

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 Tuesday, July 13, 2010

6 from 4:05 p.m. to 7:11 p.m.

7 * * * * *

8 BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

- 9 WAYNE GEORGE
- JOHN "JACK" GORMAN
- 10 KELLY BARRERA, Chairman
- CARL YOUMAN
- 11 JAMES WERTER, Secretary-Treasurer

12 * * * * *

13 ALSO PRESENT:

- 14 DOUGLAS N. BURNETT, Esquire, St. Johns Law Group, 509
- Anastasia Boulevard, St. Augustine, FL, 32080, Attorney
- 15 for Airport Authority.
- 16 EDWARD WUELLNER, A.A.E., Executive Director.
- 17 BRYAN COOPER, Assistant Airport Director.

18 * * * * *

19

20

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

24

1	I N D E X	
2	PAGE	
3	PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	3
4	APPROVAL OF MINUTES	3
5	FINANCIAL REPORT ACCEPTANCE	3
6	AGENDA APPROVAL	4
7	MEMBER COMMITTEE REPORTS	
8	TPO	4
	EDC	4
9	Intergovernmental	5
10	SJC Aerospace Academy	18
11	REPORTS	23
12	PROJECT UPDATES	34
13	ACTION ITEMS	
14	A. Park Naming Discussion	40,59
	B. TRIM Discussion & Action	93
15	C. Resolution 2010-03	112
	D. Valiant Aviation Maintenance Lease	114
16	E. Environmental Mitigation	123
17	OLD BUSINESS	146
18	HOUSEKEEPING	156
19	PUBLIC COMMENT - GENERAL	158
20	AUTHORITY MEMBER REPORTS	158
21	NEXT BOARD MEETING	169
22	ADJOURNMENT	169
23		
24		

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

2 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: We're ready to start
3 calling the meeting of the St. Johns County-St.
4 Augustine Airport Authority on July the 13th into
5 session. If we could all stand for the Pledge of
6 Allegiance.

7 (Pledge of Allegiance.)

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

9 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Thank you. We're ready for
10 the approval of the minutes. Has every board
11 member had the opportunity to review the minutes
12 from the previous meeting? Any additions,
13 substitutions or corrections to the minutes?

14 (None.)

15 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Hearing none, the minutes
16 will stand as approved.

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

18 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Financial report
19 acceptance? Any additions, deletions?

20 (None.)

21 MR. WERTER: No, everything looked fine the
22 last I looked at it. I need a copy of the agenda.

23 MR. GORMAN: It's on this thing.

24 MR. WERTER: It's contemporary now. Is it

25 under Google docs?

4

1 AGENDA APPROVAL

2 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Meeting agenda approval, I
3 would like to make an adjustment to the meeting
4 agenda. I would like to move the park naming
5 discussion as the top action item and remove it
6 from the bottom so that we can get some community
7 input on that. Do we have any objections?

8 (None.)

9 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Do we have any other
10 revisions to the meeting agenda?

11 (None.)

12 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Then the meeting agenda
13 will stand as approved.

14 MEMBER COMMITTEE REPORTS

15 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Member committee reports,
16 TPO? Carl?

17 TPO

18 MR. YOUMAN: TPO, there's nothing to report.
19 There was no meeting last month.

20 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: EDC, Jim?

21 EDC

22 MR. WERTER: Oh, yeah. Last month, they had
23 the -- let me get this closer here. Last month,
24 they had the meeting, the annual breakfast meeting,

25 and all it really was was a camp -- campaign

5

1 platform for the state financial officer who's
2 running for Governor. But other than that, there
3 wasn't really any outlook as to how we're doing.
4 So it was mainly just a campaign speech. So
5 nothing to report other than that.

6 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I know that we have a
7 regional economic development on Friday. So if any
8 board members can attend that, I'm sure that would
9 be very beneficial. Intergovernmental? Was that
10 Jack?

11 INTERGOVERNMENTAL

12 MR. WERTER: I think I covered for Jack.

13 MR. GORMAN: Mr. Werter did cover for me.

14 MR. WERTER: Okay. Let me go back with this
15 newfangled technology here and get to my notes.

16 Okay. The intergovernmental --
17 intergovernmental committee meeting on July 7th,
18 the new EOC Sheriff's Office is under construction.
19 FDOT was present and they talked about AMTRAK
20 leaning downtown. I don't know how valid that was.

21 I informed them of our progress out here with
22 our -- our new maintenance buildings and future
23 negotiations and potential for new business on the
24 airport. There's a Meet The Candidates night

1 7 p.m. The Salt Run dredging is continuing.

2 Water management attacking the problem of
3 algae bloom, and it's a different strain of algae.

4 I don't know if we really need to go any further
5 than that, but they are working on that problem.

6 Something we should be aware when we're out there
7 in the water.

8 They are worried about the money situation,
9 continued, and Ron Sanchez can address that
10 further. But money's a problem for the government.
11 So there's a continuing drop of real estate taxes,
12 decreasing money for operations and projects. And
13 they don't expect a recovery until 2015 is what
14 they were talking about at the meeting.

15 I was thinking, and I'm beginning to lean more
16 and more towards Buzz as we really have to look at
17 our war chest and -- and see what we can do to
18 either make it more productive or more
19 conservative, one of the two, because who knows
20 what the heck is going to happen? And in my
21 practice, I see it everyday. I just don't see any
22 hope in the future right now on the economy, on the
23 horizon anyway. So, on that note, it's something
24 we should keep in mind when we talk about our

25 budget.

7

1 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. Thank you, Jim.
2 Carl, on the AMTRAK, I know things have been quite
3 busy on that.

4 MR. YOUMAN: Yeah. I don't know where to
5 start sometimes. But my follow-ups, I sent a copy
6 of the 2001 plan to -- to Tom Carper, the chairman
7 of the board of AMTRAK, and followed up a number of
8 times with him and he has not responded back. So I
9 do not know if he will or will not eventually. But
10 he has responded to a couple of the e-mails saying
11 they are working on it.

12 While I was at a -- a Railroad Industrial
13 Clearance Association conference in Las Vegas, a
14 gentleman by the name of Gil Carmichael, who was a
15 former FRA administrator under Reagan, gave a talk
16 on intermodalism.

17 And one of his comments, just a real short
18 version of it, "In summary, this holistic vision I
19 call Interstate 2.0 is a reality-based national
20 rail plan for the 21st century which should be
21 expanded to all of North America. If done right,
22 it will seamlessly connect all modes of
23 transportation, provide a very safe, sustainable,
24 and energy-efficient infrastructure that safely and

25 re -- reliably moves people from car/transit to

8

1 train to plane and freight from ship to train to
2 truck. Interstate 2.0 will be the new
3 transportation paradigm for the 21st century and
4 beyond."

5 He's also the founding chairman of the board
6 of directors of the Intermodal Transportation
7 Institute at University of Denver, besides being
8 former -- former railroad administrator. He's
9 recommended that I write to this one gentleman and
10 send him an executive summary of the plan, and copy
11 him in on it because he'll talk to him about it,
12 and that's been done.

13 This is a copy of the executive summary, if
14 anyone would like a copy of it. And we have met
15 with other people. And one of the things that is
16 being determined is who are the actual decision
17 makers in this process, because the Treasure Coast
18 folks have not been candid about that with us. In
19 fact, they have done everything in their power to
20 keep us out of the loop, except for the public
21 meetings that Ed and I attended.

22 And personally from watching what is going on,
23 I question the TPRC -- I mean, it's TC -- Treasure
24 Coast TPO's agenda. And the reason for that is

25 they support the Miami intermodal facility concept,

9

1 but here in St. Augustine, they do not. And I'm
2 just wondering if their objective is only to get
3 AMTRAK, irregardless of -- of the validity of an
4 intermodal facility here versus just the station.

5 We still do not -- the other part is the
6 funding, and another gentleman is looking into the
7 funding aspect as to how this is going to be
8 funded. And I've read in The St. Augustine Record
9 that the City of St. Augustine will have to come up
10 with 20 percent of whatever the cost of the station
11 is and they'll have to carry the operating costs
12 over the years.

13 And why are they so adamant about not having
14 the facility here is beyond my comprehension, since
15 the Airport Authority has the ability to fund this
16 multimodal facility and create a progressive
17 forward-looking entrance to the city of
18 St. Augustine rather than try to renovate an old
19 station that's behind a shopping center.

20 And they seem to hold to this utopian concept
21 that you can walk from San Marco downtown with
22 suitcases in the middle of the summer and that all
23 of these passengers will be happily smiling down
24 the street, "We're in St. Augustine pulling our

25 luggage along."

10

1 And I still -- how do I say this? I would
2 walk with anybody from St. Augustine that believes
3 in this at any time. I make a challenge to them:
4 I'll walk with you and let's see how you feel when
5 you get downtown and whether this is valid or not.

6 And then I see in the paper this morning
7 St. Augustine the city to see \$2 million in -- less
8 in 2010. And how they're going to finance 20
9 percent when they have infrastructure problems,
10 they've got, what is it, the 450th anniversary to
11 finance and many other things.

12 If the citizens actually understood what was
13 happening, I'm just wondering how much enthusiasm
14 would -- would be for this process within the city
15 of St. Augustine and not let the airport handle the
16 transportation functions that it's designed to do,
17 and it would service not only St. Augustine, but
18 the entire St. Johns County.

19 So, The Record came out with a editorial
20 supporting this issue and in the end of the
21 editorial, they said they hoped the airport would
22 not continue their efforts. But I believe if we
23 didn't continue our efforts, we would be remiss to
24 the citizens of St. Johns County who we do

25 indirectly represent in a transportation -- well,

11

1 we directly represent them in a transportation
2 function. And their word or their input has not
3 been aggressively looked for, as all the meetings
4 have been held in downtown St. Augustine.

5 So, we're going to continue our -- with the
6 behest of the board of course, I'll continue with
7 the assistance of Ed, who's a front-runner in this
8 thing, to secure the multimodal facility here in --
9 at the airport for the benefit of the citizens of
10 St. Johns County.

11 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Carl, has -- in any of
12 these discussions, has the topic of the -- the
13 Customs facility and the opportunity to be able to
14 utilize that with rail been brought up?

15 MR. YOUMAN: It's been brought up and it's
16 part of our argument. And it was even brought to
17 more home when the Bahamian group -- you were here,
18 right?

19 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Uh-huh.

20 MR. YOUMAN: The Bahamian group came here for
21 tourism efforts and for economic benefits between
22 north Florida and Bahama, and this was organized by
23 Senator Tony Hill, who I met at the -- and his
24 assistant, administrative assistant asked for a

25 copy of the executive summary which was sent to

12

1 him.

2 But they brought out the fact that this is --
3 with the Customs facility here, they highlighted
4 the fact that for all the Caribbean, this is --
5 this is a natural entrance point into Florida,
6 would benefit St. Augustine by visitations, but
7 they highlighted the use of that Customs facility.

8 They said that it -- you know, where the
9 Jacksonville airport doesn't even have one, we have
10 it here. And they indicated that a lot of the
11 Caribbean folks like to take trains. That's their
12 mode -- they enjoy taking a mode of transportation.
13 And this -- they said if you had that multimodal
14 facility here, you'd open up a transit point for
15 the Caribbean population.

16 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: So they saw this as a
17 transportation center.

18 MR. YOUMAN: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Do we have any other board
20 input? Jack?

21 MR. GORMAN: In my own mind, there was much
22 discussion with -- from the City of St. Augustine
23 and to the AMTRAK, maybe a core of AMTRAK
24 executives, and it became I think kind of an

25 ancillary discussion where they wanted a whistle

13

1 stop in St. Augustine, this is just my own opinion
2 that that happened, and that's why St. Augustine
3 was somewhat insulated as far as AMTRAK discussions
4 from being able to be in play.

5 And as far as actually, you know, commuter
6 rail, I just feel that's what happened, just from
7 having been there. As far as commuter rail, it
8 just shows you the poignancy of having to be in a
9 TPO and having a presence there. Because if you're
10 not there, you don't ask, you're never going to
11 get. And we just haven't had enough political
12 presence and enough -- basically we're kind of
13 outnumbered in the ability to be able to push
14 through the idea of an intermodal facility there.
15 We just haven't had enough presence yet.

16 I mean, if you keep the pressure up, and
17 Carl's doing a wonderful job of doing that, you've
18 got a chance. But without it, you haven't got a
19 chance at all. It's just kind of we're kind of
20 coming in late here.

21 MR. YOUMAN: If I may -- yeah, and the reason
22 for that was we were excluded from --

23 MR. GORMAN: That's very true.

24 MR. YOUMAN: -- all of the processes that were

25 up to this point.

14

1 What I wanted to say, we were also recommended
2 to rebut these -- there were two opinions articles
3 in favor, but they were both biased of course when
4 you read -- knew who was handling them, et cetera.
5 But they -- that we should have opinions in the
6 paper stating our case and stating, you know -- not
7 our case, what the benefits are for St. Johns
8 County as well as the citizens of St. Augustine.

9 And there is another article -- side article
10 in the same paper today, commuter rail here in
11 eight to ten years. And it had been brought up
12 that, well, we can build a facility at San Marco
13 and then build a facility here. But the reality of
14 it is that will never happen, because AMTRAK will
15 never stop in two points, and it's too close for
16 commuter rails stops, just within two or three
17 miles.

18 I met with the FEC, and they also indicated
19 they were at this point not favoring any location.
20 But they did say that if AMTRAK goes beyond two
21 trains and goes to six, that we'll have to double
22 track all the way through from St. Augustine to
23 Florida -- to Miami. And when commuter rail comes
24 in, they foresee a four-track mainline all the way

25 through -- into St. Augustine.

15

1 I don't see how they'll do that, but that's
2 what they foresee to handle the traffic. You see,
3 they're -- they're not going to allow anything to
4 hinder their intermodal presence because that is
5 their basis of revenue now, the intermodal train,
6 and they're strictly scheduled.

7 MR. GORMAN: Do you feel that there's a
8 conflict between the FEC and its -- and its freight
9 operations and the growth of AMTRAK only because of
10 the -- wouldn't four-track require right-of-way?

11 MR. YOUMAN: Oh, yeah.

12 MR. GORMAN: That's going to require more
13 right-of-way, and that's undoable almost.

14 MR. YOUMAN: I can't answer that question.
15 That's in -- that's in FEC's purview. They
16 understand what they have out there and what they
17 have to do to protect their intermodal freight
18 business because that's their bread and butter.

19 And you can see that -- you can understand
20 that that's a fact about any railroad in the
21 country increasing passenger service. You can see
22 from all of the write-ups -- I know this is not an
23 airport direct issue, but they want expansion of
24 capital facilities, multiple tracks to handle the

25 passenger trains to not conflict with their basic

16

1 business, which is freight.

2 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Buzz?

3 MR. GEORGE: Carl, what do you suggest we as a
4 board do?

5 MR. YOUMAN: I almost forgot. As part of
6 the --

7 MR. GEORGE: I thought you might have
8 forgotten.

9 MR. YOUMAN: Well, there's a resolution here
10 that's later on the agenda, and I was going to ask
11 the board to please read it and approve the agenda,
12 and I will call the North Florida TPO, which I'm a
13 representative member of the board, and talk to
14 Jeff to have it put on the agenda. And I've
15 already talked to Denise Bunnewith about this, and
16 request that they approve this resolution. That's
17 one thing.

18 And continue our direct efforts in the opinion
19 page. And I'll be following up with these other
20 people as to who's making the decisions and get to
21 them and how the financing is so that we can
22 understand it.

23 MR. GEORGE: Well, it sounded like you were
24 saying that we needed to -- to mount a, I'm going

25 to say a writing campaign, you know, that -- to get

17

1 the word out --

2 MR. YOUMAN: Yes.

3 MR. GEORGE: -- and solicit from our friends
4 for them to write.

5 MR. YOUMAN: Yes.

6 MR. GEORGE: Okay. Is it possible to be
7 getting some bullets --

8 MR. YOUMAN: Yes.

9 MR. GEORGE: -- you know, like the PR
10 committee does so well?

11 MR. YOUMAN: Ed and I are working on that
12 right now.

13 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

14 MR. YOUMAN: And we'll have bullets. And Ed
15 will assist in for -- giving formats, too, and so
16 will I.

17 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

18 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: And also, Buzz, I'd just
19 like to -- on the resolution that we all have a
20 copy of, there's some really outlined bullets here
21 that you can also take advantage of.

22 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

23 MR. YOUMAN: I personally -- oh, I'm sorry.

24 MR. WERTER: Well --

1 MR. WERTER: Also additionally, my question
2 for Carl. I know you contacted Dana Treen and I
3 spoke to Dana Treen of the Florida Times-Union and
4 he was going to hook you up with a reporter that's
5 more this -- in line for him. Have you had any
6 word from Florida Times-Union?

7 MR. YOUMAN: None.

8 MR. WERTER: Okay. I'll follow up.

9 MR. YOUMAN: And personally, getting more into
10 this, I believe it's our -- as a board, I hope you
11 all agree, that it's our actual civic duty to do
12 whatever we can to get this facility here for the
13 benefit of everybody in this county and the
14 airport.

15 Of course the ben -- the airport is going to
16 benefit, but it's going to benefit for the benefit
17 of the county and all of the citizens of the
18 county, instead of this station being stuck in the
19 middle of nowhere.

20 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Thank you, Carl. Move on
21 to the Aerospace Academy. That's you again, Carl.

22 AEROSPACE ACADEMY

23 MR. YOUMAN: Busy -- it's been busy, I'll tell
24 you. This high pay is really getting me rich.

25 Aerospace, I believe the only function we've had

19

1 since the last meeting was the board of directors.

2 The --

3 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Strategic meeting
4 yesterday. There was also the family fun day.

5 MR. WUELLNER: That was --

6 MR. YOUMAN: That's already been covered.

7 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: That was at the end of May?

8 MR. YOUMAN: Yeah, there was nothing --

9 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay.

10 MR. YOUMAN: -- just the family fun day and
11 they had a board of directors meeting.

12 And one thing I've got to say about that,
13 there's some high-powered people on that board, I
14 mean, that are giving their free time to make this
15 Aerospace Academy, how do I say it, viable in a
16 growth pattern for the next five -- they made a
17 five -- they're working on a five-year plan.

18 They had a three-hour brainstorming session,
19 and it is getting so detailed as to the growth of
20 the Aerospace Academy. In fact, Gail, who's the
21 instructor there, said they had 200 kids apply, and
22 they were overwhelmed. And what they were really
23 really excited about is the fact that this is
24 happening across the county now.

25 It's not just St. Augustine based. But kids

20

1 are driving -- the parents are driving them in in
2 vans five kids at a time to come to St. Augustine
3 High School for the Aerospace Academy. And they're
4 coming from, what is it, Bartram and Nease and all
5 over the county. Especially in -- they were really
6 excited because of the northwest section.

7 And they're -- they were talking in terms of
8 how to relate all of the aerospace functions to
9 keep the interest activity high over a five-year
10 period, and that evolved into the discussion of the
11 fast evolving technologies that are occurring in
12 aviation itself, and also the need for dedicated
13 smart air traffic controllers and maintenance
14 people, because this is -- this is truly still a
15 growth -- growth industry.

16 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: One of the things that, you
17 know, in talking just about the AMTRAK -- and I
18 know in Ed's background and also in other people
19 who have aviation degrees, intermodal and
20 multimodal is usually one of the course
21 requirements. So that's one of the additional
22 assets for the Aerospace Academy if we had the
23 multimodal here.

24 MR. YOUMAN: That's correct. I can't -- I

25 know I'm dropping back, but I can't understand this

21

1 parochial backward thinking when intermodal is the
2 way of the future. And most progressive nations in
3 the united -- in the world have -- are more
4 advanced in this concept than we are.

5 In Europe, they'll take -- their airline
6 system, the way I understand it, there's very few
7 commuter planes, commuter that's like we have here
8 for short distance travel. Trains come into these
9 intermodal terminals, high-speed trains, and they
10 dump 600 people who have made a reservation to go
11 to Australia and all 600 get on this airbus and
12 they take off and they go, you know, 3000, 4000
13 miles. And here, we're batting our heads trying to
14 I guess catch up, but we can't -- and it's a fight
15 and I don't understand it. But that's the way when
16 you deal with nonreality sometime.

17 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: And the last little note
18 I'd just like to add to that is that we have eight
19 interns that are being placed here at the airport
20 at the different businesses.

21 Galaxy has one. Florida Aviation Career
22 Training has one. Florida Flyers has one. Passero
23 has two. And the Airport Authority has three. And
24 I saw Passero's and the Airport Authority's at the

25 earlier sustainability. So they're actively

22

1 engaged and attending the meetings.

2 MR. YOUMAN: If I may add, on Aerospace, this

3 concept in the schools that we have around

4 Jacksonville -- what is it called?

5 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Embry-Riddle?

6 MR. YOUMAN: Embry-Riddle and the University

7 of Florida I believe also has a --

8 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Florida State Community.

9 MR. YOUMAN: Florida State, okay.

10 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Florida State College of

11 Jacksonville.

12 MR. YOUMAN: All right. Thank you. You're

13 the expert on that.

