

1 ST. AUGUSTINE - ST. JOHNS COUNTY AIRPORT AUTHORITY

2 Regular Meeting

3 held at 4796 U.S. 1 North

4 St. Augustine, Florida

5 on Monday, October 18, 2010

6 from 4:00 p.m. to 5:51 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	3
7	MEMBER COMMITTEE REPORTS	4
8	REPORTS	17
9	PROJECT UPDATES	21
10	ACTION ITEMS	
11	A. Resolution 2010-09 FDOT JPA	27
	B. Casa Cola Hangar - Lease Agreement	29
12	C. FIND Grant Approval	33
	D. Release of Retainage - South GA	39
13	E. Lease Policy Amendment	41
	F. Fuel Farm Project	52
14	OLD BUSINESS	79
15	HOUSEKEEPING	90
16	PUBLIC COMMENT - GENERAL	94
17	AUTHORITY MEMBER	98
18	NEXT BOARD MEETING	103
19	ADJOURNMENT	103
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I'd like to go ahead and
3 call -- we'd like to call the meeting of the
4 St. Augustine-St. Johns County Airport Authority
5 into session. If we could all rise for the Pledge
6 of Allegiance.

7 (Pledge of Allegiance.)

8 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

9 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Thank you. Do we have any
10 additions, deletions, or changes to the our last
11 Airport Authority board meeting minutes?

12 (None.)

13 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Hearing no additions or
14 changes, the meeting minutes will stand as
15 approved. Financial report?

16 FINANCIAL REPORT

17 MR. WERTER: Oh, I just reviewed it today.
18 Didn't see any irregular -- irregularities, excuse
19 me, so everything's fine.

20 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. So then the
21 financial report will stand as approved.

22 AGENDA APPROVAL

23 THE WITNESS: Agenda approval? Do we have any
24 additions, deletions for today's meeting agenda?

25 MR. WUELLNER: We -- we did make an adjustment

4

1 after it went out the other day, but it was
2 corrected in today's agenda sent. So if you have
3 the one from today, it should be fine.

4 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. Then the meeting
5 agenda will stand as approved.

6 MEMBER COMMITTEE REPORTS

7 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Member committee reports?

8 TPO, Carl?

9 MR. YOUMAN: TPO. It was an uneventful
10 meeting. They had a resolution passed for the
11 St. Johns County. It was just a formal type of
12 detail thing for one of the grants, and that was it
13 for that.

14 And the other important item that was on the
15 agenda was SUS (sic) allocation of funds. And one
16 of the priorities they put together, since there's
17 a tightness of funds, is to try to highlight
18 particular projects to get partic -- projects
19 completed and not just the little tidbits all over
20 the place.

21 And two of the highlighted projects are in
22 Nassau County through -- construction through the
23 2013-2014 year. And the second one was 313. Not
24 our portion, but the other portion. And there's

25 substantial funds being allocated to -- as soon as

5

1 I get my glasses on, I'll tell you what it is --

2 for purchase of right-of-way. In 2010-2011 current

3 year --

4 (Mr. George enters the room.)

5 MR. YOUMAN: -- \$4,752,985. And then next

6 year -- excuse me. In 2012-2013, \$2,150,000 more.

7 And also good news for St. Johns County is that

8 there's funds allocated in each of the years to

9 purchase vehicles and equipment for the St. Johns

10 County bus system. That's the main things for the

11 TPO. Oh, and RS&H made a trip generation study

12 presentation at the actual TPO meeting.

13 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Was there any feedback on

14 that?

15 MR. YOUMAN: No. They just accepted it.

16 There was a -- just a one question about the

17 buildout date and that was about it. But

18 everything else was understood and they were kind

19 of happy that U.S. 1 wasn't going to be maxed out.

20 And once -- since this is sort of like with

21 TPO, they also gave the trip generation study

22 presentation to the technical committee and a

23 meeting that Bryan was at, but I don't remember

24 what that is, and they're going to do it at

25 St. Johns commissioners tomorrow, and I'll be there

6

1 to represent the board for that also tomorrow.

2 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Thank you. And thank you
3 for being there tomorrow. All right. EDC?

