 meeting?

12 MR. WUELLNER: Yes.

13 MR. WERTER: Then condition it, money will be
14 released upon supply of the releases.

15 MR. WUELLNER: That's --

16 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: So amend the motion to be
17 contingent on --

18 MR. WERTER: Completion of paperwork.

19 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, that was our
20 recommendation from staff.

21 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. So the motion's
22 amended. Do we have a second on that?

23 MR. GEORGE: Second.

24 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: We'll put it to a vote.

25 All in favor?

124

1 MR. GEORGE: Aye.

2 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Aye.

3 MR. GORMAN: Aye.

4 MR. WERTER: Aye.

5 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: None opposed? Motion
6 passes.

7 HOUSEKEEPING

8 MR. WUELLNER: Cell tower update. Just to
9 let you know, it is up. It went up about 4
10 o'clock a week ago Friday. So it's been in place
11 ten days. It was lighted as of the first day.

12 We have received the first \$15,000 capital
13 contribution check and begun receiving monthly
14 rent for the first carrier. The first carrier on
15 the tower is AT&T. They expect to be operational
16 by the end of the month. I've seen guys hanging
17 off the tower all morning.

18 MR. GEORGE: How much did the tower cost us?

19 MR. WUELLNER: We have exactly zero dollars
20 into this project.

21 MR. GORMAN: It's been named, by the way.

22 MR. WUELLNER: I'd like to fill the whole
23 place with that kind of thing. It's an impressive
24 financial performance. I wouldn't want them stuck

25 up all over the airport, so don't misquote me.

125

1 MR. GORMAN: And I've heard a name. It's
2 been named.

3 MR. WUELLNER: It has?

4 MR. GORMAN: Yes. Its name is Spike.

5 MR. WUELLNER: Spike.

6 MR. GORMAN: And there's a new rule around
7 the airport: Don't hit Spike.

8 MR. WUELLNER: Don't hit Spike. Seems
9 reasonable.

10 MR. GORMAN: I thought that was funny when I
11 heard it. Sorry.

12 MR. WERTER: Which brings to attention that
13 we had our first news reporters here today asking
14 questions about the tower.

15 MR. GORMAN: Sure.

16 MR. WUELLNER: That's what I'm told. I don't
17 have any real update on what they -- what was said
18 or not said, or what the angle was.

19 MR. WERTER: It's off centerline by how far?

20 MR. WUELLNER: Centerline? I honestly don't
21 know, but I'm going to guess in the 2000 foot
22 range, 2500 feet. Guess -- I don't have a firm
23 number, but just eyeballing it here, it's got to
24 be every bit of that. It's smaller than the two

25 towers directly across the street that Grumman

126

1 have up.

2 MR. GORMAN: Is that true, it's actually

3 shorter?

4 MR. WUELLNER: It is shorter, so... And it's

5 prettier.

6 MR. BURNETT: And it's in a far better

7 location than it would have been in otherwise --

8 MR. WUELLNER: Absolutely.

9 MR. BURNETT: -- if the other --

10 MR. GORMAN: The other -- the other one was

11 actually close to the centerline, wasn't it?

12 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. There is I understand

13 an agreement in place with Verizon at this point.

14 They will take the number two highest position on

15 there, and I would expect in the next 30 to 60

16 days, they'll begin putting their antennas on it.

17 MR. WERTER: Great. I've got coverage when I

18 go home on U.S. 1.

19 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. It will certainly

20 improve wireless high speed access for anybody

21 using it. And your meetings or proposed meetings

22 going into next year, we ask you to kind of take a

23 look at those over the next -- between now and the

24 next real -- you know, regular meeting and if

25 you've got issues with it, let us know. But we --

127

1 what we've done is last three or four years, we've
2 kind of combined the June/July meeting. We've
3 just kind of worked it into the schedule this
4 time.

5 Obviously, as we get closer to that date, if
6 there's a need to put another meeting back in that
7 mix, we'll bring it to your attention and see if
8 we can try to get it to work. They're approaching
9 now half the year where it's not on the third
10 Monday, most of which is not our fault. The
11 holidays stack -- federal holidays for the most
12 part stacking up on the third Mondays of the first
13 several months, we end up with -- behind the curve
14 right away each year.

15 So, anyway, look -- check your calendars and
16 the like. If you've got input, dates that just
17 don't work or you know are going to be a problem
18 at this point, we'll talk about it.