14 MR. WUELLNER: It just changed names. It's

15 hard to keep straight.

16 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: They've gone through three

17 names since I've lived here.

18 MR. YOUMAN: To me, this concept and what's

19 happening with the Aerospace Academy and the

20 internship process, we're developing in this area

21 home-grown aerospace employees. And to me, that

22 can be a marketing tool to bring I don't know what

23 kind of businesses. I'm not an aerospace person.

24 But they've got -- like Cecil Field's getting them.

25 Why can't we? It's good clean industry. It

23

1 increases our economic base. It gives the -- the
2 kids here the opportunity to stay home for -- and
3 get great jobs, and we can provide them.

4 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Agreed.

5 REPORTS

6 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: All right. We'll move on
7 to the reports. Mr. Sanchez from the county
8 commission.

9 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: Reminds me of my old
10 performing days here to have to step up and turn
11 the mic on.

12 Good afternoon. I want to congratulate you on
13 your facility. I've already been to five or six
14 meetings on the other side over here and it's
15 really nice. Everyone's enjoying it. And, you
16 know, keep up the good work because you've
17 certainly done a lot of that since I've been paying
18 attention, and that's three and a half years.

19 There's been quite a bit of information out
20 about the county and the budget. The county is
21 okay. We're not in a financial disaster. We
22 are -- we are right where we figured we would be.
23 And last year, you know, we did make an adjustment
24 and that was a two-year plan, so we are not

25 planning any increase in ad valorem taxes this

24

1 year.

2 The people that will get them are people that
3 have saved a lot of money with this Save Our Homes
4 issue where their assessed value could not be
5 raised more than 3 percent a year. In a lot of
6 cases, that assessed value still has not caught up
7 with the new assessed value according to the
8 decline in valuation.

9 So until those two figures come together,
10 those people will probably see a little increase.
11 It will be the same folks that saw it last year.
12 It's my understanding the businesses, the rental
13 properties, all of the things that really needed a
14 break are coming down. I've had people tell me
15 that said they've been in business here 30 years,
16 they've never had a tax decrease like they did last
17 year. So I think they will experience another one.

18 We had about a 10 percent devaluation come in
19 as a final figure. And that's about a 1 percent
20 fluctuation. We will know next week. So we can
21 live with that, and we're going to get by.

22 What has caused the county some problems or
23 some -- some of them I call leftovers, things that
24 were not acted on way back when they should have

25 been. But anyway, we have the intermodal phone

25

1 system -- interoperable phone system that has to go
2 in.

3 The federal government mandated it, and then
4 they came along and they had a problem with the
5 people maintaining our old equipment, that that
6 would not happen either past 2012, so it's a forced
7 mandate. And this is an America, free enterprise,
8 the companies just love that because they get to
9 sell new equipment. So anyway, it's worked out.

10 But irregardless, it's such a great system and
11 I'm hoping we can get something worked out on that.
12 We do have someone that's come in very very
13 reasonable compared to the \$30 million -- 30-some
14 million figure we were getting. Unless the entire
15 county, everybody, all of the -- the city, the
16 beach, the school board, mosquito control, airport
17 even, everyone will come under this radio program
18 and that's where we can save some money in the long
19 run.

20 It's an 800 system, they refer to it. I like
21 it. We need it. Because if you're on the scene of
22 anything at all, you can actually converse with
23 anyone else in the county without being interrupted
24 or without having to go through a switchboard.

25 That if it's a real emergency, that switchboard's

26

1 already bogged totally down. So anyway, we have
2 that to deal with.

3 We have the drainage program to deal with.

4 There was an ordinance passed in the mid 90s to
5 implement that, but no one ever set the fee. I
6 mean, I'm sitting there going all they had to do
7 was put a dollar per property or \$5 or like the
8 City of St. Augustine, put \$10, and bingo, they're
9 already off, I think.

10 We could have raised some money. We could
11 have satisfied the federal government's mandate to
12 have that done. But instead now we -- we look at
13 the situation again like the other one by 2012, we
14 will lose all federal funding if we don't have
15 something worked out. We can be fined \$50,000.
16 And it's been debated, but Michael Wanchick could
17 go to jail. He tells people that I could probably
18 go to jail. But anyway, we're going to work on
19 that, too.

20 We have a lot of things to work on in the
21 future. But the county is okay and we're okay
22 because a lot of advance decisions we made early
23 kept us from being like a lot of other counties. A
24 lot of counties are totally decreasing their

25 sheriff's department, their fire department.

27

1 One county has actually gave up, they said,
2 well, we're just going to have to privatize
3 everything and whatever the bill is, you people are
4 going to have to pay it. I mean, they don't know
5 what else to do. They're out of money.

6 We have never been in that situation and I
7 don't think we will, because we have some good
8 leadership involved in our administrator who is
9 very intelligent. Not to mention the board
10 members. I mean, of course we -- you know, we come
11 in kind of under that thing.

12 We've kind of been on the back of our
13 employees the last couple of years. They've gotten
14 no raise at all. That's everybody except the fire
15 union, of course. And keep in mind the people that
16 are not union members of the fire service did not
17 get an increase. So, you know. We have that to
18 deal with this year and then we have a new contract
19 to look into the following year. I hope I'm around
20 for that.

21 In case you haven't been keeping up, we have a
22 dog issue. I'm not going to bark up that tree,
23 believe me. I've been reading what I know in the
24 newspaper. Thank you, Pete. So, the board is

25 totally out of that. That is all administration's

28

1 decisions and so forth. We're not involved in

2 that, so...

3 We had a little amphitheatre thing. The --

4 that's pretty much worked out. I think when the

5 waste and fraud division finishes their

6 investigation, you'll basically see that there

7 wasn't hardly anything to any of the complaints.

8 However, the procedures within the county are the

9 rules that were violated. That's why there's been

10 some disciplinary action. The waste and fraud

11 division is very very sharp. They will find

12 anything out there and so forth.

13 David Dinkins has been relieved of his duties

14 as our agriculture extension officer. He is a

15 University of Florida employee. Our board had

16 nothing to do with that decision. Our

17 administration had nothing do with it.

18 Our administration did try to encourage them,

19 since David is so well liked by the farmers and

20 everybody, to try to keep him on in some position.

21 They decided yesterday morning to relieve him of

22 his duties and send him home. So far, he has not

23 been reassigned, and we don't have any control over

24 having that happen because he is a University of

25 Florida employee. We do pay 40 percent of his

29

1 salary. So, anyway, I definitely wanted to cover
2 that because I figured there would be some people
3 wanting to know.

4 Commercial development, we -- we continue to
5 do everything we can to bring more stuff here.

6 We're cleaning up the unfriendly attitude.

7 Property values are going down. That will help
8 some in bringing some businesses in here. We are
9 doing an impact fee study, which I don't know if we
10 can decrease it or not because once that's in there
11 and working, there's a lot of complications.

12 We did open a Small Business Administration
13 office, and the University of North Florida who is
14 doing a study for us also put us in, nominated us
15 for a state award in our partnership efforts with
16 the Small Business Administration, and we won the
17 state award. I'm very happy about that.

18 Let's see. I think that pretty much covers
19 everything. Unless anyone's got any questions,
20 I'll be glad to try to answer them.

21 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Thank you, Ron.

22 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: Okay. Thanks.

23 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Mr. Slingluff?

24 MR. SLINGLUFF: Nothing to report.

25 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Thank you. Mr. Nehring?

30

1 MR. NEHRING: I just wanted to add my personal
2 thanks to the board members that attended the
3 opening of the Irregular Warfare Center. We've
4 already had one other meeting with Ed and
5 discussing some of the operations that we're
6 forecasting to try and start initiating over there.
7 So, it was a very hot day and I appreciate
8 everybody that --

9 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: It was a wonderful event.

10 MR. YOUMAN: Yes, it was.

11 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Harry?

12 MR. RUHSAM: SAAPA had their monthly meeting
13 this past Saturday, July 10th, and I was actually
14 not present, so I'm reading from notes here. But I
15 guess the discussion on whether to keep the old
16 club -- clubhouse would be deferred for discussion
17 since we're paid up through the end of the year.

18 July 31st here at the multipurpose building
19 will be a cookout, and there'll be a presentation
20 on the making of the movie The Aviator by Noel
21 Schoonmaker. His -- his sister won an Oscar in the
22 making of that movie.

23 December 3rd will be the Christmas party. And
24 another event, this Thursday the Florida Junior

1 students will be escorted here for a tour of the
2 tower, and the Valiant hangar by Michael Deck, a
3 SAAPA member. And finally this may have been
4 mentioned before, but there were four scholarships
5 awarded to the Aerospace Academy students, four
6 students. Yes, sir?

7 MR. YOUMAN: Should it be mentioned that -- Ed
8 doesn't know this yet, that he's going to give a
9 little talk on the AMTRAK mode -- multimodal
10 facility? I'm sorry.

11 MR. WUELLNER: Oh.

12 MR. YOUMAN: Congratulations. I haven't
13 talked to you about it, but I volunteered you to
14 give a talk about the AMTRAK intermodal facility so
15 that --

16 MR. WUELLNER: When would that be?

17 MR. RUHSAM: Note to self. I'm finished,
18 thank you.

19 MR. YOUMAN: July 31st. I hope you're
20 available.

21 MR. WUELLNER: Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Thank you, Harry.

23 MR. RUHSAM: Oh.

24 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: One other thing?

25 MR. RUHSAM: Well, I'll just mention, you

32

1 know, one of the things to help promote the airport
2 and what it does and to get the community involved,
3 as I'm sure a lot of you-all know, we have a number
4 of folks at SAAPA working hard on the Memorial Day
5 air show. I'm sure we'll be calling on folks that
6 aren't involved yet to get involved to help on
7 that. Is that what you -- okay. Thanks.

8 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: That's exciting.
9 Mr. Burnett?

10 MR. BURNETT: Sure. We've worked on a number
11 of issues this month including one related to the
12 property ownership or entitlement of the Airport
13 Authority related to the 13/31 safety work. And
14 I've got to give a big thank you to Bryan Cooper,
15 because Bryan has found, or we found out through
16 Bryan's efforts that the Airport Authority has
17 records dating back and much better records -- no
18 fault of the clerk of courts. The clerk of court's
19 only required to keep records going back so many
20 years. Your airport administration actually has
21 records that are better than the clerk of court has
22 related to some of the property ownership or
23 entitlement that the Airport Authority has.

24 And one very important thing is it looks like

25 the Airport Authority got some of its property

33

1 directly from the United States Government, which
2 eliminates some of the issues, or at least it got
3 the -- the city got it directly from the United
4 States Government and turned around and deeded it
5 to the Airport Authority, which eliminates some of
6 the issues that we potentially were going to have
7 with the state of Florida.

8 So anyways, that was a rather interesting
9 exercise and actually a lot of manhours this past
10 month. But anyways, it was an interesting and
11 great thing that Bryan had found that -- that work.
12 So -- or found those documents. Anyways, other
13 than that, don't really have anything specific to
14 report. I've got something that's on the agenda
15 that I'll speak to when we get there.

16 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Thank you. Good job,
17 Bryan. Ed, do you want to do the traffic count?

18 MR. WUELLNER: Sure. We continue to have
19 fairly good news. This is the June-over-June data
20 for last -- for this year over last and it's --
21 we're up about 1,166 operations, which equates to
22 about 16 percent at this point for month over
23 month.

24 Where the current year is the yellow bar in

25 the graph across there, you can see that at the

34

1 current pace, if we're able to sustain it, we'd
2 actually have the best year in three years in terms
3 of actual -- of takeoffs and landings. So, if we
4 can get that to equate to revenue, that would be
5 great. But it is encouraging if you use the metric
6 in terms of takeoff and landings, because as -- as
7 the good news portion. Which I guess bring us to
8 updates if you're ready to move into that.

9 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I am.

10 PROJECT UPDATES

11 MR. WUELLNER: I am, too. Multiuse building.
12 We are wrapping up punch I -- punch list items. If
13 you look around the building you'll find, you know,
14 spots of Drywall compound repairing this and that.
15 Those items should be wrapped up over the next
16 couple of weeks.

17 If this -- if all goes well, this will be the
18 last report on this building, since it's now
19 occupied and performing its functions. Which
20 brings us to the next piece of the puzzle, which
21 was the aircraft hangar facility. Probably noticed
22 that under construction on the way in.

23 Expect those efforts to wrap up over the next
24 couple of weeks. And you have an agenda item later

25 to approve one lease component related to that at

35

1 this time. But it should be occupiable toward the
2 end of the month.

3 Runway 13/31 rehab, it's important we're all
4 understanding what's going on, because I suspect
5 that over the next few weeks your phone may ring
6 off the hook with people asking you questions as to
7 what's going on and what the issues are, but
8 I'll -- let me fill in.

9 You recall we have a grant from the FAA to do
10 the rehab of that runway. That involves
11 installation of runway centerline lights,
12 replacement of the edge lighting, adding paved
13 shoulders to the existing runway width, and
14 includes adding a -- what's called a blast pad on
15 the ends of the runways.

16 That -- much of that work, particularly
17 preliminary work related to electrical, needs to be
18 done with the runway closed. We have been able in
19 the contract to get most of that work to
20 nighttime-type work. The net effect of that is
21 that the main runway will be closed most nights
22 beginning in the -- within the next week or so and
23 will remain closed during nighttime. And for our
24 purposes, that's going to be somewhere around

25 8 o'clock at night until perhaps 6 a.m. in the

36

1 morning.

2 That won't necessarily be every night. So we
3 are encouraging everybody who's trying to use the
4 facility to check the NOTAMs. We will keep that as
5 updated, you know, as possible. We will have a
6 dedicated page on the web site that will
7 communicate the latest and greatest, including taxi
8 route maps, things of that nature that you may need
9 to know.

10 At this point, we believe we can keep one of
11 the two shorter runways open pretty much
12 continuously through it. But there will be, you
13 know, I'm sure some short periods of time where,
14 you know, the whole place is effectively shut down
15 while something is accomplished in those areas.

16 And of course weather playing into that mix
17 could make some of those periods, you know,
18 interesting at times. But again, pay attention.
19 If you -- if you're doing the flying, you need to
20 be playing attention to NOTAMs and checking that
21 web site and contact the tower or the FBO. We'll
22 have as current information as possible in the
23 hands of people who, you know, are arguably in some
24 position of authority to give it out.

1 mid-January. However, we believe based on the
2 schedule that's been presented and some updates
3 related to it, that it will be closer to
4 Thanksgiving than it will be the first of the year.
5 So we're hoping to get it up, finished, running
6 obviously on the long -- the shortest time line as
7 possible. I think that's it. It is already under
8 notice to proceed, so it's -- we receive -- begin
9 to receive equipment related to lighting and all.
10 So that work will go on.

11 A project component I just glossed over, but
12 it would be the approach lighting, the portions of
13 approach lighting that are in -- in pavement will
14 be included in the -- or included in this job also.
15 So that when the approach lighting is formally
16 funded, we won't be back in there tearing up brand
17 new asphalt to install another few thousand cans.
18 It's not a thousand. I'm just making the number
19 up. Okay. So I think that's it for that one.

20 ARFF facility. This, as it has been for a
21 while, waiting AIP fund release. I -- my feeling
22 is that it's being programmed right now, meaning it
23 should pop out very very quickly. They have
24 another 30-day extension to AIP in the current

25 budget year. That extension effectively fully

38

1 funds the fiscal year for AIP.

2 With that said, hopefully they'll be able to
3 get the grants issued before the expiration of this
4 extension in early August or pass a multiyear bill
5 that effectively extends it. And the consultant
6 and our staff continue to meet to find value
7 engineering or creative ways that we can make sure
8 that this project is -- is done in the least
9 expensive way and obviously meets the budget
10 expectations that will be established in the grant.
11 This grant also will include the wildlife hazard
12 assessment study as a part of it. So -- as far as
13 grant conditions. And let's see what else we've
14 got here.

15 Environmental assessment. If there's any real
16 good news, it appears that the FONSI determination
17 has been made by FAA, meaning they are at this
18 point agreeing of a finding of no significant --
19 significant impact. It is -- as I understand it,
20 should have been handed up to FAA legal last week,
21 which means the letter is in -- you know, it's
22 basically due almost any day back from them.

23 So hopefully that will complete the EA
24 process, which at this point is the single obstacle

25 to wrapping up the permitting, because without that

39

1 initial determination, the permitting process can
2 only go so far until that's formally done by FAA.

3 We have done first bidding on that follow-on
4 project to the safety area, and I can tell you that
5 the FAA had allocated about \$5.5 million for the
6 mitigation, the design permitting, the safety area
7 work along the east side, and that budget is
8 intact.

9 We have bids that will come in at or under
10 that number already. So -- and we I think had 11
11 or 12 -- 11 bidders respond to that. And right
12 now, encouraging, it looks like a -- a local
13 company is the low bidder. So it's -- that looks
14 pretty good so far.

15 So, again, if all goes well, that should be in
16 a position to -- once the FONSI is formally issued,
17 should allow it to go under grant in anticipation
18 of the permits. So it won't go into construction
19 necessarily immediately, but it will allow it to
20 get under grant so we don't lose the money
21 associated with it. And then if -- if all goes
22 well, there'll be the follow-on phase next year
23 some time which would construct the taxiway at that
24 point.

1 again. I think we've had all we can sustain on
2 that.

3 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: On the park update --

4 MR. WUELLNER: Uh-huh.

5 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: -- would it be possible
6 for --

7 MR. WUELLNER: I'm fine with it.

8 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Mary, on the park update, I
9 know that you had wanted to speak but had to leave.

10 Can you go ahead and give us your update on that
11 and then we'll go into our agenda item?

12 MS. WILLIS: I was talking. I was talking.

13 Thank you, Kelly. I do have a 5 o'clock
14 appointment. I'm going to be a little bit late for
15 it, so I stayed. And I have some real interesting
16 I think and exciting news about the park and the
17 history that you should be apprised of.

18 Since I was asked by Bryan to go to the
19 meeting of your PR committee on June 8th for the
20 discussion of names, I have met with two
21 archeologists and a historian. And I have a brief
22 history that I want you to be aware of, and it will
23 put all of these names that I had been pushing for,
24 which wasn't Sanchez, into perspective.

25 The original area was called Araquay by the

41

1 indians, which I thought was an English word with
2 "quay" on the end. It was an indian name, and it
3 ended in q-u-e-i. And you'll see varied spellings
4 of course coming from an unwritten language such as
5 the indians, which were the Timucua.

6 Then this area in the 1600s and 1700s was
7 called Casa Cola, which it extend -- would extend
8 the length of the Sabate Grant approximately from
9 Indian Creek to Araquay Brook six miles from here.
10 Maybe about where you live, Jack. I did not know
11 that. I have not seen that on a map. However,
12 Indian Creek was on the 1830s maps. I think,
13 Bryan, you pointed that out at our June 8th
14 meeting.

15 Before that, I was pushing for Sabate. I am
16 now in agreement with Indian Creek, which is
17 what -- Jack's shaking his head, which is what was
18 the consensus of the five PR committee members, and
19 I did not disagree on June 8th.

20 Now, for a quick history lesson, this land was
21 the Sabate Grant 200 years ago in 1808 or 1809, I
22 get two different dates. And I was given copies of
23 the legal papers of the Commission in 1837
24 redetermining that it was the property of Pablo

1 Commission. By then, we were a part of the United
2 States but not yet a state. And that was lot of
3 fun reading that with a magnifying glass in the old
4 script.

5 The land extended from Indian Creek right over
6 here to Araquay Creek six miles on the river.
7 Approximately three miles wide. If you had a
8 square area, which you didn't, or a rectangular
9 area, that would be 18 square miles or over 11,000
10 acres. You sit on the southern -- or the airport
11 sits on the southern extremity at 640 acres per
12 square mile. And of course with the undulating
13 configuration of the marsh, it wasn't straight.

14 The land was generally known, that whole area,
15 as Casa Cola as I said in the 1600s and 1700s.
16 There was a Spanish mission here, I did not know
17 that, Santa Cruz, in the Casa Cola area. I cannot
18 tell you exactly where, and to my knowledge,
19 there's been no archeological dig.

20 There was a farm here, Araquay farm, and a man
21 named Brian Conner actually bought it in 1807
22 before Pablo Sabate the next year 1808 or 1809. I
23 have called the number of a living descendent name
24 Sabate in St. Augustine, a young woman, and talked

25 to her mother. So there is such a person. Should

43

1 you choose to use that name, you would want to
2 invite her to the dedication for anything.

3 There was a permanent residence constructed
4 there. And by the way, I grew up on six acres
5 which you now have included that was north of the
6 old airport before -- south of the game and club
7 road. And so I'm very interested in this Spanish
8 grant, this Spanish land.

9 Sabate was really a Minorcan from the colony
10 in New Smyrna. He was not directly from Spain. He
11 was born in Spain. And then coincidentally, in
12 1931, the year we came to St. Augustine, was the
13 year that the Florida School for the Deaf and Blind
14 board bought the land for the dairy farm over
15 there.