4 MR. WERTER: The meeting's on Thursday.

5 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. Intergovernmental?

6 MR. GORMAN: That report will be on the next
7 meeting.

8 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. AMTRAK? Do we have
9 any updates on AMTRAK?

10 MR. YOUMAN: Oh, yeah. One of the questions
11 that came into my mind was how St. Augustine was
12 going to finance this operation, because there's
13 no -- there was nothing in the papers on it or
14 anything else.

15 So I called the finance department at
16 St. Augustine. They had no idea how much it was
17 going to cost. I called the Treasure Council (sic)
18 TPO, and they were supposed to have made their
19 decision based on a differential in cost between
20 the station at San Marco and here, but it turns out
21 they have no idea how much it's going to cost
22 either.

23 I prepared a little questionnaire as to a cost
24 analysis for it. I don't know what I'm going to do

25 with it yet, but it appears that the St. Johns --

7

1 the St. Augustine citizens are going to be very
2 surprised when they find out what the 20 percent
3 portion of this operation may be. And that may
4 make a big difference in what happens in the
5 future.

6 There was a -- Mr. Mica and Secretary of
7 Transportation Kopelousos had a meeting which Kelly
8 and I attended, and Kelly gave a presentation on
9 the AMTRAK situation for promoting it for the
10 airport. Kelly did a stupendous job. I mean,
11 stupendous.

12 And then they presented some comments, and
13 Kelly had clarifying statements that just cleared
14 everything up. And they asked me if I'd like to
15 make some comments, but I deferred to Kelly,
16 inasmuch as sunshine laws were involved, et cetera,
17 et cetera. But there was nothing more for me to
18 add. And I think that it will make a great
19 difference in what's going to happen in the future
20 what happened in that meeting.

21 It just -- I know everybody knows this, but it
22 was brought out in that meeting that the runway
23 improvements to 31 or the safety area
24 improvements -- and it was in the paper, too, but I

25 just want to make a comment about it, that he

8

1 brought it up, too -- with the GPS measurements to
2 an exact 8,000 foot runway, this will give Northrop
3 Grumman the ability to go after contracts to secure
4 military aircraft which will be rebuilt due to the
5 cost process in our -- in our federal government's
6 problems. And what else about that? Oh, it's
7 going to have a big surge in employment, too, once
8 that happens if these contracts go through. That
9 was brought out by Mr. Mica.

10 Oh, just as information, at the Mica meeting,
11 it was passed out to the attendees, which were also
12 the county representatives, the commissioners, the
13 managers, the commissioners for St. Augustine.
14 It's a project background. They received a copy of
15 the St. Augustine Passenger Train Platform at the
16 St. Augustine Airport, which is this. They also
17 received a -- excuse me. A conceptual cost
18 estimate which was made up for the station and a
19 copy, a single copy of the intermodal
20 transportation center flier. So everybody is
21 informed and we just keep pushing.

22 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Ed, for the record, can you
23 clarify -- sometimes there's some confusion over --
24 where the financing from the Airport's part will

25 come from?

9

1 MR. WUELLNER: Well, two locations. One is
2 the grant process they're -- they're currently
3 pursuing is -- is a Federal Railroad Administration
4 grant. That would have some -- at this point some
5 unknown local match required to it. The
6 expectation is it will be somewhere in the 80
7 percent range. It would be facilitated through
8 FDOT.

9 My guess is it will come in the form of a --
10 what would probably be best described as a block
11 grant to the state, meaning one grant to the state
12 for them to issue individual grant agreements with
13 local communities and FEC and all of those parties
14 that are involved in the project, to whatever the
15 needs are as they identify them.

16 My suspicion is there will also be some state
17 participation in that, which should cut the
18 difference I would expect somewhere in half.
19 Assuming that, the 10 percent would need to come
20 out of -- if it's an airport project, would need to
21 come out of Airport -- Airport Authority-related
22 funds to support it.

23 There's also the possibility that some
24 intermodal funds could be -- could be identified

25 within the State's intermodal plan. There's even

10

1 the opportunity, depending on how things go in the
2 election process upcoming, that the project could
3 be even funded to a higher percent or completely
4 eliminated off the docket, depending on who's --
5 who's running the ship by the time the grants are
6 identified or not identified. But there are a
7 number of communities part -- competing for the
8 same general fund of money nationwide, so...