19 MR. GORMAN: Will you be e-mailing this?

20 MR. WUELLNER: You have it with you --

21 MR. GORMAN: Oh, I'm sorry.

22 MR. WUELLNER: -- but I can. We can --
23 whatever works for you.

24 MR. GEORGE: Whatever floats your boat.

25 MR. WUELLNER: And that's all I have.

128

1 AUTHORITY MEMBER REPORTS

2 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. Authority members.

3 Mr. Werter?

4 MR. WERTER: Nothing.

5 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Mr. Gorman?

6 MR. GORMAN: Key critical meeting. I mean,

7 land use in the next ten years will be everything.

8 In other words, right now, if any of these

9 projects -- if one or any or the road or anything

10 goes through, our 10-year plan is out the window.

11 We start with a completely new 10-year plan.

12 So this is a critical issue meeting to me as

13 far as planning. And it will continue to be, you

14 know, for the next -- until this all -- all of

15 those land pieces are spoken for and the

16 development's done and the permits are done, and

17 our runway or our plans, our -- you know, are

18 firmed up. So this is really a very important

19 meeting to start off.

20 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Buzz?

21 MR. GEORGE: At the SAAPA meeting, it was

22 brought up that there was a problem with parking

23 around the hangars in the southern development

24 area, that people having to park in the grass, and

25 because of the water and the -- you know, it's

129

1 getting ruts in the thing out there. Just need
2 somebody to look at it and come up with some plan,
3 and then verbalize it to the -- may at the next
4 time the next statement goes out.

5 MR. WUELLNER: I -- I've just become aware of
6 it myself in terms of it being -- the comment
7 being made right before the Authority meeting --

8 MR. GEORGE: Yeah.

9 MR. WUELLNER: -- so I haven't had a chance
10 to even get with Kevin and see what we've got out
11 there.

12 MR. GEORGE: I'm sure that the new
13 representative from the Pilots Association to the
14 board will take the message back that we -- we
15 listened and we're --

16 MR. WUELLNER: We're studying the problem.

17 MR. GEORGE: Yes.

18 MR. MARTINELLI: Mr. George, would you like
19 to take over my responsibility to be the liaison
20 to the -- we already discussed it.

21 MR. GEORGE: Okay. Trying to keep all of my
22 fellow board members cognizant of what you're
23 doing.

24 MR. MARTINELLI: Thank you, sir.

1 audit. That was a very -- a very pleasing thing
2 to hear and the comments that were made. And the
3 items that Dennis (sic) and Monk brought out were
4 very very well noted. I think that our financial
5 performance is just -- it's getting stronger, as
6 they pointed out, in tough economic times, which
7 is a great thing.

8 The -- when we do look at these FAA projects
9 and should they be -- should we secure them, I
10 want to make sure that we bring in our educational
11 partners, because this is something new. It's
12 something that even the career -- construction
13 career academy may be interested in witnessing or
14 coming out and knowing about.

15 And with the high schools, they are going to
16 have the open house showcase in January, so that's
17 something else to be looking forward to. Board
18 members are always encouraged to come to those
19 things and to represent the Airport Authority and
20 represent the Aerospace Academy there.

21 And also, with that -- should some of these
22 FAA projects happen, I would like for the PR
23 committee to take up and invite different
24 aviation-related entities as the reporters from

25 the different magazines and stuff to also be a

131

1 part of that.

2 Thank you, guys for tonight. It was a
3 very -- it was a long meeting, but it was also
4 information packed, and I think a lot of
5 information we're going to have to mull over as a
6 board.

7 MR. GEORGE: Can I say one more thing?

8 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Certainly.

9 MR. GEORGE: I hope everybody has a merry
10 Christmas and a happy New Year, and I'll see you
11 next year.

12 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Stay safe. And our next
13 meeting will be on January 11th at 3 o'clock. And
14 we'll break at that meeting for the special
15 organizational meeting and then reconvene the
16 public hearing.

17 MR. WUELLNER: Elect the officers.

18 MR. GEORGE: Oh.

19 MR. WUELLNER: That will be the only business
20 item.

21 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Meeting adjourned.

22 (Meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.)

23

24

1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2

3 STATE OF FLORIDA)

4 COUNTY OF ST. JOHNS)

5

6 I, JANET M. BEASON, RPR-CP, RMR, CRR, FPR,

7 certify that I was authorized to and did

8 stenographically report the foregoing proceedings

9 and that the transcript is a true record of my

10 stenographic notes.

11

12 Dated this 17th day of December, 2009.

13

14

JANET M. BEASON, RPR-CP, RMR, CRR, FPR

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