16 And unfortunately, in October 5th, 1907 (sic)
17 when Gus Craig was the director of this Airport
18 Authority, our old plantation house was bulldozed
19 down. We did wear black arm bands under the
20 direction of John Griffin, an eminent archeologist,
21 and met at the Ponce Lodge for a drink to mourn the
22 loss of the old plantation house which I played in
23 many times as a child when Mr. Coleman was the
24 farmer there.

25 So, to summarize the historical outline,

44

1 Araquay is your oldest name. Indian Creek, we know
2 was documented in 1830, and I think would be a very
3 appropriate name for the park because you love to
4 have a river or a creek in the name of any park.

5 It sounds very cool and refreshing and delightful,
6 and we look forward to the use of that park.

7 There has been a suggestion that the name
8 Sabate be given to a structure. But then that will
9 come in the report of your own committee. I won't
10 say any more about that now.

11 As far as the word Araquay, yes, it's the
12 oldest one, but I think the creek name is probably
13 preferable because of the word creek. And if -- I
14 do have copies for the members. If you'll take the
15 clip off that and pass them around, Jack.

16 And there's a map in there that shows the
17 airport area in the context of this six mile long
18 by three mile wide Sabate Grant. If you have any
19 other questions, I'll stay a minute and then I have
20 to run.

21 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Mary, thank you for your
22 history that you've done on the airport, for
23 sharing the information and giving us a historical
24 overview of the park area. Does anybody have any

25 questions as far as the historical overview?

45

1 MR. YOUMAN: Just a comment.

2 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Go ahead.

3 MR. YOUMAN: I think she gave a fantastic
4 presentation, and thank you, very much.

5 MS. WILLIS: You're quite welcome. De nada.

6 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: We're very fortunate. With
7 that, Ed, did you want to go ahead and talk about
8 the park development? And I know we have the
9 agenda item to discuss the naming later.

10 MR. WUELLNER: Not much I can add to the -- I
11 don't know what I've done with it. There it is.
12 The -- not much I can add to the park development
13 at this point.

14 The trail construction work continues as we
15 get students down here, and we've applied some
16 limited staff resources to keeping it maintained in
17 between now and then. Still looking toward opening
18 first phase at the -- in August. So -- and as you
19 mentioned, we have a naming item on the agenda a
20 little bit later.

21 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay.

22 MR. WUELLNER: Issues reporting. There were a
23 total of four events reported, three of which
24 involved noise, one a low flying aircraft. They

25 were all daytime operations.

46

1 And one actually official criminal pursuit
2 related to it, meaning they were chasing an air --
3 chasing someone in the helicopter, I suspect. Two
4 normal touch-and-goes that just resulted in people
5 not liking that activity. And the one that was way
6 outside the area that was -- had nothing to do with
7 us. So that's kind of the summary of it.

8 Are we -- I should have asked this before the
9 meeting, but are we following up getting them the
10 detail stuff? Is that part -- it's here? Okay.
11 Thank you. Just dawned on me I hadn't personally
12 seen it.

13 Marketing and PR. As was mentioned by Carl
14 earlier, we hosted a Bahamian delegation here a few
15 weeks back at the behest of Senator, state Senator
16 Tony Hill, and looks like some of that activity may
17 lead to some improved or increased relationships
18 between the Bahamas and our community.

19 We were quite fascinated -- I know those of
20 you that could -- managed to get there that
21 morning, I was absolutely fascinated by some of the
22 connections of St. Augustine to the Bahamas in our
23 history.

24 I just -- I had no idea that some of that

25 connectivity was there, and it's -- it was quite

47

1 fascinating as it tied to the Fort Mose and some
2 other things in our community, so -- to include in
3 the original population of parts of Marsh Harbour
4 coming directly out of the St. Augustine commune --
5 community evacuating the hurricane. And many chose
6 not to come back. So it in effect ended up being
7 populated in many respects out of St. Augustine.
8 So it was a -- as I mentioned, it was a pretty
9 interesting deal.

10 But one of the interesting things that's come
11 out of it is an opportunity to work closely in a,
12 what do we call it, an outreach program between the
13 Bahamas and the U.S. related to minorities and the
14 minority tourism aspect of some of the unique
15 things in this part of Florida that directly tie to
16 the history of the Bahamas.

17 So, some of that's going to I think mature and
18 continue to get discussed and we're going to look
19 towards some economic development opportunities
20 within those communities.

21 MR. YOUMAN: It also ties in with the Freedom
22 Trail --

23 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah.

24 MR. YOUMAN: -- historically, the Freedom

25 Trail through St. Augustine. And it ties in with

48

1 the Bahamians as well as the civil rights movement,
2 all the way through. Very historically
3 fascinating. I mean, really interesting that I
4 never knew about it.

5 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, it's kind of neat how you
6 get little pieces of the area's history.

7 MR. YOUMAN: Does this -- does this tie in
8 with the economic letter that you sent out which is
9 not on the agenda I don't believe?

10 MR. WUELLNER: Right. It didn't require
11 action at this point. Go ahead if you want.

12 MR. YOUMAN: No. Go ahead. You wrote the
13 letter.

14 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Before we hit that, Sacha,
15 did you have anything else that you might want to
16 add from -- as one of the coordinators of the -- of
17 the group?

18 MS. MARTIN: Actually, I didn't coordinate
19 this particular -- I'm sorry.

20 MR. MARTINELLI: Here, I'll get it.

21 MS. MARTIN: Sacha Martin, 133 Coastal Hollow
22 Circle. I was a coordinator for the junkanoo
23 festival which occurred in 2009 and 2007. And we
24 worked very closely of course with the Bahamian

25 tourism people on that, especially those from

49

1 Abaco, but also Nassau.

2 And so we had already established a kind of
3 social connection with Bahamas. And -- but we
4 didn't -- our group didn't really have anything to
5 do with this organization with Senator Hill except
6 that we did participate in the reception for the
7 Bahamian officials.

8 And I think they were very excited to know
9 about the activities that we had already done with
10 the Bahamas on a tourism level and an economic
11 development level. You know, it was pointed out
12 that when our groups were here, they spent quite a
13 lot of money here and -- in addition to giving
14 entertainment and a cultural exchange program. So
15 that's all I have to say.

16 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Thank you, Sacha. Carl,
17 did you want to elaborate any further?

18 MR. YOUMAN: No.

19 MR. WUELLNER: And the last point of the
20 marketing and PR is the Citizens Airport Group,
21 which we have not really heard anything of in the
22 last several months. Directly, anyway. I'm not
23 aware of any upcoming meetings.

24 MR. GEORGE: I got the impression from talking

25 to Dr. George that they wanted to have a few

50

1 meetings without the airport there. Just kind of I
2 guess get their act together.

3 MR. WUELLNER: Okay. That leads then into
4 benchmarking. T-hangars are at 99 percent
5 occupancy. I think we have a single port-a-port
6 that's not yet -- not available at this point.

7 Corporate hangars, the small ones are at 80
8 percent. We have I believe three still vacant in a
9 50 x 50, 50 x 60 size. That seems to be a very
10 difficult size right now in the current economy.
11 It's not that people don't have airplanes or aren't
12 interested, they're just -- most of them are using
13 it as a business-related expense at that size, and
14 they're not really at a point where they want to
15 jump into the lease for a -- for an aircraft hangar
16 and they're hanging tight wherever they are right
17 now. Hopefully that will -- with an increase in
18 operations and the like, maybe that's going to, you
19 know, work into some additional activity that would
20 free up some of that.

21 Corporates, we have all but one larger hangar,
22 and it's got some -- some issues to work through
23 from a maintenance standpoint before we can put it
24 back into service. And it's also got a few

25 associated legal issues related to the builder of

51

1 the building that Doug is assisting us in getting
2 that straightened out.

3 So hopefully it will get back available to be
4 leased in the not too distant future, and that's I
5 believe it's unit 10 -- is it 10? It's corporate
6 hangar 10. And corporate 8 is the other. One side
7 of the building and the other.

8 But you may or may not recall that the door at
9 one point had failed, and when the door came down,
10 it effectively jacked a corner of the building a
11 bit. So there's -- there's some issues. We've got
12 it structurally fixed.

13 What we are trying to work through is getting
14 it recertified back to us from a -- from an
15 engineer standpoint, that it's -- that the building
16 is safe and meets -- meets the warranty kind of
17 issues to us. And Doug will do a great job I'm
18 sure of winding that down.

19 That brings us to the fuel sales. You can see
20 '09 versus '10 on jet fuel in particular, you know,
21 that's down -- down over a third. Self-fuel, which
22 I do not have the -- the avgas non self-fuel
23 numbers, but you can see it's actually up like 2500
24 gallons, thereabouts. So, you know, mixed messages

25 out there right now, you know, parts of it.

52

1 The light GA guys that aren't dependent on
2 business-related deductions and/or under corporate
3 pressure for using their airplanes, you know,
4 they're using it more for recreation are flying.
5 Those who need it for business and the like,
6 especially those flying jet aircraft, are being
7 very cautious in the use of their airplanes, which
8 is not good news overall for GA.

9 MR. GEORGE: I wonder if there's a downsizing
10 of airplanes.

11 MR. WUELLNER: Well, there --

12 MR. GEORGE: You know, a lot of our tenants
13 here with large airplanes, they also have a single
14 engine, and I know some people that have a single
15 engine because the twin engine was costing more.

16 MR. WUELLNER: Uh-huh. There's that -- the
17 jet piece is particularly troubling to me because
18 what we've seen is sort of a demonizing that's gone
19 on at the highest level of our government related
20 to general aviation.

21 And not that some of the lumps weren't in some
22 respects due on excesses, but they managed to
23 vilify the use of corporate aviation in many
24 respects, and that has really made it difficult to

25 be caught using one and -- you know, especially if

53

1 you've not done or are not familiar with the
2 homework that supports having one of those and
3 using it. And some companies have done a better
4 job of making that the case to their board of
5 directors and shareholders and others haven't.

6 So you've also got some interesting things
7 going on in the market relative to the airplanes
8 themselves and the valuation of those, which makes
9 it even weirder to try and either acquire one or
10 unload one because of values and financing and is
11 the money -- money from private sources available
12 to purchase those things. It's a very complicated
13 expensive environment right now to be in, in
14 corporate jet in particular.

15 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Carl?

16 MR. YOUMAN: There was also an article I
17 believe in USA Today about the high foreclosures
18 of --

19 MR. WUELLNER: I saw that.

20 MR. YOUMAN: -- jets. Plus the fact that so
21 many of them are corporate-type jets which they
22 said was amazing.

23 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. And finding the bottom
24 on value right now. I mean, there was a -- Michael

25 will attest to that, but just a few years back,

54

1 there was -- there was almost a side, I'll call it
2 a black market -- it really wasn't that convoluted,
3 but you could literally sell your position in line
4 to take delivery of an airplane.

5 MR. GEORGE: You could.

6 MR. WUELLNER: And it was an extremely
7 interesting and dynamic place. That is not the
8 case now. Most of -- many of those people who were
9 in that queue to make money on the deposit side of
10 this have long lost those deposits. Chime in where
11 you will.

12 MR. SLINGLUFF: Is this on? Yeah, if I could
13 just clarify on that -- the jet fuel sales side.
14 Month over month, we're probably -- on the straight
15 GA jet fuel, we're seeing about 6 percent downturn.

16 MR. WUELLNER: Okay.

17 MR. SLINGLUFF: The bulk of that, of the
18 gallons that you -- you're not seeing on the flow
19 there is military fuel.

20 MR. WUELLNER: Okay.

21 MR. SLINGLUFF: And we don't really understand
22 that whole process there. But that has gone away.
23 So, hopefully it will come back. But it -- for us,
24 it's very low margin. It's not really affecting

25 our bottom line that greatly, but it does affect

55

1 the fuel flow.

2 MR. WUELLNER: Probably affects us more than
3 it does you.

4 MR. SLINGLUFF: Yeah.

5 MR. WUELLNER: Well, not really, but --

6 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Carl?

7 MR. YOUMAN: By military, what do you mean,
8 Coast Guard, big jets?

9 MR. SLINGLUFF: All of the military that comes
10 in here. We are a contractor, military contract
11 fuel provider and so, you know, at times we're on
12 the roster to stop in. And we're contracted out
13 for five years at a time. So it's -- and it's a
14 fixed into plane rate. So it's not -- not pricing
15 issue. It's just their habits and practices change
16 and sort of drift around.

17 MR. YOUMAN: Thank you.

18 MR. WUELLNER: Considering all of the assets
19 deployed worldwide right now, there's -- it's very
20 interesting.

21 MR. WERTER: Just a quick question. On the
22 corporate hangars at 80 percent, but there's eight
23 on the list, is that because of a maintenance
24 issue?

25 MR. WUELLNER: Eight is the waiting list.

56

1 MR. WERTER: Yeah. Eight -- eight parties on
2 the waiting list to get into the hangars?

3 MR. WUELLNER: Yes.

4 MR. WERTER: And what's holding up those eight
5 getting into the hangars?

6 MR. WUELLNER: They have -- they keep
7 declining taking one.

8 MR. WERTER: Oh, they decline. Okay. All
9 right.

10 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, but they want to stay on
11 the list. So it tells me --

12 MR. WERTER: "We want it, but not right now."

13 MR. WUELLNER: Exactly.

14 MR. WERTER: Okay.

15 MR. WUELLNER: Exactly the sentiment out
16 there.

17 MR. BURNETT: And before we move on, if I
18 could just mention Hangar 10 for this reason. Now
19 that I'm involved in it and I -- I intend to try
20 and bring that aggressively to a conclusion.

21 As I understand it -- I understand the issue,
22 I'll give you a very brief overview of part of the
23 issue. You've got a manufacturer of a building and
24 you've got a manufacturer of a door. And you've

25 got a contractor.

57

1 From your staff's perspective -- and this is
2 very oversimplification of the issue, but from the
3 staff's perspective, they don't really care what it
4 takes to get it resolved. But one of those three
5 and may be others need to just get it fixed and
6 done and over with.

7 And so now that I'm involved, my intent is to
8 aggressively bring that to a conclusion. The same
9 way -- if I can use a recent example, the same way
10 the Verizon tower matter was brought to a
11 conclusion. I know it's different, but it's the
12 same sort of approach that I'm going to take, which
13 is aggressive, but reasonable. So...

14 MR. WUELLNER: Our end result is having a
15 usable building --

16 MR. BURNETT: Yeah.

17 MR. WUELLNER: -- that's safe for the
18 occupants. I mean --

19 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: And to collect the revenue.

20 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. I can't do one till the
21 other.

22 MR. BURNETT: But not -- to not have it in a
23 position where it lingers. So it may be something
24 that comes right back before you with a

25 recommendation from me as to how to go forward from

58

1 here.

2 MR. GORMAN: How many months have we had the
3 no service from this thing at this time?

4 MR. WUELLNER: It's been in excess of six
5 months at this time. And we get a lot of lip
6 service. A little action. You think it's on track
7 and it dies off again, and then they just don't
8 want to talk about it. All of the finger pointing,
9 as you can imagine. Sort of classic.

10 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: We look forward to a speedy
11 resolution.

12 MR. BURNETT: Well, I think it's also one that
13 the Airport Authority has a lot of construction
14 that goes on out here and you can set the tone for
15 how you address issues. And, you know, folks --
16 contractors all talk. The folks in the trade all
17 talk. So this is how we deal with things. So I'll
18 bring it back to you with a recommendation the next
19 meeting, hopefully.

20 MR. WUELLNER: Okay.

21 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Thank you. Our next agenda
22 item, we moved it to the top, is the park naming
23 suggestions. Bryan?

24 PARK NAMING DISCUSSION

25 MR. COOPER: Hope we don't try and keep it a

59

1 secret.

2 MR. WUELLNER: It's slide 22, those of you
3 that are trying to find it.

4 MR. WERTER: Is there an option on this thing
5 to get all of the slides?

6 MR. WUELLNER: I -- if there is, I'm not aware
7 of it yet. And none of this is on here.

8 MR. WERTER: Okay.

9 MR. WUELLNER: But we will send it to you. So
10 we can e-mail it to you. We have not done that.

11 MR. COOPER: Before I get started, I'd like to
12 just point out some things about the park. This is
13 a conceptual site plan --

14 MR. WUELLNER: Take the mic, please.

15 MR. COOPER: -- that was -- that was used, I
16 want to go back six years ago -- five, six years
17 ago. And the reason I want to point this -- point
18 this out is this creek that you see right here is
19 not only the southern border of the airport, but
20 it's the southern border of the park.

21 This road coming in here used to be what is
22 now Taxiway Foxtrot. That was called Indian Bend
23 Road, which that name came because of Indian Creek.
24 So, the northern border of the park is Indian Bend

25 Road which was named after Indian Creek, which is

60

1 the southern border of the airport and the park

2 itself.

3 (Mr. Burnett leaves the room.)

4 MR. COOPER: Indian Bend still goes out to

5 U.S. 1 here. And that will become important later

6 on on whether -- on why our decision was to use

7 this.

8 We were tasked with naming the park and

9 recommending a logo. You had been presented a few

10 options for names and a few options for a logo and

11 signage, and you didn't particularly like any of

12 them or you weren't able to come to a consensus.

13 We didn't have a lot more success in all of that.

14 You asked the PR committee and the park

15 committee combined to do that, and so we came up

16 with -- we met a couple of times. I met

17 individually with every single member. We met the

18 committees together. And we came up with 16

19 possible names, with multiple variations on most of

20 those names. We were able to come to a consensus

21 on the name.

22 Now, in discussing the names, as we went

23 through them, we said we wanted to make sure it has

24 a historical tie-in. We wanted to make sure that

25 the local neighborhoods could recognize it or had

61

1 that recognition. We wanted it to be easy -- easy
2 to find for people that weren't familiar with the
3 airport because we suspected people that use the
4 park weren't necessarily going to be airport users.

5 And we had been asked to consider coming up
6 with a name that could also be used in naming the
7 area, for example, the hangar area or the aviation
8 business park or this building or some other parts
9 of the park itself. So in coming up with a name,
10 Indian Creek Park at Saint Augustine Airport, we
11 felt like met all of those goals.

12 Now, one of the variations of this, which most
13 the members I talked with individually actually
14 prefer and I kind of like it myself, is to call it
15 Indian Creek Preserve instead of Indian Creek Park.
16 Now, I'd like to go back to the original discussion
17 or the purpose of the park six years ago.

18 First of all, it had four functions. One, we
19 needed as we developed this area out here a buffer
20 between us and the neighborhood to the south, as
21 Joe was getting tired of looking at airplanes. And
22 we wanted to say, okay, since we had to create that
23 big piece of land to create that buffer, let's go
24 ahead and make that an environmental education

1 Then we said since we're going to have trails
2 through there, let's make it a wellness trail along
3 with that for people that walk and jog and such
4 through that park. And then last, there was an
5 effort to solve the problem of people stopping on
6 U.S. 1 and watching airplanes take off and land.
7 So we've said let's -- that's a perfect place to
8 put an airfield observation deck.

9 Those were the four purposes for reasoning of
10 the park. It was brought to the board in 2005. It
11 was voted on, discussed, and all of the meetings
12 and planning that we've had since then has been
13 related to these -- these four purposes.

14 On the logo or the signage, we weren't able to
15 come up to a consensus on the logo. Now there were
16 some questions that needed to be answered before we
17 could do that. Until a name was selected, we
18 couldn't up with a signage.

19 There's a lot of different things that would
20 affect with some of these various names what that
21 logo would look like. And some of the questions
22 was, is there going to be an entrance to the park?
23 That would have a big effect on what type of signs,
24 what size signage, what the signs would say.

25 Is there going to be a change in the purpose

63

1 of the park? Now that's the reason I went back
2 to -- pointed out what the four purposes were
3 originally. If there's going to be a change in the
4 purpose, then the signage would be greatly affected
5 by that.

6 Is the park going to be marketed outside of
7 the area? When I talked to Bob that had presented
8 the stuff before, he's marketing background and he
9 was looking at some pizzazz to market the park, and
10 I went and talked to him at his office. He said,
11 well, if you're going to market this in
12 Jacksonville and get people to come down here, you
13 want to get their attention, you could probably
14 color it. You need something that's got a lot of
15 pizzazz to it.

16 And so our question was, are we really going
17 to try and market people to come to this park from
18 Gainesville or Jacksonville or Daytona? And if
19 we're going market it, market it to who? Is it
20 going to be aviation people or is it going to be
21 nonaviation people? So all of these are questions
22 that made us unable to come to a consensus on this.

23 But what we did agree on the signage was the
24 idea of using a crest that was presented as a logo

25 was a good idea. We liked that. We saw a lot of

64

1 good things, rather than just little square signs
2 or -- or a round sign that you would see in a lot
3 of parks. We liked the crest idea particularly in
4 St. Johns County, St. Augustine.