9 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Carl?

10 MR. YOUMAN: I'd like to also add one thing
11 that nobody's really considered or brought out,
12 that at San Marco, they will have to construct a
13 new siding, which involves new switches and signal
14 processes, changes at the central dispatch center,
15 and that is big big bucks. While we have a siding
16 we're all set right here, all we have to do is
17 build the station.

18 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. To -- to be fair about
19 the siding, it seems to be very, very, very unclear
20 at this point as to whether those costs at a
21 particular city or a particular location will be
22 moved to the local community, meaning there would
23 be a local match for those rail -- the direct rail
24 improvements, or that would remain a part of the

1 to the local community.

2 But the stations as proposed and any
3 improvements related to the stations are absolutely
4 on the local community side. So until the grant
5 actually shows up and the -- the details get worked
6 out, I would hesitate to say that the costs of rail
7 improvements at San Marco or anywhere else are
8 directly going to the city. We don't -- we don't
9 know that for sure yet.

10 MR. YOUMAN: But even if they are, it's still
11 a good point to highlight --

12 MR. WUELLNER: Absolutely.

13 MR. YOUMAN: -- as to the total cost of the
14 project.

15 MR. WUELLNER: It does reduce the total cost
16 of the project. That's for sure.

17 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Buzz?

18 MR. GEORGE: Ed, are they merely tolerating
19 the little annoyance called the airport? In other
20 words, have they already made their decision?

21 MR. WUELLNER: Who is the "they"?

22 MR. GEORGE: I don't know who "they" is.

23 MR. WUELLNER: It's our understanding at this
24 point that Florida DOT will ultimately make the

25 decision. It will not -- it's not an FRA. They're

12

1 simply providing money to the state to get it up
2 and running. AMTRAK has stated publicly they'll go
3 wherever the station is. So, I -- my -- the
4 impression we're getting is it's from -- directly
5 the State's decision at this point.

6 In the next couple of days, we will be going
7 to Tallahassee and meeting with the Secretary of
8 Transportation to make sure she's completely aware
9 of our project, of the impacts of it, the -- how it
10 would come together, and the intermodality of it
11 compared to the other location. We want to make
12 sure she's as educated as possible so that when
13 decision time does come, there's as many decision
14 makers educated on the project as possible. I hope
15 that answers --

16 MR. GEORGE: Yeah.

17 MR. GORMAN: Who -- what -- what type of --
18 who's actually meeting with the Secretary of
19 Transportation?

20 MR. WUELLNER: Carl is going with Bryan and I.

21 MR. GORMAN: Okay.

22 MR. WUELLNER: We've got a 9:30 meeting on
23 Wednesday with her.

24 MR. GORMAN: Excellent.

25 MR. WUELLNER: We'll hit the road early.

13

1 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Buzz?

2 MR. GEORGE: Just a little rhetoric. When the
3 Bridge of Lions, you know, was under decision and
4 they kept saying, "Well, it's the Department of,"
5 you know, "Transportation that's going to
6 ultimately make the decision." And some very smart
7 people made it a -- a big committee out of let's
8 get to -- to the legislatures, you know. Don't
9 stop at the DOT. And by the time it came down for
10 the DOT to make the decision, I think in my
11 opinion, the legislature had already made the
12 decision for them.

13 So, that happened in that case. I don't know
14 if it's a -- an additional tact we should take, you
15 know, by going after that, you know, or maybe get
16 our airport friends involved in forming a
17 committee, you know. But I know you guys are doing
18 everything you can. God knows you're spending a
19 lot of time on it.

20 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Buzz, with -- with
21 everybody doing different things, would that be
22 something that you'd be willing to head up?

23 MR. GEORGE: Well, usually if you bring it up,
24 you have to do that. So, yes, I would.

25 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Well then, I would ask that

14

1 you would do that for us because --

2 MR. GEORGE: Then I would accept that
3 responsibility.

4 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Thank you, very much. We
5 could use that -- that help in that area.