5 And we felt that using it as information and
6 direction to features on the trails was a really
7 good idea. As the trails split and as different --
8 you came to different features, a different piece
9 of that crest could be used or a different color of
10 one part of the crest could be used to keep you on
11 that area. Sort of like the yellow line on the
12 floor in a hospital. But to try and cover all of
13 the features and the name of the park plus have an
14 aviation tie-in, it would be just far too busy for
15 a crest. So we felt the name of the park ought to
16 be on a separate sign.

17 I'd like to show you a couple of sample
18 features. Environmental education. This is a
19 signage -- this is just a piece of the sign. I
20 wanted to park -- point this out. This is at the
21 Florida Aquarium in Tampa. Those of you going to
22 the FAC conference next month will actually be
23 taking a tour of this place.

24 They have a picture of a map here. This is a

25 sign that referenced the sediment basin. It's a

65

1 parking area out in front of the entrance to the
2 Florida Aquarium. This sign then talks about where
3 you're at on this. It talks about why you use
4 sediment basins, and they call it the stormwater
5 trail. It goes around all of the different basins
6 and gives you reasons why you would do that.

7 This is one further down the trail on a wet
8 detention pond. Again on the stormwater trail.
9 Why stormwater runoff is important. This is all of
10 the environmental education aspect of it.

11 One more is a filtration pond. Where you're
12 at on the stormwater trail, the reasons you use
13 filtration pond. What it does, what it
14 accomplishes, why is stormwater polluted, and why
15 do you try and get rid of it and how.

16 So for us we said, well, where we do we go
17 from here after this? We'd like to be -- both the
18 committees would like to continue to be involved in
19 the process to help move this forward. And any
20 questions? I was told to keep this brief.

21 MR. YOUMAN: To -- to progress further, you're
22 saying we have to make a decision on a name.

23 MR. COOPER: That was the purpose.

24 MR. YOUMAN: I'm sorry. To progress further,

25 we have to make a decision on the name?

66

1 (Mr. Burnett enters the room.)

2 MR. COOPER: You asked me for some
3 recommendations and we gave you one.

4 MR. YOUMAN: Is that for today?

5 MR. GEORGE: How easy is it to get the top
6 ten, the top five? Something more than just one.

7 MR. COOPER: You want them in writing or you
8 want me to read them off to you?

9 MR. GEORGE: Something more than the top five.

10 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Do we want -- do we want --
11 this is the question and answer portion and then we
12 can go to public comment before we get into board
13 discussion. You can answer the question. We're in
14 a question and answer period. Go ahead. Ask.

15 MR. GORMAN: The only caveat I have is the
16 fact that there's a unique quality to the park and
17 the one unique quality is the fact that it is an
18 aviation-related park and that it allows the
19 observation of aviation, and that is not in the
20 name at all. That's the only caveat I have.

21 It is an aviation observation park. And
22 all -- all deference to the intelligence of the
23 entire committee, which is great, I mean -- and
24 their labors, but that single unique element is

25 left out of -- of the name Indian Creek.

67

1 Because Indian Creek could be in Tallahassee.
2 Indian Creek could be in Gainesville. If you
3 haven't actually lived in the Araquay area, Indian
4 Creek means nothing, does not communicate much to
5 the public at large. But putting something in the
6 name that has an aviation or airport to me would
7 convey the unique aspect of the park.

8 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Do we have any other
9 questions for Bryan before we open it up for public
10 comment?

11 MR. WERTER: Just one. As far as visiting
12 aviators, is there anything in the park that
13 encourages general aviation to come visit us to
14 have a picnic at the park, for instance? I always
15 envisioned maybe some sort of gate on that air --
16 on that side of the area where pilots can tie up
17 and come in. But I don't think there is an apron
18 there they can do that.

19 MR. MARTINELLI: There is.

20 MR. WERTER: Is there?

21 MR. MARTINELLI: By the multipurpose building.

22 MR. WUELLNER: Right across here.

23 MR. WERTER: Over here. That's right. Yeah.

24 Okay. I take that back. But as far as a gate goes

25 or some sort of access for aviators to go in and

68

1 enjoy the park?

2 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, there's a gate, a
3 controlled gate right there.

4 MR. WERTER: And was there -- is there a box
5 on there? You know, a communications box?

6 MR. WUELLNER: No. It's currently card access
7 controlled, but it can be added as an access --

8 MR. WERTER: But when we have guest -- guest
9 aviation --

10 MR. WUELLNER: It can be -- when we know, we
11 can unlock it, yeah.

12 MR. WERTER: Okay.

13 MR. COOPER: It's right down here on the
14 corner of the building. And the trail will come
15 very close to that. To tie into one of the trails
16 would be very easy.

17 If the entrance to the park, for example, is
18 put out here in front of the -- this building, that
19 would also make it an easy access. But to say
20 some -- that we were looking or the park committee
21 has looked at trying to create something that would
22 attract general aviation to fly in here and use the
23 park for a picnic, no, we didn't do that. We
24 didn't discount it, but we didn't go in that

25 direction.

69

1 MR. YOUMAN: Would that be a function of
2 SAAPA's -- one of SAAPA's activities in
3 coordinating, you know, these fly-ins like they
4 always have to fly in to use the park? I don't
5 know. Just a suggestion.

6 MR. WERTER: Or you just put it in the -- in
7 the individual directories, you know, aviation park
8 or park attached for picnicking or something like
9 that as a facility.

10 MR. COOPER: We took -- the park committee
11 took the position that we -- that the airport was
12 creating an asset. And who used it, we -- we
13 weren't talking about marketing that. If SAAPA
14 marketed it for fly-ins and used that asset, then
15 that's fine. We -- we agree with that. But that
16 was not one of the things that we had approached.

17 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay.

18 MR. COOPER: Can I read these names?

19 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Yes, please. Answer Buzz's
20 question on that.

21 MR. COOPER: One of -- one of the session --
22 suggestions was no name. Wait and name the park at
23 a later date after the park evolves and is refined.
24 Number 2 was Araquay Park. Number 3 was

25 St. Augustine Aero Park. St. Augustine Aero Eco

70

1 Park. St. Augustine Aeronautical Eco Park.

2 St. Augustine Aviation Eco Park. Indian Bend Creek

3 Park at Saint Augustine Airport. Indian Creek Park

4 at Saint Augustine Airport. Nature Unspoiled.

5 Araquay Park or Araquay Trail. Indian Creek Trail

6 at Saint Augustine Airport. And this one, El

7 Parque de la Conquista del Cielo. That means of

8 the park of the conquerors of the sky. Araquay

9 Airfield Park. Airport Indian Creek Park. Araquay

10 Aviation Nature Walk, or Araquay Aviation Nature

11 Park. Aviators Nature Walk.

12 MR. GEORGE: Thank you.

13 MR. COOPER: That was 16 of them and --

14 MR. GEORGE: Thank you.

15 MR. COOPER: -- there are some variations on

16 each one of those.

17 MR. GEORGE: Yeah.

18 MR. GORMAN: Can I say one more thing?

19 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: If it's a question --

20 MR. WERTER: No, it's not going to be Jack

21 Gorman Air Park.

22 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: If it's a question for

23 Bryan, because otherwise we're going to open it up

24 for public comment.

25 MR. YOUMAN: One question --

71

1 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Jack has -- Jack has the
2 opportunity to ask a question.

3 MR. GORMAN: I can make it a question. In
4 other words, I think no matter what we do, the
5 public's going to call it the airport park.

6 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. Carl, did you have a
7 question for Bryan?

8 MR. YOUMAN: This -- this was looked at for
9 the general community as a whole, I gather, rather
10 than pilots or things like that.

11 MR. COOPER: Yes. Yes. We didn't see that as
12 an aviation attraction. However, the airport
13 observation deck was designed to go out very close
14 to the runway, as close as you can get it, for
15 people that want to come and watch airplanes take
16 off and land with appropriate signage there for,
17 you know, what frequencies to listen to them and
18 those types of things.

19 MR. YOUMAN: And they will.

20 MR. COOPER: I believe they will.

21 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Go ahead, Buzz.

22 MR. GEORGE: One other question. Bryan, you
23 listed the four points about why we were looking
24 into a park.

25 You -- I got the implication that that was the

72

1 sequence of importance, but my memory says that the
2 reason for the park was so the public would have a
3 place to watch airplanes so that it would tie us
4 together. So that would be my recollection of what
5 the primary purpose of the park was. Jack, how was
6 yours? You were here in 2005.

7 MR. GORMAN: That was my recollection of it,
8 too, that it was an aircraft aviation park and
9 unique in that aspect, yes. I agree with you
10 totally.

11 MR. GEORGE: Yeah.

12 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. Do we have any
13 further board questions for the -- for Bryan?

14 (None.)

15 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. We'll open up for
16 public comment. Mary is not here. Reba is not
17 here. Sacha?

18 MS. MARTIN: Before I comment, I have a
19 question. Indian Creek, about how wide is that and
20 does it go right into the Intracoastal Waterway?
21 And how far is it from the Intracoastal Waterway?

22 MR. GORMAN: Can I answer that?

23 MR. COOPER: Do you want me to answer that?
24 Indian Creek --

25 MR. GEORGE: 757 yards.

73

1 MR. COOPER: -- used to go originally directly
2 into the Intracoastal Waterway. When the runway
3 was extended in 1965, that cut it off and the canal
4 was dug from the intracoastal to tie back into it
5 on this side of the runway. So it still connects
6 to the -- the intracoastal.

7 MS. MARTIN: In other words --

8 MR. COOPER: At the widest point, it's around
9 50 feet. At the narrowest point, it's around 10
10 feet.

11 MS. MARTIN: In other words, could I come by
12 boat and end up at the airport observation deck?
13 Will there be a dock envisioned in part of the
14 plan?

15 MR. COOPER: Yes and yes.

16 MS. MARTIN: Yes. Okay.

17 MR. COOPER: At high tide.

18 MS. MARTIN: Or a very shallow boat.

19 MR. COOPER: And a small boat.

20 MS. MARTIN: Yes, shallow.

21 I think there are two unique qualities that
22 we're looking at. And the first, and I have to
23 agree with -- with both Jack and Buzz, is that it
24 is very unique in that it is a place to watch

25 airplanes take off. That doesn't exist anywhere

74

1 else.

2 And second of all, there's waterfront access.

3 And by that, you know, then there could be a

4 possibility of funds, grant funds coming from

5 Florida Inland Navigation District and the Port and

6 Waterway if there is boat access as well. And

7 therefore, Indian Creek does connote that it is a

8 waterfront. And, you know, Indian Creek Aviation

9 Park would say that it is related to aviation. I

10 think if you say "at Saint Augustine Airport,"

11 didn't we just change the name of the St. Augustine

12 Airport?

13 So anyway, my recommendation is definitely to

14 have aviation as part of the name and something to

15 do with water as part of the name.

16 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Thank you, Sacha. Bob Cox?

17 MR. COX: Bob Cox, Palencia. I -- she just

18 covered my point. I was like you spent a lot of

19 time changing the name of the airport and I didn't

20 hear any of those names cover Northeast Florida

21 Regional Airport in the name. So it's every one of

22 them Saint Augustine Airport, and I thought we were

23 trying to shift away from it. Thank you.

24 MR. COOPER: Let me -- let me make a comment

25 about that because we did discuss that issue. When

75

1 we had those meetings and did this, the name of the
2 airport had not been changed at that point. And
3 secondly, when we looked at the potential signage
4 and logos, we wanted to keep that name as short as
5 possible and not have a paragraph up there.

6 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay.

7 MR. WERTER: What's the new procedure now for
8 comments?

9 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Well, right now we're ready
10 for -- we already did our board question and
11 answer, so we're ready for a motion and discussion.

12 MR. WERTER: Okay.

13 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Did you want to make a
14 motion?

15 MR. WERTER: I move that we open this up for
16 further discussion.

17 MR. YOUMAN: I'll second that.

18 MR. WERTER: Comment.

19 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Go ahead.

20 MR. WERTER: We're talking about -- you know,
21 as opposed to the airport and marketing the airport
22 regionally in the southeastern region, we're
23 talking about a community recreational park. So we
24 have to keep some familiarity. If you throw NFRA

25 on there then, you know, it kind of industrializes

76

1 the park in my mind and your mar -- you know, your
2 market space is right here from the St. Augustine
3 and Jacksonville area.

4 So I -- I don't find it overly intrusive or
5 offensive that we stick with St. Johns County or
6 St. Augustine's -- at St. Augustine or something
7 like that because the market area is here. This
8 park is for our community, and when visitors come
9 through, for them also. It's not like we're Disney
10 trying to attract people from Ohio to come see our
11 park.

12 So, you know, Bob, not meaning to be offensive
13 or whatever, it's the focus group and to keep it
14 more on the nonindustrial side. So I kind of tend
15 with the names that have been presented, as long as
16 some may be. But that's my way of thinking of it,
17 you know. Not to industrialize the park by using
18 our new acronym for the airport itself.

19 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Jack?

20 MR. GORMAN: Well, again, in deference to Bob,
21 I mean, I understand doing the way the name -- that
22 name was created to make it more marketable to the
23 Part 121 operations, so that people could identify
24 with north Florida, rather than wanting -- they

25 didn't want to fly into St. Augustine.

77

1 But again, in keeping with the idea that Jim
2 has, it's really going to be used by local people
3 and so -- at least in my own mind. So keeping
4 something in there that's localized would make some
5 sense.

6 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Go ahead, Carl.

7 MR. GORMAN: That's my thought.

8 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Go ahead.

9 MR. YOUMAN: Just a comment is that I believe
10 that there should be a tie-in somewhere to aviation
11 airport somewhere in the name, because it's been
12 brought up a number of times that we're a unique
13 facility here and it's a unique park. And there
14 should be a tie-in.

15 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: This is a -- we have this
16 new building here and it's a multipurpose -- a
17 revenue-producing multipurpose building. This room
18 right here is available for meetings, and I think
19 that the park is a natural partner in marketing the
20 multiuse building or this meeting room to different
21 groups. For instance, family reunion.

22 I think there are -- there are marketing
23 opportunities to market the two together. The
24 public park and picnics and the multiuse building,

25 I think there's those -- those chances to market

78

1 outside of our local community, but I agree with
2 you all that the most amount of use is going to
3 come from inside the community. I think even with
4 fly-ins, there's the opportunity to market the
5 building and the park together.

6 MR. GORMAN: Can we vote on deferring it?
7 Because nobody can make a decision right now.
8 Seems like --

9 MR. GEORGE: I've got -- I've got a comment to
10 make before that. We're an Airport Authority.
11 We're not a park company.

12 The county is responsible for parks for the
13 area. The City of St. Augustine is responsible for
14 parks. Bryan made a reference to what was the
15 requirements for this park from 2005. It's now
16 2010. It's taken us five to six years to get to
17 this part.

18 This is not a \$25 million project that
19 requires all of this analysis and everything. We
20 initially in my opinion established it as a -- for
21 aviation, and "aviation" in my opinion should be in
22 the name, not "The Conference Center at Indian
23 Creek Park." That's getting into a different --

24 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Well, having "at Saint

25 Augustine Airport," is that not having aviation in

79

1 the name?

2 MS. MARTIN: No.

3 MR. YOUMAN: No.

4 MR. GEORGE: Not in my opinion.

5 MR. YOUMAN: Can I ask a question?

6 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Go ahead, Carl.

7 MR. YOUMAN: Do I remember there was a

8 discussion about tie-in of names? Araquay Street,

9 I think that was the entrance between Araquay

10 building of some kind and Araquay Park or

11 something? I guess that was dismissed, wasn't it?

12 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: At our last board meeting,

13 none of us gravitated towards those different

14 names. Buzz.

15 MR. GEORGE: We asked the PR committee and the

16 park committee to get together and give us their

17 recommendations. If we feel strongly that

18 "Aviation" should be in it, then we did not give

19 them enough explicit instructions and we need to

20 give them time, because they have been working on

21 this and they know all of the ins and out.

22 And if we can come to an agreement with our

23 board that says "Aviation" should be included in

24 the park name, and then give it back to the

25 committee and ask them to please do it one more

80

1 time and apologize.

2 MR. GORMAN: I make a motion that we --

3 MR. GEORGE: Second.

4 MR. GORMAN: -- vote. Let -- let's vote on

5 whether "Aviation" should be in the name and then

6 just put it to bed and give it back to the

7 committee.

8 MR. GEORGE: I second that.

9 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Do we have any more board

10 discussion on the motion that's been presented and

11 a second?

12 MR. WUELLNER: Is it the word "Aviation" or is

13 it an aviation reference? I just want to be clear.

14 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Is it the word "Aviation"

15 that needs to be in the park?

16 MR. GEORGE: No.

17 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Is it "Aeronautical" that

18 needs to be in the name? Is it "Airport" is not

19 supposed to be in the name? What are the

20 parameters?

21 MR. GEORGE: Okay. The parameter that I would

22 position is that the primary purpose of this was so

23 that people can observe aviation, and therefore,

24 "Aviation" should be in the name to imply that

25 intent.

81

1 MR. WERTER: Buzz, but is it the specific word
2 "Aviation" or some aviation-associated word like
3 "Air Park" --

4 MR. GEORGE: I'll take --

5 MR. WERTER: -- "Aviation, Aeronautical"?

6 MR. GEORGE: I'll take aviation-associated
7 stuff. But we need just --

8 MR. GORMAN: In other words, the name needs to
9 community that it is an aviation observation park.

10 MR. GEORGE: That's a better way of putting
11 it, Jack, yeah.

12 MR. YOUMAN: May -- may we ask Bryan his
13 opinion of what we're talking about since he's the
14 head of the committee and they have to take this
15 back?

16 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: We can, but we haven't
17 voted on whether or not they're going to take it
18 back because we're still in a board discussion.
19 What about Indian Creek Air Park?

20 MR. GORMAN: You want to let them, the
21 committee rehash this thing and word --

22 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I don't know. We're in
23 discussion now, so we can discuss it among
24 ourselves. Indian Creek Air Park, would that

25 satisfy what you're looking for?

82

1 MR. GEORGE: As a pilot, an air park to mean
2 means a residential area that I fly airplanes into.

3 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Agreed.

4 MR. GEORGE: It does not mean a park that is
5 there for observation.

6 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: So then would Indian Creek
7 Observation -- how far would you go with it?

8 MR. WUELLNER: Overlook?

9 MS. MARTIN: Indian Creek Aviation Park.

10 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Would Indian Creek Aviation
11 Park be acceptable?

12 MR. WUELLNER: It implies a theme that's --

13 MR. GEORGE: What's that?

14 MR. WERTER: The word "Aviation," I -- for
15 lack of a better word, I'm at a loss for words.

16 MR. GEORGE: Aviation Observation Deck at
17 Indian Creek Park.

18 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: The question I have is that
19 as a board if we can't come to any consensus and we
20 can't take what the -- what the committees have
21 given us as consensus --

22 (Mr. Burnett leaves the room.)

23 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: -- at what point will there
24 be a consensus if we can't hash it out now?

25 MR. GEORGE: If we don't hash it out or give

83

1 it back to the people that spent a lot of time
2 hashing around all of these things, then we are not
3 privy to their input, and therefore we probably
4 won't be able to make a decision.

5 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: But we've already received
6 their input.

7 MR. GEORGE: I still think that "de plane" is
8 good.

9 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: So we -- we received that
10 they want to have Indian Creek in the name. That's
11 what we've received. Okay. What the board doesn't
12 like is that there's no emphasis on the aviation
13 aspect that name and the opportunity for one day to
14 be able to have an observation deck, which we don't
15 have that phase built in. So what would be the
16 name that would satisfy that if they've already
17 told us that they like Indian Creek?

18 MR. GEORGE: Well, I think, Madam Chairman,
19 that the motion and the second was to turn it back
20 to them.

21 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Right. But it hasn't
22 been -- it hasn't been voted on yet. So we're
23 still in the discussion.

24 MR. GEORGE: So what is the discussion? I

25 don't understand what you're asking.

84

1 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: At -- at what point is it
2 Indian Creek? Does the aviation need to be -- is
3 what word, what verbiage?

4 MR. GEORGE: You're asking me to do the
5 committee's job. I'm saying give the committee the
6 instruction to include the aviation aspect in the
7 name.

8 MR. GORMAN: And defer it.

9 MR. GEORGE: Now, if you want me to give you a
10 list of 14 that would be acceptable to me, then
11 I'll have to come back next week and do it.

12 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: But you already gave -- you
13 already gave the committee a list of ones that
14 would be acceptable to you. So that's why I'm
15 trying to get more -- a finer direction here. If
16 Air Park isn't acceptable, then that's not what we
17 want to send back to the committee.

18 MR. WERTER: No, no, no. What he's saying
19 is -- if I may. And it -- it's simple. He said
20 let's hand it back to the committee with
21 instructions that they should pick an
22 aviated-associated word to include in the name of
23 the park. Let them come back with more options for
24 us to pound our heads on, and that's the simple

25 motion.

85

1 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I have that. And I also
2 got, though, that there are words that wouldn't be
3 acceptable right off the bat.

4 MR. WERTER: Well, that's what we whip up on
5 later.

6 MR. GORMAN: Kelly, no offense --

7 MR. WERTER: That would be half the
8 dictionary.

9 MR. GORMAN: The motion that Jim just
10 clarified and a second was made, we just need to
11 vote on that to get rid of that. In other words,
12 we did make a motion, we did second it. So if we
13 vote on it, whether we can give it back to the
14 committee or, you know, do what you want to do. We
15 need to vote on it, don't we?

16 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: We're in the discussion
17 part, and I think that if we're going to send it
18 back to the committee, we need to be able to give
19 them parameters that we're going to find acceptable
20 so that it doesn't come back here to the board and
21 then gets debated again.

22 This is the second time it's come up. We
23 need -- if what we gave them for parameters with --
24 I mean, right off the bat, we've already said Air

25 Park wouldn't work.

86

1 MR. GEORGE: No. I said in my opinion Air
2 Park wouldn't work. There's 16 people on the
3 board -- on the committee. Maybe they would think
4 it would work. When it comes back here, if there
5 are four people that think it would work, then the
6 vote is 4 to 1. So you're trying to put words in
7 my mouth that -- that for the whole board Air Park
8 is not acceptable.

9 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I'm trying to get a
10 clarification before we send it back, because if
11 I'm on that -- if I'm on that committee and I've
12 given my feedback and I feel good about it and
13 strong about it, and it's been kicked back again,
14 I'm going to want to say, "Okay, aviation what?
15 Airport's not going to work. Air Park, I've gotten
16 feedback that that's not palatable." So what is?
17 Carl.

18 MR. YOUMAN: Do we agree that Indian Creek
19 is -- is part of the name? Let's ask that
20 question.

21 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: In my opinion, it is. I
22 think it has -- I think for the reasons that have
23 been presented already. It's got location. It's
24 got historical.

25 MR. YOUMAN: Should -- should we make a motion

87

1 that the name -- we accept the name Indian Creek
2 with the proviso that the tying -- some kind of
3 tie-in to the airport facility is required and we'd
4 like to ask the committee to look at that aspect?

5 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I would be comfortable with
6 that.

7 MR. YOUMAN: Are you comfortable with that?

8 MR. GEORGE: No. We have a motion and a
9 second --

10 MR. YOUMAN: On what?

11 MR. GEORGE: -- on the floor for discussion,
12 and I'm not in favor of changing. I want to
13 hear --

14 MR. GORMAN: That was clarified by Mr. Werter.

15 MR. GEORGE: -- I want to hear a vote on the
16 motion. And I don't know if -- if the proper term
17 is call to vote. I mean, we've just beat this
18 around. It's a fairly clear-cut motion and a
19 second, I thought.

20 MR. YOUMAN: Okay. Then we voted on -- we --
21 for discussion.

22 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Right. After the motion
23 and second, then comes the discussion amongst
24 board. But Buzz is ready for it to be called to a

1 MR. YOUMAN: What is the -- what is the motion
2 to vote on specifically?

3 MR. GORMAN: Let Mr. Werter do that again.

4 MR. WERTER: As I understand, the current
5 motion on the floor is to turn it back over to the
6 committee with instructions that they should author
7 several options for names with an
8 aviation-associated word in that name, i.e -- and
9 Buzz, it could be Air Park coming back at you.

10 MR. GEORGE: Fine.

11 MR. WERTER: You know, but any number of -- it
12 could be Air Park. It could be Aviation. It could
13 be Aeronautical, which is one of my least
14 favorites. You know, something along those names.
15 And that's the motion in itself.

16 Now -- now, procedurally, I'm at a loss for,
17 well, do we change the motion around since it's in
18 discussion? I don't know if you do that or not
19 procedurally. But sometimes, you know, a cigar is
20 just a cigar and we can get overly involved with
21 nitpicking the procedure, okay?

22 Now, with the understanding that it's going
23 back to the committee for -- I mean, we could
24 decide right now if Indian Creek is a good part of

25 that name. Let's make Indian Creek and some

89

1 aviation-associated term with Indian Creek. We
2 could send it back that way.

3 I don't see a problem with altering the motion
4 at this point to say, "Okay, we all took a vote,
5 Indian Creek we like that part of the name," but
6 send it back to them with the -- with the primary
7 instructions. Find out how to fit an
8 aviation-associated word into that title.

9 And I don't think, you know, that we should
10 get -- we should treat -- I wish Doug was here --
11 treat it as a chancery item, a fairness item, and
12 alter the motion and just loosen up a little bit in
13 that area so we can get the job done. You know, we
14 are not federal government. We are not that much
15 of a bureaucracy where we can't do that.

16 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Are we in favor of amending
17 the motion?

18 MR. WERTER: I -- pardon my anger, but it's
19 partly pain-related, so...

20 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I think regardless of
21 whether even we amend the motion or not, the
22 discussion that took place on the motion should be
23 able to give the feedback to the committee.

24 MR. WERTER: Yeah. It could be under the

25 table. Hey, tell the committee, "You know, off the

90

1 record, we kind of like Indian Park, you know," or
2 "Indian Creek," you know, and then they come back
3 with --

4 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Everything we say is on the
5 record.

6 MR. WERTER: Well, I mean, you know, as not
7 part of the formal --

8 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Motion.

9 (Mr. Burnett enters the room.)

10 MR. WERTER: -- motion. They get the word.
11 Reba's -- maybe she ran for her life. But some of
12 the PR people. Bryan's here. "Yeah, they were
13 talking at the board. They kind of like Indian
14 Creek, but they need something aviation related."
15 No big deal. Let's work the KISS principle a
16 little bit.

17 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. I'm with that. Then
18 we'll call it for a vote. We have a motion and a
19 second --

20 MR. WERTER: Buzz, is there something,
21 anything I --

22 MR. GEORGE: No.

23 MR. YOUMAN: What is the motion we're voting
24 on? I just want to be clear.

25 MR. WERTER: Okay. Officially, if I may --

91

1 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Restate the motion.

2 MR. WERTER: -- restate the motion. I move

3 that we refer this -- this matter back to the

4 committee for a review of names to include an

5 aviation-associated word in the title of the park

6 name.

7 MR. GEORGE: Period.

8 MR. WERTER: Say what?

9 MR. GEORGE: Period.

10 MR. WERTER: Period. End of statement.

11 Off -- off the motion, they've heard our feelings

12 about Indian Creek.

13 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: And the airport.

14 MR. WERTER: Who seconds? Oh, that's your

15 job.

16 MR. YOUMAN: It's already been seconded.

17 MR. GEORGE: Yeah.

18 MR. WERTER: No, I just restated the motion.

19 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: There's already a motion

20 and a second and he was just clarifying -- he was

21 restating the motion.

22 MR. GEORGE: Yeah. At the point that he

23 made -- where I made the period, that was the

24 motion and that was seconded.

25 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: And so now we can call it

92

1 for a vote because we've already had plenty of
2 discussion, unless there's any more discussion.

3 MR. BURNETT: Well -- and I apologize, I had
4 an emergency phone call, but we -- and it was a
5 true emergency. Mr. Gorman had made a motion that
6 was seconded. Has that motion been withdrawn?

7 MR. GORMAN: No.

8 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Huh-uh. He just restated.

9 MR. GEORGE: That's what he was restating
10 Jack's motion.

11 MR. BURNETT: So to make sure the record's
12 clear, as stated by Mr. Werter, Mr. Gorman, do you
13 adopt that motion as your motion?

14 MR. GORMAN: Yes.

15 MR. BURNETT: Okay. And then the second
16 adopts as well?

17 MR. GEORGE: The second adopts it also.

18 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: All in favor, aye?

19 MR. GEORGE: Aye.

20 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Aye.

21 MR. GORMAN: Aye.

22 MR. YOUMAN: Aye.

23 MR. WERTER: Aye.

24 MR. BURNETT: Any opposed? Was that

1 MR. GEORGE: We don't know yet.

2 MR. WERTER: It was three.

3 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Aye.

4 MR. GORMAN: I said aye.

5 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Any opposed?

6 MR. GEORGE: Oh.

7 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Then motion passes.

8 MR. GORMAN: That was easy.

9 MR. WERTER: Oh, yeah. In what universe?

10 TRIM DISCUSSION AND ACTION

11 MR. WUELLNER: Makes me look forward to the
12 balance of the agenda even more. Next item that --
13 up is the TRIM adoption. During the month of July
14 each year, you're required to take some affirmative
15 action in a formal basis to -- to determine what
16 the maximum or the not-to-exceed limit would be
17 relative to ad valorem taxation.

18 We understand that the thinking at this point
19 as well as the budget building is that that level
20 be set at zero, but it does require your formal
21 action to either place a number on the table, a
22 millage rate, or -- including zero, and approve
23 that as a -- as a motion.

24 MR. BURNETT: If I could speak to this just a

25 little bit more.

94

1 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Uh-huh.

2 MR. BURNETT: If you don't adopt a millage of
3 zero, interestingly enough, the -- the roll-back
4 rate would be imposed by law. So therefore, if
5 you're going to quote unquote come off the tax
6 rolls, you've got to adopt a millage rate of zero
7 in order to do that.

8 The other thing that you should be aware of,
9 and this is an interesting thing that we've both
10 learned of, Mr. Wuellner and I, is that your taxes,
11 if you take 2009, they're collected this year and
12 then the Airport Authority pays the property
13 appraiser/tax collector the year after for what was
14 collected the year before.

15 So although you'll adopt a millage of zero,
16 you still have, and that's one of the budgetary
17 items you'll be talking about going forward, is
18 you'll still have on the budget payments to the
19 property appraiser related to the collections that
20 they've already done for the previous year. So it
21 will make a budgetary impact still on us for
22 another year until that's gone.

23 Next year, we may have a different situation
24 on how we deal with the roll-back rate. I intend

25 to talk to you about that in another month.

95

1 Potentially we wind with an Attorney General
2 Opinion that we request from the Attorney General
3 related to coming off the tax rolls or how we
4 repeatedly do this in future years.

5 It's kind of a rarity. I can tell you there's
6 a 1999 Attorney General Opinion and there's one
7 piece of case law out there, but just there really
8 isn't a lot out there in the way of law for coming
9 off of the tax rolls because it's not norm -- it's
10 not the usual thing that government does. So --

11 MR. GEORGE: Could you send a letter to the
12 editor to state that, please?

13 MR. WUELLNER: He's here.

14 MR. YOUMAN: May I ask a question on that?

15 If --

16 MR. BURNETT: Yes, sir.

17 MR. YOUMAN: If we vote for zero this year and
18 five -- three years from now -- and next year we
19 vote zero, the third year we vote zero, the fourth
20 year some -- some unknown thing occurs, can we vote
21 to reinstate the --

22 MR. WUELLNER: Yes.

23 MR. YOUMAN: -- tax assessment?

24 MR. BURNETT: You can. You're limited by that

25 cap that you can increase every year.

96

1 MR. YOUMAN: And what -- what do you mean by
2 that?

3 MR. WUELLNER: We don't -- it's a percent
4 over -- it --

5 MR. YOUMAN: If -- if it's zero, what's our
6 cap the next -- next time?

7 MR. BURNETT: It will be up -- it will be that
8 percent from zero. It's a --

9 MR. YOUMAN: There can't be anything --

10 MR. BURNETT: I understand the multiplication.
11 I understand the multiplication. But if you have a
12 hundred and you're at zero, it's -- it's one of the
13 issues we've got to talk about some more and do
14 some more research on, but it -- this is -- it's an
15 odd issue.

16 In fact, let me just tell you the only thing
17 that I found is the Lower Florida Keys Hospital
18 District did this in 1991. But other than that,
19 you just don't have it occur.

20 MR. YOUMAN: Should we make sure we protect
21 ourselves from the future -- for future boards that
22 we don't shut the door on emergency situations?

23 MR. WUELLNER: It -- it's not shut. The -- in
24 this respect. The -- your charter provides for a

25 maximum level of ad valorem regardless. That is

97

1 set by the charter at a max of one half mill. So
2 that -- that would be the absolute upper end you
3 could ever be -- be on anyway.

4 The zero piece, what we're -- what we're --
5 what we are struggling with is that over the last
6 couple of years, the legislature has adopted some
7 formulas, for lack of better words, that limit the
8 ability of taxing entities to increase the ad
9 valorem millage above previous years' levels.

10 And that does not envision, because it just
11 doesn't happen, someone having gotten off the tax
12 rolls and coming back on. So that's where we kind
13 of get to giggling about the, how do you get a
14 percentage over zero? Because it --

15 MR. YOUMAN: Right.

16 MR. WUELLNER: I -- I think what we want to do
17 between now and formally having to do something is
18 get the state group, the Bureau of Administrative
19 or whatever it is anymore, to make a determination
20 for us or give us some opinion as to if that
21 scenario developed, how does under current statute
22 the Authority get back in the game if it needed to.

23 We've always just administratively looked at
24 it and went, well, if you -- our most likely

25 scenario for ever touching ad valorem -- and I say

98

1 most likely because it's probably not -- is in
2 backing some sort of bond issue or something along
3 that line.

4 MR. GEORGE: Right.

5 MR. WUELLNER: That is voter approved if
6 you're backing it with ad valorem. So, it -- it
7 requires it go to a local referendum in order to
8 commit that anyway. So, that -- that's another
9 component of it. But it's not general revenue. It
10 would be specific for some -- obviously tied to
11 some capital project.

12 MR. GORMAN: I've got something here. It is
13 my understanding that if you go to zero, that you'd
14 have to have a referendum to bring up -- and you
15 can clarify this with me, but it doesn't sound like
16 Doug is clear on it yet -- that you would have to
17 have a referendum to bring ad valorem back.

18 But if you go to .00001, you still have that
19 ability without the referendum to bring it back,
20 but you have proved to the public your sincerity in
21 pulling them off the tax rolls. So that is my
22 recommendation, to go to .0001.

23 MR. WUELLNER: I don't think that's
24 technically correct.

25 MR. GORMAN: Well, we don't seem to have the

99

1 technicalities down yet anyway --

2 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah --

3 MR. GORMAN: -- so...

4 MR. YOUMAN: And that makes me leery of voting

5 zero today --

6 MR. GORMAN: Right.

7 MR. YOUMAN: -- till we know.

8 MR. GORMAN: I agree.

9 MR. WUELLNER: Your alternative at this point

10 is, even though the intention is to be off the tax

11 rolls, you know, we can get it clarified. You can

12 adopt a millage rate today, just understanding it's

13 the maximum you -- you know, not that we're

14 intending to assess it, is kind of my point, but it

15 does get a number into the TRIM notification,

16 whatever that is.

17 MR. BURNETT: Okay.

18 MR. GEORGE: All we're doing today is

19 establishing the not to exceed. So if we establish

20 the not to exceed because of this discussion as --

21 if we establish that at what it was last year or

22 the roll-back, we still have the option that gives

23 them time to investigate it --

24 MR. YOUMAN: Okay.

25 MR. GEORGE: -- so that we have a better

100

1 understanding of it. By the time you get to the
2 final, you know, it's going to be zero -- excuse
3 me, it may be zero.

4 MR. YOUMAN: Okay. I can accept that, but I
5 can't -- I can't accept voting zero today.

6 MR. WUELLNER: The TRIM piece, you could
7 always bring it to nothing.

8 MR. YOUMAN: Correct.

9 MR. WUELLNER: You can always bring it to
10 anything below it. You just can't go any higher,
11 whatever that number is.

12 MR. YOUMAN: Right.

13 MR. BURNETT: There's -- there's nothing out
14 there for solid authority on this subject. Because
15 of that -- and I've been doing a lot of work on
16 this because of the importance of it. Because of
17 that, I guess and since we've had this discussion
18 now, I'd ask you to make a vote to authorize me to
19 seek an Attorney General Opinion as to the issue of
20 if we set the millage to zero, how we increase it
21 and what we can increase it by.

22 MR. GORMAN: Seems like our only option.

23 MR. WUELLNER: It really is because of the
24 newness of the law that affects it. If that recent

25 change in the legislature over two years ago had

101

1 not happened, you could jump on and off as you see
2 fit to any level up to the half mill.

3 MR. GEORGE: Well, it's to our advantage to
4 have something higher level than just here that
5 says that.

6 MR. WUELLNER: Absolutely. Absolutely.

7 MR. GEORGE: And so I think I agree with Doug.

8 MR. GORMAN: Can we make a motion right now
9 to --

10 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: No, we have to open this up
11 for public discussion.

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

13 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Do we have -- Bob Cox?

14 MR. GORMAN: Bob has left.

15 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: And Sacha?

16 MS. MARTIN: No.

17 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Seeing no public comment,
18 we can open up for board question and answers,
19 which is -- is there any other questions? Doug, I
20 have a question. At what point is our final date
21 that we have to set this not to exceed? Is it our
22 next meeting on the 16th?

23 MR. WUELLNER: I think it's ahead of that,
24 actually. I don't have it in front of me.

25 MR. GEORGE: It says final adoption is on

102

1 September the 20th. Is that --

2 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, there's a --

3 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Date --

4 MR. WUELLNER: -- statutory established date

5 by which we have to submit the --

6 MR. GORMAN: TRIM.

7 MR. WUELLNER: -- the TRIM notification. If

8 you hang on a second, let me see if I can find it

9 out of an e-mail here.

10 MR. YOUMAN: Then does that mean --

11 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Carl?

12 MR. WUELLNER: Go ahead and --

13 MR. YOUMAN: Does that mean, what is my

14 question, we have to have a special meeting or

15 something on that date to make an official vote?

16 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: We may. That's what he's

17 trying to research.

18 MR. BURNETT: It's whatever -- it would be

19 our -- it would be our August meeting, would it

20 not?

21 MR. YOUMAN: Our August meeting is August the

22 16th, isn't it?

23 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Uh-huh. So the question is

24 would that give us enough time, and that's what

25 he's trying to --

103

1 MR. BURNETT: I know Donna's not here tonight,
2 but I know Donna tracks it very closely to make
3 sure our meetings are on schedule.

4 MR. WUELLNER: We must have --

5 MR. GEORGE: Well, our next meeting is August
6 16th --

7 MR. WUELLNER: That's --

8 MR. GEORGE: -- and that's clearly within the
9 final adoption by one month of September the 20th.
10 I'm sorry.

11 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. I just -- I just found
12 it in their letter and it says must be returned to
13 their office no later than 4:30 p.m. Monday, August
14 16th.

15 MR. WERTER: We have to move our date up.

16 MR. GORMAN: We're going to have to move our
17 date up.

18 MR. WUELLNER: That's -- that's the date.
19 It's typically 30 days after they submit the -- or
20 tell you that the tax rolls are -- certification
21 are in place, the DR-420 as it's called.

22 MR. GEORGE: So we can bypass on electing a
23 TRIM now --

24 MR. WUELLNER: Yes.

25 MR. GEORGE: -- as long as we do it by --

104

1 MR. WUELLNER: Let me -- let me -- and maybe
2 that's -- yeah. The fallback position here is the
3 do-nothing alternative is that by statute, that
4 rollback -- it will fall back to the rolled-back
5 rate and that will be established as the TRIM
6 notice.

7 That is not the adopted rate for you folks.
8 That would have to happen in September, at which
9 point you could take it to zero, depending on
10 the -- or, you know, at that point, we have all of
11 the act together. I suspect by the 16th, no matter
12 what, we have an answer of what's going to happen
13 or at least the process that would have to be there
14 to get an opinion.

15 MR. YOUMAN: Well, what you're saying if we
16 take -- the 16th is too late to take action on
17 whatever was supposed to happen on the 16th, but it
18 won't affect us negatively because we have a last
19 option in September --

20 MR. WUELLNER: Right.

21 MR. YOUMAN: -- to make a decision to whatever
22 the rate is the roll-back rate --

23 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. Kind of -- kind of the
24 worst-case scenario is a PR -- for lack of better

25 terms is a PR kind of thing.

105

1 If it defaults to the rolled-back rate, it's
2 going to come out in the tax notices as that rate.
3 That's not the adopted rate, but that's the
4 preliminary notification that's required. It will
5 show you as assessing ad valorem. You're going to
6 create a hullabaloo over the fact it still looks
7 that way.

8 MR. YOUMAN: Then we should have --

9 MR. WUELLNER: I'd like to get it resolved
10 ahead of the 16th.

11 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I agree.

12 MR. GORMAN: Can we move -- can we just simply
13 move our date up like to the 9th or some --

14 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: The 9th is the --

15 MR. WUELLNER: FAC.

16 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: -- FAC. We could move it
17 up to the 13th.

18 MR. GORMAN: There you go.

19 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: We could move it up in time
20 on the 16th.

21 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. It's a -- it's really a
22 quick matter to get the form filled out and over
23 there. It's not a --

24 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: We could have a 2 o'clock

25 meeting --

106

1 MR. WUELLNER: -- especially if the outcome is
2 it's going to be zero.

3 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: We could have a 2 o'clock
4 meeting on the 16th --

5 MR. GORMAN: There you go.

6 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: -- if the 16th works as the
7 best date for everybody.