6 MR. GEORGE: All right.

7 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Anything else on the
8 intermodal transportation center? Let's talk about
9 the Aerospace Academy.

10 MR. WUELLNER: The Aerospace Academy met,
11 yeah, about a month ago. I don't know exactly the
12 date. It got moved around a little bit. I
13 attended it.

14 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: It was the 24th of
15 September. It was a Wednesday.

16 MR. WUELLNER: Okay. Sounds about right. I
17 knew it was about a month ago. They basically got
18 a briefing on the current school funding issues
19 that are out there. I agreed to help the school
20 itself with meeting with the local community
21 colleges -- well, they're now state colleges as
22 they're known -- in trying to find where we could
23 get the best articulation agreements going at the
24 lowest possible cost.

25 The schools, as you most are aware, are

15

1 getting very very tight on funding. Historically
2 the school has had to give up a full-time teacher
3 position funding in order to pay for the curriculum
4 from Embry-Riddle. So the -- the -- but that's
5 only available for one more year, meaning this
6 current year.

7 After that, they've got to find ways to come
8 up with those same curriculum advantages. And the
9 most expedient way is to explore all of those
10 options with Florida State College in Jacksonville
11 and St. Johns State College, as it will be known
12 here shortly. Even Jacksonville University and UNF
13 as more local players in this and more public
14 institution, it's -- it's hoped that the cost can
15 be brought down to where it can still be -- the
16 curriculum can still be accommodated.

17 It will also -- if it's successful, it would
18 open the door for more teacher opportunities in the
19 school. Currently because of the agreement with
20 Embry-Riddle, a Master's Degree is required to
21 teach the courses that are -- that Embry-Riddle is
22 offering at the high school, because they require a
23 Master's Degree to teach because they're getting
24 college credit for the same class.

25 Using some of the state college methods, there

16

1 are ways to allow four-year college or Bachelor's
2 Degree-type individuals to do that education and
3 still require some college credit for -- or still
4 get college credit for students. So it's certainly
5 worth exploring and seeing where it goes. But they
6 were looking for somebody to assist them in just
7 meeting with these schools and seeing where we
8 could pound something out with them. So I said I'd
9 help there.

10 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Great. Anything else
11 upcoming for them? I know --

12 MR. WUELLNER: Nothing short term. As you
13 mentioned, they -- you probably saw in the paper
14 that they shot -- shot rockets off last Monday I
15 believe it was at the school again and got a nice
16 paper -- or article in the paper, you know,
17 bringing attention to the academy.

18 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Carl?

19 MR. YOUMAN: I don't know if I'm stealing
20 SAAPA's thunder, but on September 11th at their
21 fly-in, members of the St. Augustine High School
22 staff and aerospace board members were present.
23 But most important, there were a number of
24 aerospace students who volunteered their time and

25 were very active in helping out and -- I mean, they

17

1 were everywhere. It was very impressive.

2 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Thank you.

3 MR. WUELLNER: And they'll begin working once

4 a month in the park on weekends beginning in

5 November, rather than weekly. We're hoping to get

6 a larger number of students with -- and minimize

7 our overtime commitment to having to supervise most

8 Saturdays. So it will bring it down to one day a

9 week -- or one weekend -- one day a month, and

10 hopefully we'll get a larger turnout also as a

11 result.

12 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Moving on to reports,

13 Mr. Sanchez?

14 REPORTS

15 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: Good afternoon. Thank

16 you. I don't have a lot to report on. I just want

17 to -- thank you. There's not a lot to report on

18 unless anyone's got any questions.

19 I do want to agree with Carl, though. I was

20 at the meeting with Congressman Mica. I tell you

21 what, I was very very impressed with your Chair's

22 presentation. It could not have been done any

23 better. It was absolutely perfect. There's no way

24 anyone could misunderstand any of that. So I

25 just -- I did want to offer that.

18

1 And I -- you know, I have my own beliefs and
2 stuff, but I'm kind of hoping Congressman Mica gets
3 in there and we have enough changes, because you're
4 going to see the money is going to be a lot easier
5 to get if he becomes chairman of the transportation
6 committee. There's no doubt that would be a
7 definite plus for all of us. That's it, unless
8 there's any questions. Okay.