8 MR. GEORGE: Fine with me.

9 MR. WUELLNER: You can do that --

10 MR. GEORGE: Yeah.

11 MR. WUELLNER: -- 16th?

12 MR. YOUMAN: That gives you enough time if
13 that's the first thing on the agenda --

14 MR. WUELLNER: Is it possible to do it earlier
15 than 2:00?

16 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Yeah. We could do it at
17 1:00.

18 MR. WUELLNER: If it's all the same to you,
19 why don't we just move the whole meeting forward.
20 We'll make that the first item and that way you
21 don't have the -- you don't have multiple meetings.

22 MR. GEORGE: You mean move it forward in the
23 same day?

24 MR. WUELLNER: The same day, yeah.

25 MR. GEORGE: Sounds good to me.

107

1 MR. WERTER: What time are we talking about?

2 MR. WUELLNER: So we'll start at maybe

3 1 o'clock on the -- on the 16th?

4 MR. WERTER: Could we make it 1:30? I have a
5 trial that morning that may run a little over.

6 MR. YOUMAN: That's fine with me.

7 MR. WUELLNER: That's fine by us. We'll be
8 prepared to submit the form, get somebody over
9 there to drop it.

10 MR. GEORGE: Yeah, right.

11 MR. WUELLNER: In fact, I could do it
12 electronically probably sitting right here the way
13 it's set up.

14 MR. GEORGE: I'd rather have somebody
15 physically do it.

16 MR. WUELLNER: Well, they -- either way.

17 MR. GEORGE: But just so there's no
18 misunderstanding, I think we're all consistent in
19 our philosophy that we want it to be zero.

20 The budget that was submitted at the workshop
21 just earlier -- earlier was oriented toward it
22 being zero. But to protect us, to give time for
23 legal to find out what the options are, we're just
24 going to let it slide to the next meeting.

25 MR. WUELLNER: Very well put.

108

1 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: To -- to protect future
2 boards.

3 MR. GEORGE: I'm sorry?

4 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: And to protect future
5 boards.

6 MR. GEORGE: Yeah.

7 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Carl?

8 MR. YOUMAN: Does that give you sufficient
9 time, Doug, to work through these processes and get
10 an answer, do you think?

11 MR. GEORGE: Yes.

12 MR. BURNETT: I would hope -- I -- it will get
13 us to where we have I think a better handle on the
14 legal issues. I mean, I'm talking to the folks at
15 the state, and the TRIM compliance department of
16 the Department of Revenue.

17 MR. YOUMAN: Did we excite them with our
18 stance?

19 MR. WUELLNER: No. I'm just betting they
20 never anticipated this area, so it's --

21 MR. YOUMAN: So it's creating an issue for
22 somebody.

23 MR. WUELLNER: There's an -- there's an
24 odd-out possibility that it would have to require

25 legislative action to correct. I mean, that's a

109

1 possibility. Not --

2 MR. YOUMAN: But if it comes to -- I'm sorry.

3 Can I --

4 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Go ahead, Carl.

5 MR. YOUMAN: If it comes to that, if it comes
6 to a legislative decision, would we then have to
7 protect ourselves by the TRIM -- at the TRIM date
8 and actually not -- and actually have to have a tax
9 next year at whatever rate, the lowest rate we have
10 to have it just to be -- protect our future boards
11 just like Jack said? I know he said .0001. He
12 wasn't -- he wasn't being facetious.

13 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah.

14 MR. GEORGE: I thought we agreed to defer that
15 to the next meeting.

16 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Yeah. I think that to try
17 to make an assessment on that without having a
18 legal background and -- and -- would be a mistake.

19 MR. WUELLNER: We'll get the info to you.

20 MR. GORMAN: Right. What -- the only -- my
21 only caveat, my only fear is that we will not have
22 a decision by that meeting.

23 MR. BURNETT: Sure.

24 MR. GORMAN: Doug, will -- can you pretty much

25 guarantee that you will be talking to the State

110

1 Attorney (sic) and they will come out of their --

2 MR. GEORGE: That you'll be talking to them.

3 MR. GORMAN: -- collective committees to be

4 able to figure what's going to -- their answer? I

5 don't want to have this to be forced into taxing

6 the public because the Attorney General didn't come

7 to a decision as to the ad valorem policy.

8 MR. BURNETT: I'm going to do my best to run

9 it down to be able to give you a legal opinion

10 independent of the one we'll seek from the Attorney

11 General. But as it stands right now, I don't have

12 my -- I don't have a clear answer to be able to

13 give you that opinion right now. That's -- so

14 that's where it stands at the present moment.

15 One thing I would ask, though, so that we have

16 very clear strong direction to them, and I'd like

17 to be able to put this in my letter, is that this

18 is -- I'd like for you to vote on it, and hopefully

19 it's unanimous, that we seek this Attorney General

20 Opinion.

21 That way, I can put that in the letter so that

22 it's not one of these ones where you're infighting

23 or the like or it's not an unanimous thing that the

24 Airport Authority is seeking. This is a "We need

25 this opinion."

111

1 MR. YOUMAN: If you give your statement of
2 what the -- what we should vote on, I will make the
3 motion based on your statement and somebody can
4 second it.

5 MR. BURNETT: It would be that we -- that the
6 Airport Authority Attorney is directed to seek an
7 Attorney General Opinion on the implications of
8 setting ad valorem tax assessment at 0 mills for
9 future boards or future years for then imposing ad
10 valorem taxes if later that becomes necessary.

11 MR. YOUMAN: That's my motion.

12 MR. WERTER: Second.

13 MR. GEORGE: Third.

14 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Is -- is that a correct
15 motion, to do it that way?

16 MR. BURNETT: Yes, ma'am.

17 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. All in favor?

18 MR. GEORGE: Aye.

19 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Aye.

20 MR. GORMAN: Aye.

21 MR. YOUMAN: Aye.

22 MR. WERTER: Aye.

23 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Motion passes unanimously.

24 RESOLUTION 2010-03

25 MR. WUELLNER: Okay. Hopefully this one will

112

1 be easier. We have in front of you proposed
2 Resolution 2 -- 2010-03, which is the regulation
3 resolution that just supports the multimodal
4 development as a preferred alternative by this
5 board.

6 A like resolution will be forwarded to the
7 North Florida TPO for their consideration and
8 adoption at their next meeting hopefully. I mean,
9 we'll -- we'll have it to them, whether they'll
10 agenda it.

11 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: We have no public comment
12 on this, so we can open up for board question and
13 answer.

14 MR. YOUMAN: Just a statement. I talked to
15 Denise Bunnewith when she was at -- which meeting
16 was that?

17 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Trip generation study.

18 MR. WUELLNER: Yesterday, probably.

19 MR. YOUMAN: Trip generation study. And she
20 said to get it passed and Jeff, who's the head of
21 the North Florida TPO now --

22 MR. WUELLNER: -- Sheffield.

23 MR. YOUMAN: -- will be available two days
24 this week, which gave us till tomorrow, and he'll

25 be gone the next three days, to get it on -- on the

113

1 agenda. So I'll call him tomorrow once we get it

2 approved or Ed --

3 MR. WUELLNER: To be clear, we're talking
4 about two different resolutions. One is adopted by
5 this board.

6 MR. YOUMAN: Correct.

7 MR. WUELLNER: The other is a similar motion
8 that we are forwarding -- resolution we are
9 forwarding to the TPO for their consideration of
10 adoption.

11 MR. YOUMAN: Correct.

12 MR. WUELLNER: I just want to make sure you're
13 clear, because you keep talking about passing this
14 one to go to that one, and they're really
15 independent operations.

16 MR. YOUMAN: Right. Correct.

17 MR. WUELLNER: Okay.

18 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I make a motion that we
19 adopt Resolution 2010-03 support for the multimodal
20 development.

21 MR. GEORGE: Second.

22 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Any further board
23 discussion?

24 MR. WERTER: I object to the motion only for

25 one thing. Too many T's in an "attest."

114

1 MR. WUELLNER: Okay. You want a few more or a
2 few less?

3 MR. WERTER: I said too many.

4 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Any further board
5 discussion?

6 MR. WUELLNER: Will you attest to that?

7 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Call it to a vote. All in
8 favor, aye?

9 MR. GEORGE: Aye.

10 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Aye.

11 MR. GORMAN: Aye.

12 MR. YOUMAN: Aye.

13 MR. WERTER: Aye.

14 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Motion passes unanimously.

15 VALIANT AVIATION MAINTENANCE - LEASE

16 MR. WUELLNER: Okay. Next is the agenda item

17 first of what I anticipate to be two maybe three

18 leases related to the maintenance facility that's

19 finishing construction.

20 This is -- anticipates 8,500 square feet of

21 leasehold, a five-year lease with three -- with

22 five-year -- three five-year options, if I can get

23 that out. Effective date of the lease is

24 approximately August 1st or notice to pro --

25 certificate of occupancy, if I can get --

115

1 that's about it for speech today, I think.

2 It is an initial rate of \$4.50 a square foot
3 which equates to \$38,250 per year. That is
4 similar -- we set the -- structured the lease to be
5 similar to how we structured the Southeast Aero
6 leases when we entered into those to have a
7 four-year fixed increase each year. Eventually
8 settling at \$5.50 a square foot at the beginning of
9 the sixth year, which would equate to \$46,750 at
10 that point with CPI adjustments from that point on.

11 We are using the standard form lease, and we
12 would recommend approval of this. And we'll -- as
13 I said, once we get the other two leases prepared,
14 we'll get them back to you.

15 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: We have no public comment
16 on this agenda item, so we can open it up for board
17 question and answer. Jack?

18 MR. GORMAN: Real quick. I'm sorry, Carl.

19 MR. YOUMAN: No, that's okay.

20 MR. GORMAN: Real quick, there's no -- in
21 other words, with these leases it's understood
22 that, because I know how aviation works, there's no
23 exclusivity --

24 MR. WUELLNER: No, we're not allowed to --

25 MR. GORMAN: -- granted to this. Yeah. In

116

1 other words, even though there's -- and the second
2 question is, is that entire facility being leased
3 to them? In other words, it's rather large.

4 MR. WUELLNER: It's a little over half.

5 MR. GORMAN: Over half. So the other half is
6 not leased out yet?

7 MR. WUELLNER: Correct. Two -- two of the
8 four hangar bays are to be leased to others.

9 MR. GORMAN: And would -- and is that -- then
10 is that office space or that administration space
11 all leased to the one entity or is it --

12 MR. WUELLNER: It is at --

13 MR. GORMAN: -- you're going to divide it in
14 half?

15 MR. WUELLNER: It is at this point. It is at
16 this point. The intent is that over time, that
17 tenant will absorb the balance of the space and it
18 will be one -- it will be one leasehold at some
19 point in the future.

20 MR. GORMAN: So you're not -- you're not --
21 it's not available to divide up that administration
22 of that office space at this time.

23 MR. WUELLNER: Not currently. We didn't size
24 the office to be able to piece it. It's not very

25 very big.

117

1 MR. GEORGE: Go ahead.

2 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Carl was next on questions.

3 MR. WUELLNER: Yes, sir.

4 MR. YOUMAN: If somebody comes in and says, "I

5 want to lease that other half," is it open to -- I

6 mean, you're not shutting --

7 MR. WUELLNER: At this point, I have -- yeah,

8 I've got several people I'm talking to, but no

9 one's signed anything yet, so...

10 MR. YOUMAN: Oh, we do have other

11 opportunities for the second half.

12 MR. WUELLNER: I have at least one of the two.

13 MR. YOUMAN: Okay. And how many years is it

14 going to take to pay back this facility at whatever

15 rate?

16 MR. WUELLNER: This is about eight years of

17 repayment of our 50 percent of the grant.

18 MR. YOUMAN: Okay. Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: It's Buzz's turn.

20 MR. WUELLNER: That's leasing it all, though.

21 That's not --

22 MR. YOUMAN: Pardon?

23 MR. WUELLNER: That's not just tied to this

24 one lease. That's once the facility's completely

1 MR. YOUMAN: Right. That's what I'm getting
2 at. Because the rent will be proportional to
3 whatever this rent or lease fee is right now.

4 MR. WUELLNER: Exactly.

5 MR. YOUMAN: Okay.

6 MR. GEORGE: Does the lease --

7 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Buzz?

8 MR. GEORGE: Oh, I'm sorry. Does the lease
9 contain personal guarantees?

10 MR. WUELLNER: It is a -- in this case, it's
11 an existing tenant, so we do not have a personal
12 guarantee on it. Valiant Air is already here as a
13 tenant.

14 MR. BURNETT: The policy that --

15 MR. GEORGE: I thought that wasn't what the
16 policy said.

17 MR. BURNETT: The -- the policy that -- I
18 believe and correct me if I'm wrong. The policy I
19 believe that was adopted before was, on existing
20 tenants it wouldn't be required unless there was --
21 if there became a bad payment history or payment
22 problems --

23 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah.

24 MR. BURNETT: -- and then they would be

25 required to pay the personal guarantee.

119

1 MR. WUELLNER: You -- you set it up that at
2 any point where they develop a bad history, it --
3 there's a clause in the lease that allows us to
4 require personal guarantee. But it does not -- it
5 does not specifically require it on the front end.

6 It's basically if they -- they start making a
7 poor payment history, something that causes us
8 alarms, we have a right within the lease to
9 effectively compel them to sign a personal, so that
10 we're not at risk.

11 MR. GEORGE: How -- how do you compel them to
12 sign something after the fact?

13 MR. WUELLNER: They've already signed it
14 agreeing they will.

15 MR. GEORGE: They could then say, "No. Forget
16 you. I'm not going to sign it."

17 MR. WUELLNER: Well, they've already to sign
18 it in the original.

19 MR. BURNETT: What -- what happens, I believe
20 the -- and I'd have to have --

21 MR. WUELLNER: I'm being told they signed one
22 on the original lease, anyway.

23 MR. GEORGE: That what?

24 MR. WUELLNER: That there is one in place on

25 the original lease anyway.

120

1 MR. GEORGE: But is this a continuation of the
2 original lease?

3 MR. WUELLNER: We would just rewrite the lease
4 because it's a different building.

5 MR. GEORGE: Yeah.

6 MR. BURNETT: So because there's one already,
7 we'll have one on this one.

8 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Jack?

9 MR. GORMAN: Is -- in other words, this is
10 a -- I have -- as a matter of fact, I have -- am
11 very familiar with them, but there is no
12 understanding or caveat there that you cannot put
13 another maintenance facility adjacent to them?

14 MR. WUELLNER: No, sir.

15 MR. GORMAN: So, in other words, you could put
16 another maintenance facility.

17 MR. WUELLNER: Absolutely.

18 MR. GORMAN: And my only -- then the reason I
19 asked about the office space was, would there be
20 office space available to them or would they have
21 to build it into the facility?

22 MR. WUELLNER: You'd have to build it in at
23 this facility to actually operate a
24 business-business.

25 MR. GORMAN: Right. But that is possible.

121

1 MR. WUELLNER: We're targeting the other two
2 units right now at storage or ancillary use of
3 somebody else already on the airport. So they
4 don't necessarily need the office space or the
5 restrooms or anything else in those units, those
6 two units. But they could be added. I mean, we
7 could at some point elect to build those out with
8 some office space or something to that effect.

9 MR. GORMAN: In other words, there -- there
10 isn't any caveat that you couldn't have another
11 maintenance facility.

12 MR. WUELLNER: No.

13 MR. GORMAN: All right.

14 MR. WUELLNER: We're --

15 MR. GORMAN: That's fine.

16 MR. WUELLNER: -- federally prohibited from
17 limiting the number.

18 MR. GORMAN: Sure.

19 MR. WUELLNER: Basically it's your divine
20 right under federal statute to go bankrupt.

21 MR. GORMAN: Right. Last question, have you
22 got a tenant for the other half?

23 MR. WUELLNER: I've got half of a half
24 committed.

25 MR. GORMAN: Okay.

122

1 MR. WUELLNER: I'm down to approximately one
2 quarter, a little less than a quarter of a
3 building.

4 (Mr. Youman leaves the room.)

5 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Do we have any more
6 questions.

7 (None.)

8 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Do we have a motion?

9 MR. WERTER: I move that we accept the lease
10 as is.

11 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Do we have a second?

12 MR. GORMAN: I'll second.

13 MR. GEORGE: I can second it.

14 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay.

15 MR. GORMAN: That's fine.

16 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Any further board
17 discussion?

18 (None.)

19 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: All in favor, aye?

20 MR. GEORGE: Aye.

21 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Aye.

22 MR. WERTER: Aye.

23 MR. GORMAN: Aye.

24 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Motion passes.

1 around me. She keeps scaring me every time. I'm
2 not looking that way and she gets me every time.

3 ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION

4 MR. WUELLNER: The next item, I promise we
5 won't belabor this, but I felt we had -- we had
6 promised kind of an interim step. And at the pace
7 the environmental -- I call it the EA project, but
8 it's sort of beyond the EA -- the actual mitigation
9 project that comes out of this, the safety area
10 project that FAA is looking at, we had -- we
11 promised you that we would get back to you on what
12 we -- in the further look at alternatives
13 available --

14 (Mr. Youman enters the room.)

15 MR. WUELLNER: -- we'd bring that back to you,
16 let you -- get you up to speed on where that is,
17 where it's kind of ended up at this point.

18 As I mentioned in the earlier project update,
19 we're really at a point where we're going to get
20 the EA from -- from FAA that has no definitive tie
21 to a commitment to what the mitigation is in
22 itself. It just says that it looks like it's
23 feasible -- it can be mitigated, let's put it that
24 way.

25 The next step, though, we were -- as we

124

1 mentioned many times, we've gone down concurrently
2 the road of permitting the project, which is the --
3 the last step if you will to actually being able to
4 go out and do something to -- to both build the
5 safety area improvements and the corresponding
6 mitigation that would be required.

7 Since the last time we briefed you on that
8 part of it, which has been several meetings ago, I
9 don't remember my -- but it's probably March,
10 the -- we have -- they have looked at a number of
11 other alternatives. I asked Andrew to kind of come
12 and tell you what those were, what we found.

13 We did find a few more that were out there
14 that are worth looking at. You know, it's
15 unfortunate but we've probably gotten to a point
16 where there's really nothing else left to really
17 kick around, but we promised that. We wanted to
18 get you back on, I'll call it at least a tacit sort
19 of decision that the mitigation that's being
20 proposed or that's going to get into permitting at
21 this point will be acceptable.

22 We have -- to that end, we have gone out, in
23 order to meet the funding requirements of FAA on
24 time line, have bid the project with what we

25 believe to be the only viable mitigation at this

125

1 point. That mitigation, we now have numbers
2 associated with because we received 11 bids to do
3 that work. So we now have a pretty -- pretty
4 honed-in number available.

5 We also know what the safety area related work
6 is, and the -- and the mitigation components. We
7 know that that fits within what FAA anticipates for
8 funding in an application. That application
9 process with FAA may come quickly, meaning over the
10 next few weeks.

11 Once the EA is out, it can then be programmed
12 and funded by FAA. It will still have to wait on
13 permits to start, but it will at least commit the
14 money to the job and, you know, the risk of losing
15 that is off the table so to speak, assuming we can
16 finish this permitting at some point.

17 So I'm going to ask Andrew to come up and just
18 walk through those -- I think there are five -- I
19 don't remember, I think five or six off the top of
20 my head. But if you have the latest version, which
21 you should have revision C of the agenda, there's
22 a -- there's a graphic in there that shows the five
23 locations and/or it's up on the screen, whatever
24 your preference is. But you do have a copy of it,

25 and he'll talk you through the five real quick and

126

1 we'll get to some decision.

2 MR. GEORGE: Madam Chairman, I'm going to have
3 to excuse myself for another commitment.

4 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay.

5 MR. GEORGE: As far as the presentation I was
6 going to make, I'll just wait and do it at the next
7 workshop for the budget.

8 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay.

9 MR. GEORGE: Okay. Thank you. Sorry.

10 (Mr. George leaves the meeting.)

11 MR. HOLESKO: As Ed mentioned, we sort of -- I
12 told you a few months ago when we talked about the
13 specific permitting options that even at that point
14 up until the very last moment, we would really try
15 to leave no stone unturned here from the river
16 heading both north and south.

17 Birkitt Environmental has continued to follow
18 up on every viable lead that has been brought to
19 them, including I think you all saw a series of
20 e-mails a few months ago from some other
21 environmental firms here in St. Augustine that
22 said, hey, there's a lot of things that you need to
23 look at.

24 We met with them, evaluated every site that

25 they had. And again, that still led us to others.

127

1 There is actually still one left today that is
2 actually still being evaluated that isn't on the
3 list. But you've got five different sites.

4 You've got Madeira. You've got the Venetian
5 Mitigation area. You've got Hammock Beach. You've
6 got Flagler County Salt Marsh. And you've got Dan
7 Webb. And just to go back a little bit about what
8 it takes to make any of those five sites or any
9 mitigation area work, and this is -- that is what
10 we've got to do for each of those sites to
11 determine if we can possibly move forward.

12 We've got to have a mitigation area that has a
13 proper size. It's got to have a proper
14 environmental value. It's got to be salt marsh
15 versus fresh water. It's got to be wet versus
16 upland. It's got to be in the proper location.
17 It's got to have the proper ownership. It has the
18 proper -- has to have the proper interest from the
19 owners and willingness to even talk with us.

20 Hopefully there's been some agency
21 coordination with the Corps of Engineers and the
22 St. Johns River Water Management District. And I
23 also want to note that during our -- our
24 discussions, we've had extensive discussion with

1 I'm not even going to try and say the full
2 name of GTM, but that's obviously the reserve right
3 up the river that really cares a lot about the
4 environment and the type of assets, you know, that
5 we're talking about. I believe that Area 2, which
6 is the Venetian mitigation area, is actually a
7 GTMNERR site. So we met with them numerous times
8 and talked with them.

9 Beverly gave me a list of notes. I just want
10 to tell you some of the things that we found in
11 these -- in these five sites, which are really the
12 reasons why they're not feasible. We've got
13 insufficient acreage on one. We actually have
14 mangroves on one. And to tell you what we mean, if
15 we tried to --

16 MR. GORMAN: I've got to go.

17 MR. HOLESKO: -- develop a spoil area that had
18 mangroves --

19 (Mr. Gorman leaves the room.)

20 MR. HOLESKO: -- we -- in theory if we had to
21 get rid of mangroves, we would have to mitigate for
22 that, which would mean you'd be doing mitigation
23 for your mitigation.

24 We had one with a potential for -- with

25 cultural resources. We have uplands and pines and

129

1 flat woods which were unacceptable. And then we
2 have several that simply have data insufficient to
3 make the technical analysis to determine whether or
4 not they're feasible.

5 The intent of showing you these five sites
6 today is to simply let you know and to confirm
7 again that we left no stone unturned. We have no
8 other viable site, other than what we have across
9 the river right now on the other side of the
10 seaplane ramp. And that -- really that's our
11 conclusion to you again. Even though there's one
12 more actually still being looked at at this point,
13 this is what we have today.

14 MR. YOUMAN: Where's the one you're looking
15 at?

16 MR. WUELLNER: It's the original island
17 project.

18 MR. HOLESKO: Here -- here's the airport. It
19 is literally before we -- before you even get into
20 the intracoastal. If you're looking out across the
21 runway, you see a scrub island on the other side
22 across from the seaplane ramp. You can see it --

23 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: It's the spoil island.

24 MR. HOLESKO: -- directly from the airport.

25 MR. YOUMAN: Huh?

130

1 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: It's the spoil island.

2 MR. YOUMAN: It's the original spoil island.

3 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah.

4 MR. HOLESKO: Correct.

5 MR. YOUMAN: I thought you said you were
6 looking at another site.

7 MR. HOLESKO: Well, we -- we are. We looked
8 at every feasible site to try and replace the spoil
9 island. There is no viable site that meets the
10 criteria to replace the spoil island, so --

11 MR. WUELLNER: So we're back at the
12 beginning --

13 MR. YOUMAN: Oh, okay.

14 MR. WUELLNER: -- spoil island.

15 MR. YOUMAN: Okay. So that's what was
16 meaning --

17 MR. HOLESKO: We've never formally --

18 MR. WUELLNER: It's a long way around, but --

19 MR. HOLESKO: We have not designed the other
20 five. We simply looked at all of the other five to
21 determine could we replace the spoil island with
22 another site that made more sense, and the answer
23 is no.

24 MR. YOUMAN: So total bottom line is spoil

25 island is it.

131

1 MR. HOLESKO: Yes.

2 MR. YOUMAN: Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: We have no public comment
4 on this, so we can open it up for board question
5 and answer. Do we have any further board
6 questions?

7 MR. WERTER: I was going to say let's do it
8 quick before Jack comes backs, but Jack is back.

9 (Mr. Gorman enters the room.)

10 MR. GORMAN: Yes, Jack is back. I have a
11 question.

12 MR. WERTER: It's his favorite subject.

13 MR. GORMAN: Yes, it is.

14 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I know you're teasing, but
15 I'm not sure everybody --

16 MR. GORMAN: One question is, do we have to
17 take that entire island down in order to give --
18 and don't give me the wrong answer because I know
19 the answer already, and I'm sorry to be like this.

20 Do we have to take that entire island acreage
21 down in order to gain enough mitigation credits to
22 be able to do our taxiway, to do our rails
23 improvement, and to do the repair? In other words,
24 does that whole island area have to be gone to the

25 tune of several million dollars?

132

1 MR. HOLESKO: I don't know the exact answer to
2 that.

3 MR. GORMAN: I do. It's you don't have to.
4 You could -- even if you used the island, you would
5 not have to take -- you wouldn't have to take the
6 whole thing down. If we take the whole island
7 down, what you're going is banking these mitigation
8 credits, in other words, for future projects. So
9 bear in mind that this whole issue does not have to
10 be taken to the extent that we are actually being
11 given a choice.

12 MR. WERTER: Question.

13 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Go ahead.

14 MR. WERTER: Are we -- we're not really -- if
15 we use the island, it really puts the mitigation
16 issue aside. It's not that we're banking credits
17 or anything, are we?

18 MR. WUELLNER: There are a few credits that --
19 I don't remember the exact number, so don't -- try
20 not to hold me to it. But there is something like
21 I want to say there was a surplus of like three,
22 maybe four mitigation credits that were projected
23 at the end of the permitting. Meaning there will
24 be a -- I'm going to tell you it's something like

25 20, 25 percent of the island's value in mitigation

133

1 is effectively banked for some other project in the
2 future.

3 The economies of scale suggest that you do the
4 mitigation all at one time only because you're
5 paying for in terms of mitigation the temporary
6 impacts of going out to the island to do the work.
7 So you would have to do that twice. So, in a
8 sense, there's a component of it you would mitigate
9 twice in that -- in that scenario.

10 I'm not recommending either way. I'm just
11 saying that's kind of how it structures out from a
12 regulatory. We do know what, you know, the order
13 of magnitude is to do that rest -- or that
14 mitigation. You know, we know that's in -- right
15 at \$1.4 million, is what it bid out to be.

16 MR. GORMAN: You've got a bid for \$1.4
17 million?

18 MR. WUELLNER: We have -- we have bids,
19 multiple bids in the \$1.4 range. We sure do.

20 MR. GORMAN: We went from \$1.4 to \$5 back to
21 \$1.4?

22 MR. WUELLNER: You had the \$5 number, not us.
23 The \$1.4 is the mitigation component of the job,
24 which is the removal -- the getting out to the

25 island, removing the island.

134

1 MR. GORMAN: This \$1.4 million includes all of
2 the functions of the mitigation, or are we
3 piecemealing this out for \$1.4?

4 MR. WUELLNER: No. It's all. It's all.

5 MR. GORMAN: That's the whole thing.

6 MR. WUELLNER: The total project, which
7 includes this -- the edge of the runway work, you
8 know, the -- not edge of the runway, but the edge
9 of the safety area work and that embankment work
10 that goes on down there, the total project is at
11 \$5.5.

12 The components from -- because it's separated
13 in the bid. We know exactly what they're charging
14 us to take the road out there. We know exactly
15 what it is to remove the contents of the, reduce --
16 get rid of the spoil island and move that material
17 off-site or off -- off the island. That mitigation
18 number is \$1.4 million. That component of \$5.5.
19 So that's included in the \$5.5.

20 So it's effectively a \$4 million construction
21 job along the edge of the runway to put the -- what
22 is that, ArmorFlex or whatever the material is and
23 all that stuff and bring it back out to the
24 prestorm kind of dimensions. That's what it bid

25 out, and we had 11 bids.

135

1 MR. YOUMAN: If the whole island as Jack says
2 is not required for the mitigation process of
3 bringing all the fill in, what happens to the rest
4 of it?

5 MR. WUELLNER: It technically gets banked.

6 MR. YOUMAN: I mean, is it going to be left
7 there?

8 MR. WUELLNER: No. What I mean by banked --

9 MR. YOUMAN: Are we taking it someplace and
10 dumping it --

11 MR. WUELLNER: -- is we do the work --

12 MR. YOUMAN: -- or what are we doing with
13 what's left of the island?

14 MR. WUELLNER: Well, the way it works is
15 that --

16 MR. WERTER: Structurally speaking --

17 MR. BURNETT: It's UMAM credits --

18 MR. WERTER: -- physically.

19 MR. BURNETT: The -- if I could --

20 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Doug.

21 MR. BURNETT: -- speak to this issue. The --
22 the entire island, the work would get done all at
23 one time.

24 MR. YOUMAN: It would be removed --

25 MR. BURNETT: Yes, sir.

136

1 MR. YOUMAN: -- and made a waterway.

2 MR. BURNETT: And -- and I think the
3 terminology they use is UMAMs. And the UMAM score,
4 if it's 20 points that's needed to do the
5 embankment, but because the island re -- renovation
6 or mitigation yields you 25 points, you have 5
7 points left over of UMAMs that you can then use on
8 something else.

9 And, for example, if you look at the 70 acres
10 on the west, there's a lot of wetlands in the 70
11 acres, so potentially the airport has use for it in
12 the future. I mean, clearly the airport has use
13 for it in the future if there's development of that
14 property on the west side.

15 MR. YOUMAN: But then all of the -- all of the
16 island itself, all of the dirt that's picked up
17 will be used out here along the edge, every bit of
18 it?

19 MR. WUELLNER: It will remain on airport. We
20 have -- they during the process have a testing
21 requirement that looks at the -- what's coming out
22 of the location. They've done some samples on the
23 front end. But that that's suitable to be built on
24 will eventually make its way over to Taxiway Bravo

25 extension and become the fill related to extending

137

1 the taxiway.

2 That is what -- what is considered unsuitable
3 gets mixed with suitable materials and can be used
4 for landscaping areas that aren't getting buildings
5 or structures on top of. So that the entirety of
6 the dirt ends up remaining on property at the end
7 of the day.

8 MR. YOUMAN: Okay. Now the one other question
9 beyond that, I guess, the seaplane facility
10 needs -- if there's a barge facility, that will
11 have to be dredged again, right?

12 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, that's --

13 MR. YOUMAN: What's going to happen with that
14 fill? Where are we going to put that?

15 MR. WUELLNER: Okay. The current process for
16 that looks like we will get the permit -- I mean
17 not the permit -- the funding from FIND district to
18 do the permitting next year.

19 The following year, what they do is append
20 if -- assuming we're successful a second year for
21 actual work, then it becomes a part of -- the
22 process right now will be it will be a part of the
23 state's general permit as it applies to dredging
24 and it will be -- would be probably piggybacked on

25 ongoing dredging and that spoil content would

138

1 likely go with the contractor who is in -- charged
2 with digging -- reestablishing the channel and the
3 seaplane.

4 MR. YOUMAN: Okay.

5 MR. WUELLNER: So we're not looking, at this
6 point anyway -- it's a little early in that
7 process. But at this point, we're not anticipating
8 taking the spoils from the dredge and having to
9 permit that or use that some other way. That's --
10 that currently is not what we're looking at. That
11 could change as that evaluation's done over the
12 next year with the first piece of FIND grant money.

13 MR. YOUMAN: Okay. Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: If I remember when Beverly
15 was doing her presentation, what percentage of the
16 island would -- would be needed for our -- was it
17 70 percent? What was the percentage that was
18 necessary? Bryan, do you remember?

19 MR. WUELLNER: Do you remember the numbers? I
20 was going to say --

21 MR. COOPER: I need -- I need to point out a
22 couple of things. The percentage at the first
23 blush was 80 percent, but there's some variables in
24 there that still are variables.

25 For example, the way the process works, we

139

1 determine what we believe those UMAM scores are and
2 how many -- how much impact we're going to create
3 by doing our repair work, and we present that to
4 the agencies and then they do their calculations.

5 And their calculations may not be the same as ours.

6 We're still -- hello, hello, hello. Test, test,
7 test. Test, test, test.

8 MR. GORMAN: Just grab one of these.

9 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Take Buzz's microphone.

10 MR. WUELLNER: She's ready to go already.

11 MR. COOPER: Okay. Thank you. The last
12 discussion I had, they felt our numbers of what our
13 impacts were a little low and that they should be
14 higher, therefore, we need more credits.

15 And then there's another part of it that's
16 still a variable, is how many credits they're
17 really going to give us for the island to come
18 down. That number was estimated at 25. They said
19 it could be as high as 25 1/2. It could be as low
20 as 23 1/2.

21 The number that we had where we -- we felt we
22 were only having 20 points of impact, they're
23 saying is closer to 21, 22. So we're still in that
24 negotiation point. I don't think that's been

25 settled yet. Do you know if it has, Andrew?

140

1 MR. HOLESKO: I believe it has not.

2 MR. COOPER: Okay. We're still in that
3 negotiation. So when we say there's going to be
4 five extra credits, it might be one extra credit.
5 It might be two. It might be two and a half. We
6 don't know yet. That's still a variable. But we
7 feel confident that the whole island is more than
8 what it would be.

9 Now, the other complicating factor I think you
10 need to be aware of, and I don't -- I don't
11 disagree with Jack; we don't have to take the whole
12 thing down. When they figure out exactly what it
13 is, you could leave a piece of it. But the piece
14 you leave is not on our property. It's on the
15 state property. We only own slightly over 50
16 percent of the island, around 55 percent. The
17 northern half, which is the last part that would be
18 taken, is on state-owned property.

19 Now, when -- when Andrew was pointing out, one
20 of the requirements is you have to own the
21 property. Now, because it's being done at the same
22 time and we can justify that they need salt marsh
23 there instead of uplands, and the state agrees --
24 and they haven't totally agreed with that -- has

25 that been worked out yet, either?

141

1 MR. HOLESKO: No.

2 MR. COOPER: Okay. So that's still up in the

3 air, too. Once they agree with that, if it's done

4 in the one job this one time, they'll let us do it.

5 Afterwards, we come back five years from now and

6 say we want to take that other piece we didn't

7 take, it's not going to happen. You don't have

8 that option anymore because we don't own the land.

9 MR. HOLESKO: And the other -- the other

10 consideration that would come into play at that

11 point would be that we also have to mitigate for

12 the temporary impacts that Ed mentioned earlier

13 just to get to the island and you'd have temporary

14 impacts that would occur again if you had to go out

15 there a second time.

16 MR. COOPER: Right. And the temporary impacts

17 would be then across state lands, which we couldn't

18 do. We still -- we could get -- we could gamble

19 that we don't ever need those credits again. But

20 if we're looking at any development across up, you

21 know, on the other side of Taxiway Alpha -- east

22 and north of Taxiway Alpha, I don't know, we're

23 back to the same problem, how do we mitigate it?

24 MR. GORMAN: You're talking about the Grumman

25 land over to the north --

142

1 MR. COOPER: Yeah.

2 MR. GORMAN: -- northeast?

3 MR. COOPER: As one possibility, yeah.

4 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Ed, from a board
5 standpoint, what are you looking at for us in this?

6 MR. WUELLNER: We -- honestly, we felt we owed
7 you kind of an interim place here. The grant
8 application, the contract award for the work and
9 all that is going to come at you like, you know, a
10 train in a tunnel, pardon my analogy there, but
11 it's going to come at you very quickly in August.

12 And, you know, we've -- we owed you some --
13 you know, we promised you a number of times to
14 bring you back -- you know, bring this back to you,
15 to tell you what we found in additional options.
16 You know, and in this case why they're not very --
17 why they're not really val -- you know, good
18 options at this point for us.

19 You know, in a sense, to get you as
20 comfortable as possible that the mitigation that's
21 being moved forward at this point in permitting and
22 likely in grant later, you know, are the only
23 options available to get -- to get to the end
24 result we wanted. You know, is it ultimately the

25 best possible? You know, we don't control all of

143

1 those variables. But I think we've got all we can
2 do right now.

3 It's not -- it is not permitted, but I
4 believe -- my interpretation, this is me only --
5 you know, the agencies have taken it pretty much as
6 far as they can go until FAA issues the FONSI in
7 the next really almost any day. Once that's in our
8 hands, then I think, you know, all of the balance
9 of discussion about credits and impacts, you know,
10 resolve very very quickly. But probably as
11 importantly as that is the funding solidifies at
12 that point.

13 Until the FONSI's issued, FAA statutorily
14 can't commit the money to us because there's no
15 guarantee it can be done. Once the FONSI's in
16 place, you've convinced FAA it could reasonably be
17 accomplished. The money's available. Now we wrap
18 up permitting and eventually that gets into
19 construction.

20 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. So this is really
21 just an update; it's not an agenda item as far as a
22 motion.

23 MR. WUELLNER: No. I mean, you know, what
24 I -- what I'm trying to avoid at this point,

25 continuing to evaluate -- and I'm not saying we

144

1 shouldn't. But continuing to evaluate and keep
2 putting options on the table and going through that
3 motion, you know, effectively is costing money, to
4 keep evaluating.

5 Now, you know, if something pops up that's
6 really really viable, I'm like everyone else, we'll
7 be all about finding it out. But at this point,
8 we've got a good number for what it costs to do the
9 project that will satisfy FAA when we get to grant
10 time. We've still got a permitting piece hanging
11 out there and above all of that, we've still got a
12 FONSI waiting on the paperwork. So there's still a
13 lot of things in play.

14 It at this point looks like the mitigation is
15 going to be the island unless you tell us we're
16 absolutely not doing that, in which case we've got
17 to -- we've got to come up with some action plan
18 really really fast or just plan on deferring the
19 money -- I say deferring. You may or may not get
20 it, so I don't know.

21 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Do you need a motion from
22 us to -- to direct staff to continue and --

23 MR. WUELLNER: From where I sit, if the
24 consensus is that's what it is, you know, we're not

25 going to have -- what I don't want to see is you

145

1 guys stymied by the speed of things hitting in
2 August and going, "Well, you know, we never even
3 got to talk about the other alternatives. We never
4 got to even hear about what else was done," and the
5 like.

6 You know, I'm -- at this point, it's still
7 where it was. It's still the island. It's still
8 the spoil island, is where it is. I'd like the
9 stand up here today and tell you it's not, it's
10 something else, but that's what it is. And you
11 know, honestly I don't see it changing. I'd like
12 to -- you know, you're just going to run out of
13 time.

14 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Jim?

15 MR. WERTER: Nothing.

16 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Does any of the board
17 members have any feedback for Ed on this before --
18 so he can proceed forward with it?

19 (None.)

20 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: It doesn't require a
21 motion. Just --

22 MR. YOUMAN: I thank you for the update.

23 MR. WUELLNER: I just -- my point is if
24 there's something you need to us to do differently,

25 we've got a very short window to try and do it.

146

1 Otherwise it's going to hit you and you're just
2 going to -- the decisions will need to be, you
3 know, pretty much right there that day, whatever
4 they are.

5 MR. GORMAN: My only request is to minimize
6 the damage to the environment, which it doesn't
7 sound like the bureaucrats are going to let you do.

8 MR. WUELLNER: That's -- that's it for the
9 item itself, so...

10 OLD BUSINESS

11 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. Let's move on to the
12 old business and the meeting room use policy.

13 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. We had one -- you had
14 asked us to look into the insurance. It's really
15 pretty straightforward.

16 The -- the consensus was, after talking to our
17 liability insurance carrier and even bouncing off
18 Doug to some degree, the governmental-related uses
19 of the facility are already covered. Nobody's
20 particularly worried about that and getting the
21 certificates from other governmental kind of users.

22 You elevate it to the next level. If you're
23 dealing with any kind of company or corporation
24 that already maintains some sort of premises

25 liability insurance, it's a simple matter of them

147

1 naming us as an additional insured, and this in
2 effect when they're using it becomes an extension
3 of their property for purposes of coverage or
4 liability. So they can submit to us a certificate
5 of coverage and that would solve it.

6 That brings us to kind of the lone user kind
7 of scenarios. And the suggestion has been made by
8 our premises liability people that we require some
9 sort of special event policy, or if they have
10 another way to attach it to a -- an existing
11 liability policy, that's fine, too. But they did
12 some shopping around. I believe those policies are
13 available for anywhere from 4- or 500 bucks for
14 larger events.

15 So we -- you know, we already have those
16 insurance agreements with things like SAAPA and the
17 like. They already indemnify and insure us. So I
18 don't see it being a major impact unless you have a
19 private group wanting to come in say for a wedding
20 reception or something like that, in which case the
21 recommendation is that they provide a stand-alone
22 special event policy to cover that event.

23 So that's where it is. That's kind of --
24 that's what the language tries to say. It's just

25 been that's the only change to the previous policy,

148

1 was to insert that language we got from the carrier
2 into the document.

3 MR. BURNETT: One added comment related to
4 that was there was the revision to the form for a
5 requested use where a disclosure, they're
6 acknowledging -- well, one, they're indemnifying
7 the Airport Authority from the use beyond just any
8 insurance.

9 And the added thing is they're acknowledging
10 the fact the facility's on an airport and they may
11 have noise and other things go on nearby that might
12 interrupt their use, which was a change the
13 Authority requested at the last meeting.

14 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: We do not have any public
15 comment on this, so we can open it up for board
16 question and answer.