9 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Thank you, Ron.

10 COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: Thanks.

11 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Mr. Slingluff?

12 MR. SLINGLUFF: Nothing new to report.

13 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Mr. Nehring?

14 MR. NEHRING: Nothing.

15 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: We don't have Harry here on
16 behalf of SAAPA. Do we have -- Michael, did you
17 want to speak on behalf of SAAPA?

18 MR. SLINGLUFF: We've got our annual dinner
19 dance -- SAAPA has its annual dinner dance, World
20 War II theme dinner dance in the old bulk hangar at
21 Galaxy Aviation on October 30th. Dress up. It's
22 Halloween. It's the night before Halloween. Come
23 by. And tickets are available at Galaxy Aviation
24 or contact anyone in SAAPA if you'd like to come.

25 Should be good. There's a couple of World War II

19

1 airplanes coming in. We've got a P-51 and a
2 Corsair that will be in the hangar and a 20-piece
3 big band.

4 MR. YOUMAN: What time does it start?

5 MR. SLINGLUFF: I believe 6 o'clock.

6 MR. YOUMAN: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Michael, can you send us
8 the information on the -- on the warbirds that will
9 be coming in? Are they going to be open for public
10 display?

11 MR. SLINGLUFF: Yeah. They'll -- yeah, we'll
12 put information out on that, yes.

13 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Thank you. Mr. Burnett?

14 MR. BURNETT: I have nothing to report for
15 this evening. I'll be speaking enough later, I
16 think.

17 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. And, Ed, did you
18 want to speak for Mr. Napier?

19 MR. WUELLNER: Sure. Got the traffic count
20 reports here. I'm happy to report we're up 22
21 percent, continue to grow our operations this year.
22 I would say a large part of that's related to
23 increased flight school activity at this point.
24 That's also translating to better than last year's

25 avgas-type numbers across the field where the red

20

1 line or red bar in the graph as you follow it, and
2 it's literally -- we're pretty close to on pace
3 with approximately three years ago. So it's -- it
4 continues to get -- get -- we see signs of
5 improvement anyway over the last two years.

6 So that's all good news. Hopefully it will --
7 once the runway rehab project's completed, it will
8 translate into some additional jet traffic as
9 the -- as the economy tries to recover a little bit
10 here.

11 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Jack, did you have
12 something?

13 MR. GORMAN: Just -- just a -- just a comment.
14 I'll let -- I know -- what was the amortization for
15 that self-fuel? Just curious. I mean, I just --
16 that's an awful long thing --

17 MR. WUELLNER: It would have been seven
18 years --

19 MR. GORMAN: -- but we have a lot of traffic
20 around here.

21 MR. WUELLNER: Typically it would have been
22 seven years within the original calculations. I --
23 my suspicion is we exceeded it a while ago.

24 MR. GORMAN: So the -- but the fuel figures as

25 far as sales are over the projection?

21

1 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, yeah. They're over last
2 year's sales, yeah.

3 MR. GORMAN: Yeah. Okay. Just to make it
4 clear. Thank you.

5 MR. WUELLNER: I'd -- I'd have to look it up
6 for you. I don't have all that.

7 MR. GORMAN: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Move on to project updates.

9 PROJECT UPDATES

10 MR. WUELLNER: Absolutely. Project updates,
11 first project and most important one at this point
12 is the Runway 13/31 rehab project.

13 Construction is ongoing. I would again advise
14 anybody that's thinking of using the airfield, that
15 you get those NOTAMs out and get up to speed with
16 that. That information's also available off of our
17 web site. It is -- it is current, but changes
18 frequently. So check it -- check it.

19 At this point, the current pace of work would
20 have us completing major paving operations ahead of
21 Thanksgiving. There will be a period where there's
22 some downtime, meaning there will not be
23 pavement-related activity, but the lighting
24 installation, centerline lighting, that kind of

25 thing will continue.

22

1 And then in first, second week of November --
2 or excuse me, December time line, there'll be a
3 couple of short closures where the runway grooving
4 is done. They need about a 30-day wait after
5 putting the asphalt down to be able to come back
6 and do the grooving. And that will also apply
7 final pavement marking at that point.

8 So we expect to be done ahead of Christmas
9 with the whole project complete a hundred percent
10 and done. So we do have a mid-January completion
11 date by contract. I expect we'll exceed that by
12 about a month at this point. No issues with budget
13 or anything else related to the project. It's --
14 it's plugging along pretty well.

15 We do have -- I'll just make you aware. We do
16 have some issues on the south end that they are
17 working through on an engineering standpoint with
18 FAA and some outside -- outside technical
19 assistance. Nothing particularly troubling. It's
20 just got to work through some -- some discussions
21 and paperwork. It is not -- at this point is not
22 holding up any -- any work on job, so...

23 MR. GEORGE: So the new techniques procedures
24 are working fine.

25 MR. WUELLNER: They are not in place yet.

23

1 They're still agreeing on the southern about -- in
2 order to detail it a little better, if you look at
3 some of the old aerials, you'll see that in its --
4 when the airport was originally built, some time in
5 the 70s I believe, the runway was extended by
6 Northrop Grumman.

7 The extension area is experiencing a little
8 bit of settling during the paving operations. So
9 they are working through that with FAA. FAA's
10 picking up the additional analysis cost and they've
11 also committed to us to participate in any
12 additional work --

13 MR. GEORGE: Good. Okay.

14 MR. WUELLNER: -- that would need to be done
15 to -- to make it right. They're -- they just don't
16 want to end up with an inferior product on the
17 southern -- it's about 1500 feet round numbers.
18 It's nothing major. It's -- it's not like it's
19 collapsing or sinking or anything.

20 MR. GEORGE: Yeah.

21 MR. WUELLNER: It's just when they put the
22 vibratory roller on the final asphalt, it is
23 allowing some undulation as the sand many feet down
24 settles just a little bit. So they want to make

25 sure all of that gets corrected in -- in a final

24

1 method. So we've got the big brains on it right
2 now. There's a doctorate and that kind of work
3 doing the analysis and coming back with a
4 recommendation.

5 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

6 MR. WUELLNER: ARFF facility, the grant has
7 been executed. Quality control meetings and
8 engineering continues. Permit applications are in.
9 We met with the contractor last week on this. I
10 would expect it will have contracts executed toward
11 the very first of November.

12 Right now, I would plan near the last week or
13 so of November as the actual kickoff of
14 construction efforts on the site. It is a
15 six-month construction time line. We're getting
16 more and more comfortable on the -- on the progress
17 of that job. It's just taken a while to get there.
18 We couldn't really even award it till the grant was
19 done, which was less than a month ago.

20 Safety area project. Suffice it to say final
21 permitting is underway right now. We're awaiting a
22 series of packets of information to be executed
23 and -- and returned to the agencies. We're not
24 aware of any additional issues or things that are

25 out there related to this project.

25

1 We're aware that the grant has been received
2 for the job. The award has been made for
3 construction as a result of that. It'll sit here
4 kind of in this state until all the paperwork
5 catches up to the job. I would expect it will
6 begin work in earnest on this in December. We'll
7 try to pin down the date as we get to the next
8 meeting as to when it would really -- or really
9 start. But that's -- that's kind of the time line
10 and pace we are right now. I think all issues have
11 been addressed relative to allowing those agencies
12 to be able to issue permits. So it should go
13 pretty quick and pretty smooth from here.

14 Sustainability, they're doing some internal
15 meetings and coming up with the -- at this point,
16 the baseline assessment as well as getting us some
17 best management practices drafted that we can work
18 through inside, and I'm sure next month there'll be
19 some kind of briefing on where that is in terms of
20 getting it wrapped up.

21 No noise-related or issues this month again.

22 No -- nothing reported to us and --

23 MR. YOUMAN: That's what, two or three months
24 in a row?

1 three.

2 Benchmarking, 98 percent of the T-hangars
3 occupied. Really we're just -- it's not an issue
4 of whether they'll be at a hundred, it's just we're
5 calling through the list which takes a little bit
6 of time. So it -- it's technically 98 percent
7 right this minute.