17 MR. WUELLNER: I believe we gave -- handed out
18 separately from the agenda packet -- sent out the
19 revised language. So our recommendation from staff
20 is to approve the changes and we'll get them
21 implemented.

22 MR. GORMAN: Do you need a motion?

23 MR. WUELLNER: That's her call.

24 MR. YOUMAN: Can we make a motion?

25 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I -- I have a question.

149

1 What group is going to pay \$500 in order to use the
2 meeting room for four hours, for an insurance
3 policy?

4 MR. WUELLNER: I agree. I agree. I --

5 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I understand from a
6 liability standpoint and certainly want to cover us
7 from a liability standpoint, but I also think that
8 it's not --

9 MR. WERTER: Practical?

10 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: It's -- it's, you know, not
11 feasible from a user standpoint. So I'm not sure
12 that we're really accomplishing what we're trying
13 to accomplish with making the room available for --
14 for --

15 MR. GORMAN: Can I ask a question? Do you
16 feel it would make -- that insurance requirement
17 makes the room fairly uncompetitive then as far
18 as --

19 MR. WUELLNER: Yes.

20 MR. GORMAN: -- its usage for the public?

21 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Yeah. Even I think staff
22 agrees to that.

23 MR. WUELLNER: Absolutely. And, you know, the
24 reality is it's insured from a -- from a real like

25 an injury kind of liability.

150

1 The whole airport premises is already covered
2 by that. There's a sovereign immunity aspect to it
3 that plays into this, too, with the physical upper
4 limit at this point. I believe it's 250, but I --
5 correct me on that.

6 MR. GORMAN: Do you feel then, without trying
7 to put you in -- on the spot, I'm not trying to put
8 you on the spot at all, but do you feel that we
9 don't need to add the added language; we just leave
10 it as is?

11 MR. WUELLNER: My feeling is that you would be
12 better served, because the only real risk exposure
13 as I see it -- and he may have a whole other angle,
14 but the only risk exposure I see is to damage to
15 the physical facility. You know, if somebody
16 doing's something, you know, wholesale destructive
17 in the building. Our property insurance for those
18 kind of things have his -- have high deductibles
19 because we don't envision that kind of damage.

20 My thought is you try to cover that risk by
21 increased deposits on the facility for use that are
22 refundable. If the facility's returned in the
23 condition it's been rented, then the money goes
24 back. The risk is mitigated. I think that's more

25 appropriate.

151

1 I'd would rather see a very high deposit,
2 relatively speaking, than get into this insurance.
3 At least somebody knows, hey, if I do what I said I
4 was going to do, use the facility, take care of it,
5 return it the way it was, then there's no risk to
6 them and they're not throwing out \$4- or \$500. I
7 think you're actually -- I think it's almost -- you
8 could almost argue that if I'm insuring the risk,
9 I'm going to be less careful. So...

10 MR. BURNETT: And --

11 MR. WUELLNER: I mean, whether that's
12 factual --

13 MR. BURNETT: And the airport already has
14 insurance in place to protect the use of the
15 facility, correct?

16 MR. WUELLNER: We -- we have, you know,
17 general property and liability insurance.

18 MR. BURNETT: Yeah. So -- and then a lot of
19 the users, the nonprofits and the companies are
20 going to have insurance because they want to
21 protect themselves.

22 Most of the fundraisers that I know of that go
23 on around town from the nonprofits, they have
24 insurance because they're worried about getting --

25 having liability from one of their events. It's

152

1 really -- probably comes down to the wedding

2 receptions or whatever --

3 MR. WUELLNER: Private parties.

4 MR. BURNETT: -- when it comes down that they

5 worry about. And it's a risk benefit analysis

6 that, you know, the facility's not going to get

7 used potentially if you've got a fee in the -- and

8 on top of the rental of the facility they've got to

9 go get a \$500 insurance policy for a wedding

10 reception, for example. So, it -- it may not get

11 used as much.

12 The interesting thing is how much of a deposit

13 to ask for versus the deductible and, you know,

14 what form that comes in. Because we don't take

15 credit card, do we? Or do we take credit card?

16 MR. WUELLNER: Not currently, but we're

17 looking at it.

18 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I think, you know, we had

19 talked about this before at our -- at the last

20 meeting on the meeting use policy and, you know, if

21 there's alcohol being served at a wedding

22 reception, then I don't have a problem with them

23 getting insurance, because I don't want to see

24 somebody going over that rail.

25 But if it's general wedding reception and you

153

1 have the expectation that people are not going to
2 be under the influence, then I don't -- I think --
3 I think that it's a -- I think just going with a
4 standard deposit is prudent.

5 MR. BURNETT: Is there any merit, and then
6 this is -- I don't know -- I don't profess to know
7 much about this -- this subject from a standpoint
8 of renting facilities, but is there some merit to
9 if it's beer and wine, it's one policy and if it's
10 liquor, it's a different policy?

11 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Alcohol's alcohol --

12 MR. BURNETT: I understand.

13 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: You know, but one glass --
14 one five-ounce glass of wine equals one 12-ounce
15 can of beer equals one and a half ounce of --

16 MR. WUELLNER: I think -- I think you're on
17 the point here. If you're going to use it for that
18 kind of function with the anticipation of alcohol,
19 then it not only has a higher --

20 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Risk assessment.

21 MR. WUELLNER: It either has one or the
22 other --

23 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: The higher risk assessment.

24 MR. WUELLNER: -- it requires the insurance.

25 If you're going to use it for other events without

154

1 that additional risk component, then maybe it's
2 just a higher deposit, refundable deposit piece,
3 so...

4 MR. YOUMAN: I may have missed this in your
5 presentation, but what does our insurance
6 underwriter suggest?

7 MR. WUELLNER: They threw out the number
8 classically of \$1 million because that's the only
9 number insurance knows.

10 MR. YOUMAN: Okay. What you're saying is they
11 were not of any assistance in counseling us.

12 MR. WUELLNER: Effectively.

13 MR. GORMAN: They want to sell insurance, too.

14 MR. YOUMAN: Well, I understand that, but
15 some --

16 MR. WUELLNER: Well, they --

17 MR. YOUMAN: -- some agencies are credible and
18 they do, you know, make suggestions.

19 MR. WUELLNER: Well, any -- you know, I sound
20 bad to Doug but, you know, from a legal perspective
21 and an insurance perspective, they want to put as
22 much arm's length between the owner of the property
23 and the user, and an effective way to do that is to
24 require insurance because it puts a whole new, you

25 know, group of people in between the risk. So --

155

1 and the more they can extend that arm's length, the
2 happier they are because of the less risk on their
3 side.

4 So they're always going to -- you know, from
5 an insurance carrier standpoint, they're always
6 going to want somebody else to insure the risk
7 because they don't have to. Even though they don't
8 change your premium, which is kind of the funny
9 part of the whole thing.

10 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: You know, we can always go
11 back and -- and amend the meeting room policy to --
12 to require the insurance, but I think initially, I
13 don't think that -- if there's not any alcohol
14 served, I think our risk is lower, and I don't
15 see -- I would like to see people get use out of
16 this building.

17 MR. WUELLNER: Well, I don't -- I don't see a
18 30-day use here, so what I would like to do if
19 that's all right, based on what we kind of heard
20 today, we'll create kind of a two-prong attack
21 within the policy on how we -- how we -- how we
22 skin the private use piece of it and we'll bring it
23 back to you next month.

24 I don't -- I don't see any risk. Most of the

25 users we have are, you know, already corporately

156

1 insured and have a certificate with us or are
2 already governmental. So, I just don't -- I don't
3 see any short-term risk in getting it right -- and
4 we'll just get it right in August.

5 MR. YOUMAN: Okay.

6 MR. WUELLNER: If you're all right with that.

7 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I'm okay with that. Rest
8 of the board --

9 MR. YOUMAN: I am.

10 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: -- prefer? Okay.

11 MR. YOUMAN: So this is -- this is tabled till
12 the next meeting.

13 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, we'll revise it and get
14 you something else. Takes you to old business?

15 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Uh-huh.

16 MR. WUELLNER: All right.

17 HOUSEKEEPING

18 MR. WUELLNER: There are just some items under
19 housekeeping that are coming up, just for your
20 edification. You guys wanted to talk about the
21 number of conferences to attend and all of that.
22 You may want to start talking about that in August,
23 especially if it -- especially if it has budget
24 impact. Executive director evaluations in

25 September, I believe it is.

157

1 Grand opening is scheduled right now for
2 August 20th, so put that on your calendar. They
3 will begin discussions on what that entails I think
4 later this week. And reminder, if you're intending
5 to go to FAC and have not let Cindy know, you need
6 to do that like today or tomorrow, because the
7 cutoff registration, early bird registration and
8 things of that nature are expiring very quickly.

9 MR. WERTER: Where are we staying at?

10 MR. WUELLNER: I think we have two -- I think
11 we have two people. Two?

12 MS. HOLLINGSWORTH: Kelly and Jim have
13 confirmed.

14 MR. YOUMAN: For what?

15 MR. WUELLNER: For the FAC in Tampa.

16 MR. WERTER: Where -- where are we staying at?

17 MR. WUELLNER: Honestly I don't know.

18 MS. HOLLINGSWORTH: Waterside Marriott.

19 MR. COOPER: Waterside. Right next to the
20 convention center.

21 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Cindy can send you the
22 details.

23 MR. WUELLNER: But anyway, we need that
24 quickly otherwise it's -- it costs us substantially

25 more money to let you go. And I think that's it.

158

1 ACI is still out in September that's all I know on
2 that. So that's it for that.

3 PUBLIC COMMENT

4 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. We have public
5 comment, and we have no slips for public comment.
6 So we'll open it up for Authority members. Jim?

7 AUTHORITY MEMBERS

8 MR. WERTER: Nothing.

9 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Jack?

10 MR. GORMAN: I won't bore you with my feelings
11 on the EA, but I think the rest of the meeting went
12 well.

13 I am very concerned with we're going to get
14 into a boondoggle as far as this TRIM and taxation.
15 And I'd like to -- regardless of bureaucracy and
16 ex -- and any excuses that come up, or maybe not
17 excuses, but boondoggles let's call them, I'd like
18 to get it done.

19 So I would like a heads-up even before the
20 board meeting from Mr. Burnett if we're going to
21 have trouble getting any kind of a solution from
22 the general -- the Attorney General. That would be
23 good so that we can get some kind of action on it,
24 you know, "Gee, public, we couldn't -- we had to

25 tax you because --"

159

1 MR. WUELLNER: "We can't not tax you" or --

2 MR. GORMAN: -- "we can't not tax you.

3 It's --"

4 MR. WUELLNER: Good luck with that one.

5 MR. GORMAN: I'll quit at this point.

6 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Carl?

7 MR. YOUMAN: This is a question for Doug. If

8 I ask the board for suggestions as to how to

9 proceed with AMTRAK from their viewpoint via

10 e-mail, would we be in violation of any laws?

11 MR. BURNETT: If --

12 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. I think you need to stay

13 out of that.

14 MR. YOUMAN: Okay.

15 MR. WUELLNER: I think you're creating --

16 personally I think you're creating conversation

17 that ultimately some day could be an Airport

18 Authority decision. So I'd stay away from it.

19 MR. BURNETT: Yeah.

20 MR. YOUMAN: That's why I wanted to ask the

21 question.

22 MR. WUELLNER: Any time you're talking about

23 anything that just even has the remote chance of

24 coming to the Authority in some form of a business

25 action, you know, whether it's approving a lease

160

1 or --

2 MR. YOUMAN: Okay.

3 MR. WUELLNER: -- I think you're --

4 MR. YOUMAN: But there's no problem with me

5 working directly with you --

6 MR. WUELLNER: Absolutely not. Ever.

7 MR. YOUMAN: -- and reporting back to the

8 board since I'm --

9 MR. WUELLNER: Well, I can't give your report

10 for you --

11 MR. YOUMAN: No.

12 MR. WUELLNER: -- because then I'm a conduit.

13 MR. YOUMAN: Okay. PR committee, I was

14 elected to office over a year and a half ago and

15 that's the -- that's how long it's been since we've

16 been working on the PR aspect, and I see nothing

17 that's actually come out that's viable for us to

18 take to the public and -- for speeches or et

19 cetera, et cetera.

20 And I was wondering if we will ever see it or

21 do we have a date when we will have some

22 finalization on that? I'd love to go out and give

23 speeches if nobody else does because I believe in

24 what we've been talking about. But it just seems

25 like there's a brick wall somewhere.

161

1 MR. WUELLNER: Okay.

2 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Anything else, Carl?

3 MR. YOUMAN: Other than that, I -- this was a
4 great meeting. It produced a lot, and we've got a
5 lot of opportunities coming up in the future.

6 MR. WUELLNER: We appreciate you hanging in
7 there for six hours.

8 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: We certainly do have a lot
9 of opportunities. And I think that with the --
10 with the AMTRAK and I want to commend all of the
11 board members because every board member has been
12 at one of the public meetings, and we've seen that
13 every board member is engaged in this. So, it
14 takes a lot of time and a lot of effort. And,
15 Carl, you've been leading the -- the force on that.
16 We appreciate that.

17 MR. YOUMAN: May I ask is -- I can ask for
18 suggestions right now if anybody has any ideas in
19 the public meeting, right?

20 MR. BURNETT: Yes, sir.

21 MR. YOUMAN: Jack, do you have any suggestions
22 how I could, you know, assist in this AMTRAK
23 process, who I can contact, what I can do? I'm
24 open for suggestions from all board members at this

25 point.

162

1 MR. GORMAN: It amazes me is how hard it is to
2 get the newspaper interested in something that is
3 as important as public transportation. I don't --
4 and they are to an extent, but I don't feel that
5 they have been -- they're not on the same page as
6 the airport. Maybe you contact the paper yet again
7 with a letter from you that you're so well-versed
8 into the situation as to what could and could not
9 be done.

10 MR. YOUMAN: We're going to -- Ed and I are
11 going to work on an opinion piece from me as board
12 member --

13 MR. GORMAN: So you've already got --

14 MR. YOUMAN: -- individually, not representing
15 the board. I have to put -- put that in there.

16 MR. GORMAN: That's exactly my idea. I think
17 you're ahead.

18 MR. YOUMAN: Because the -- it appears The
19 Record made a recommendation based on a lack of
20 facts.

21 MR. GORMAN: Well, that's the point is that
22 we've got to get -- I'd like to get some enthusiasm
23 for it going with the paper so we can get some
24 public.

25 MR. YOUMAN: From what I see, it's hard to

163

1 tell.

2 MR. GUINTA: That's our policy.

3 MR. WUELLNER: To make it tough?

4 MR. GUINTA: No, to -- to make -- jump to
5 conclusions without facts.

6 MR. GORMAN: I didn't say that to be acidic.

7 MR. WUELLNER: Be our business to --

8 MR. YOUMAN: Jim, you're going to assist me
9 with the reporter on -- at the Jacksonville --

10 MR. WERTER: Yeah. I'll get it to you.

11 E-mail me so I'm reminded to call Dana.

12 MR. YOUMAN: Do you have any other
13 suggestions?

14 MR. WERTER: Nancy Grace, Jane Velez-Mitchell.
15 I don't know. Those are my only contacts these
16 days.

17 MR. YOUMAN: Okay. Doug, do you have any?

18 MR. BURNETT: No, sir. Sorry. I'm making
19 sure the court reporter's getting everything. It
20 may be that you're little far from the microphone,
21 Mr. Werter.

22 MR. WERTER: Oh.

23 MR. YOUMAN: Any suggestions from anybody
24 within the audience that's still here how I may

25 attack this situation?

164

1 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Peter?

2 MR. GUINTA: I would like to meet with
3 Mr. Youman and anybody interested in the PR --
4 Peter Guinta, St. Augustine Record. I'd like to
5 also meet with some people that have -- to talk
6 about this TRIM to clear up some misunderstandings
7 I might have about the numbers and the times.

8 This way -- but I think we could come up with
9 ways to get the stories out much more frequently.
10 I've said this to the board before, before you guys
11 got here, but it just never -- never really gelled.
12 That's all I have. Sorry.

13 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Sacha? Sacha, did you have
14 any suggestions for Carl?

15 MS. MARTIN: I'm better at writing my
16 suggestions down than trying to remember anything
17 off the -- off the cuff.

18 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Thank you. Carl, I have a
19 couple of suggestions. I think that you should --
20 I know that you have an interest in the PR
21 committee. I think that you should get with Bryan.

22 I know that you and -- you and Buzz cannot get
23 together, but I think that you can get together
24 with Bryan and some of the members of the PR

25 committee to utilize their -- their background and

165

1 skills to be able to come up with a presentation to
2 be able to take it out to the community. And they
3 may have contacts of community groups that you can
4 get with and do presentations.

5 I think that that right now would be critical,
6 especially given the time line that we're looking
7 at, because we need to get our feet on the ground
8 as far as the community is concerned outside of
9 just the city of St. Augustine. I'm not sure that
10 the people as you mentioned in northwest St. Johns
11 County are aware of the multimodal or of the train
12 and the concern over the locations.

13 Another thing is, is that I would get together
14 with some of the people in the railroad society.
15 The model train society would be a great group that
16 already knows so much about rail and has the
17 interest, and I think that you could build a
18 consensus there with knowledgeable people on the
19 benefits of the multimodal.

20 Also, I know that Karen DeLaney -- or Kim
21 DeLaney from the Treasure Coast TPO really was
22 pushing for the old FEC facility, but I -- and I
23 know that she gave a quote on how much she initial
24 thought of how much that would be to rehab it, but

25 if I were you, I'd like look into that deeper.

166

1 Does that -- does that building, does it meet
2 today's standards as far as work environment?

3 I mean, those buildings that were built in the
4 60s, a lot of those have asbestos. You know, what
5 kind of -- what kind of work conditions would that
6 be? Was that just a general structural thing or
7 was that -- what type of analysis that was? And I
8 would check into that.

9 MR. YOUMAN: I --

10 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: That would be my feedback.

11 MR. YOUMAN: I -- I agree with you that last
12 point of yours right there very specifically
13 because I walked that site and looked at the
14 buildings, and they -- there's two communications
15 towers right off -- offset on the side of the
16 building between the shopping center.

17 And I looked up the track and I'm not a
18 railroad engineer, but it -- it's going to cause
19 difficulties in getting a siting I think close to
20 the building to come back out again. And it's
21 currently used as a maintenance and weigh facility
22 for the FEC, and I don't think anybody really knows
23 FEC's position as to whether they want to
24 relinquish that maintenance and weigh facility and

25 move it elsewhere or what the cost would be to

167

1 St. Augustine to do that, because I'm sure FEC's
2 not going to do that for free.

3 There's a lot of questions of economic
4 analysis that's not been asked by -- or at least
5 it's not been put out publicly that anybody can
6 rationally see how much this facility's going to
7 cost and what it's going to cost the taxpayers of
8 St. Augustine.

9 And I don't think that -- and it doesn't
10 look -- nothing against The Record, but I would
11 think that that would be something that
12 The St. Augustine Record would have done prior to
13 issuing their opinion piece, get -- get all of the
14 facts and all of the monies and economics involved
15 in whether St. Augustine can afford it and what's
16 it going to do to the -- what impact it's going to
17 have on the individual citizen of St. Augustine.

18 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I think that my last
19 suggestion would be for you to -- and Ed to arrange
20 to meet with the editorial board, with Peter, with
21 Margo, with -- with that group, and -- and sit down
22 and be able to have a thoughtful discussion. I
23 think that when we looked at renaming the airport,
24 I thought that that was very productive. And I

25 think they would be open to it.

168

1 MR. YOUMAN: Thank you. Great.

2 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Bryan?

3 MR. COOPER: Yeah, I've spoken on this, but --
4 get here where you can hear this. Many many years
5 ago when this first came up and we first formulated
6 the idea of the multimodal center over here, we met
7 with AMTRAK many times and we met with Florida East
8 Coast Railway many times, and we had joint
9 meetings.

10 And at that time, and I'm going back seven,
11 eight years ago whenever it first came up, AMTRAK
12 and Florida East Coast Railway said that that old
13 train station could not be used under any
14 circumstances for the stop. And I don't remember
15 exactly what the reasons were, but they were
16 regulatory. And both of them agreed to that. And
17 I'm just wondering what's changed since then. I
18 think that would be a good question to ask Florida
19 East Coast Railway and AMTRAK.

20 MR. YOUMAN: Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. That should be --
22 unless you have anything else, Carl, that you would
23 like to ask as far as that --

24 MR. YOUMAN: No. I thank you, everybody, for

25 their input. I really appreciate it. Thank you.

169

1 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: You're doing a good job
2 with it.

3 NEXT MEETING & ADJOURNMENT

4 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Our next meeting will be
5 here on August the 16th at 1:30, and at that point,
6 we'll meet again. And we'll close this meeting
7 out.

8 (Meeting adjourned at 7:11 p.m.)

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

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, certify

7 that I was authorized to and did stenographically report

8 the foregoing proceedings and that the transcript is a

9 true record of my stenographic notes.

10

11 Dated this 21st day of July, 2010.

12

13

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

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