8 Corporate hangars, the small ones here, is a
9 different agenda item. A little later, we'll talk
10 about how to perhaps get a handle on some of that
11 or at least make that situation better.

12 Corporate's really -- it's in fact one hangar.
13 We're still waiting on a resolution plan from Ceco
14 Building, Megadoor -- not Megadoor, HydroSwing
15 door, and the original contractor Bilco, which
16 better happen very very soon or this guy gets
17 released to the dogs to take care of it. And
18 their -- we had a positive response a couple of
19 weeks ago to -- to that. I don't -- I have not
20 seen any follow-up, though. So hopefully it will
21 get resolved here very quickly.

22 Jet fuel, you see it's -- 2010's still below
23 what it was in '09. Some of that right now is
24 being impacted by the availability of the runway

25 after hours and the like. So I hope -- hope to see

27

1 that an improving situation shortly after
2 Thanksgiving or at Thanksgiving time and on, which
3 should be tying us pretty well to our traditionally
4 a little busier time of the year for the airport.

5 Self-service, you can see is up 5,000 gallons
6 this month over last month. So there again,
7 impacts of flight school kinds of activities on
8 the -- in the avgas situation. So those are all
9 good -- point to good light GA recovery. Now if we
10 could get it spurred into the corporate side, it
11 will certainly enhance the bottom line even more.
12 Which brings us to first agenda item when you're
13 ready.

14 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Before we move into the
15 agenda items, I -- we do have some comment papers.
16 So if anybody has any comments that they'd like to
17 make, if you'd bring up your slips of paper for me
18 before we start into it. Okay. All right. The
19 first agenda item.

20 RESOLUTION 2010-09 FDOT JPA

21 MR. WUELLNER: Okay. First agenda item I have
22 for you is to ask for approval of Resolution 20 --
23 2010-09. This is basically the joint participation
24 agreement resolution with Florida DOT for the

25 safety area projects to include the approach

28

1 lighting, the safety area mitigation, the edge
2 restoration, all of those kinds of projects. This
3 will be their 2 1/2 percent share of that work.
4 Reminder that FAA's already given us the grant, so
5 this is just picking up the other half of the 5
6 percent number. It's -- otherwise it's standard
7 JPA resolution.

8 I would point out, only because it's somewhat
9 new to us, that this does include the language that
10 we had to begin adopting last month -- or I should
11 say had to consider adopting starting last month
12 related to scope changes, assurances,
13 certifications, and any other documents and
14 schedules, that I can do those on your behalf. The
15 resolution authorizes us to do that. So they are
16 looking for resolution language that now
17 specifically says that. The generic execution of
18 paperwork required doesn't cover it anymore. So
19 with that, we would recommend that you adopt
20 2010-09.

21 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. Do we have any board
22 members' questions for Ed before we open up for
23 public comment?

24 (None.)

25 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. On public comment,

29

1 Reba?

2 (Ms. Ludlow shakes her head.)

3 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Seeing no public comment,

4 we can come back to the board for questions, motion

5 and discussion.

6 MR. YOUMAN: I make a motion we accept

7 Resolution 2010 -- 2010-09 as -- as it stands.

8 MR. WERTER: I second.

9 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. Do we have any

10 discussion?

11 (No discussion.)

12 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Hearing none, all in favor,

13 aye?

14 MR. GEORGE: Aye.

15 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Aye.

16 MR. YOUMAN: Aye.

17 MR. WERTER: Aye.

18 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: All opposed?

19 MR. GORMAN: Nay.

20 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Motion passes 4 to 1.

21 CASA COLA HANGAR LEASE AGREEMENTS

22 MR. WUELLNER: Okay. Next item I have is

23 related to Casa -- the Casa Cola hangars, and

24 really this is to approve the lease -- individual

25 lease agreements.

30

1 There are four leases involved for this
2 facility right next door to include Rhumb Runner
3 Aviation for corporate storage. Jacksonville
4 Aviation, LLC for maintenance -- aircraft
5 maintenance that is. One unit to the Florida
6 Flyers as just a flight school maintenance
7 facility. They're currently doing an activity out
8 of a 50 x 50 over here. This would put them in an
9 appropriate hangar that's properly zoned and built
10 for that. And Jet Elite, LLC for corporate storage
11 and it's strictly storage of an aircraft.

12 Annual return is \$79,050 at this point.
13 They're all five-year leases with options. And I
14 would point out that that generate -- at that
15 amount of money, generates based on total project
16 cost a return of 7.5 percent on return on
17 investment. And we would suggest or Staff's
18 recommendation is that the Authority approve the
19 four lease agreements as presented.

20 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: We only have one public
21 comment card on this. Reba?

22 MS. LUDLOW: I'm good. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: We can open it up for board
24 questions. Carl?

25 MR. YOUMAN: Does this fill the space?

31

1 MR. WUELLNER: All of it.

2 MR. GEORGE: That's great. Jacksonville
3 Aviation, what kind of maintenance are they doing,
4 anything --

5 MR. WUELLNER: Light aircraft maintenance.

6 MR. GEORGE: What?

7 MR. WUELLNER: Light aircraft maintenance. I
8 would tell you this, it's sort of a -- a remnant --
9 I'm going to use that term in a very liberal
10 because they're not really technically affiliated.

11 MR. GEORGE: Right.

12 MR. WUELLNER: But it's at least one or two of
13 the individuals that were originally affiliated
14 with Gene Powers.

15 MR. GEORGE: Oh, okay. All right.

16 MR. WUELLNER: And after the demise of that
17 business, they located up in Jacksonville at Craig,
18 and they're looking to bring that back down here
19 and take advantage of the new facility.

20 MR. GEORGE: Okay. Are -- we get personal
21 guarantees?

22 MR. WUELLNER: I believe they're as a part of
23 the lease, yeah.

24 MR. GEORGE: Okay. It is supposed to be part

25 of the lease. Okay.

32

1 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Carl?

2 MR. YOUMAN: Jet Elite and Rhumb -- Rhumb
3 Runner, these are large corporate jets?

4 MR. WUELLNER: No. One is -- one is a --

5 MR. GORMAN: Pilatus.

6 MR. WUELLNER: -- Pilatus, which is a --

7 MR. WERTER: Single-engine --

8 MR. WUELLNER: -- turboprop aircraft. And the
9 other is -- what, Citation? A Cessna Citation.

10 But they have agreed to tow the aircraft out to the
11 apron area prior to start. So it's -- that's in
12 the lease agreement.

13 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

14 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Jack?

15 MR. GORMAN: Just curious. It's not relevant
16 because I think it's great that they've all been
17 leased. Who's getting the use of the office space?

18 MR. WUELLNER: Actually two of the companies
19 are splitting square --

20 MR. GORMAN: They're splitting. That's an
21 excellent idea.

22 MR. WUELLNER: And that is, if I'm not
23 mistaken, is Rhumb Runner and Jacksonville
24 Aviation.

25 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. Do we have a motion?

33

1 MR. GORMAN: I make a motion that we accept
2 Staff's recommendation.

3 MR. GEORGE: Second.

4 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: All in favor -- do we have
5 any further discussion before I call it to a vote?

6 MR. WERTER: Just one quick. On Rhumb Runner,
7 what is the nature of their aviation business?

8 MR. WUELLNER: They're corporate storage, I
9 believe. They own the airplane. It's not --

10 MR. WERTER: It's not a charter service.

11 MR. WUELLNER: It's not in a commercial --

12 MR. WERTER: Okay.

13 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. All in favor, aye?

14 MR. GEORGE: Aye.

15 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Aye.

16 MR. GORMAN: Aye.

17 MR. YOUMAN: Aye.

18 MR. WERTER: Aye.

19 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: And none opposed? Motion
20 passes unanimously.

21 FIND GRANT APPROVAL

22 MR. WUELLNER: Okay. Next is somewhat
23 perfunctory, but I wanted to make sure you guys had
24 the opportunity to actually approve the FIND grant

25 agreement. We did get a -- a nonreduced grant.

34

1 That -- the overall budget was cut, however our
2 particular grant, because it qualified so highly,
3 did get funded at the requested amount. So it is a
4 50/50 grant. There's \$40,000 FIND money and
5 \$40,000 Airport Authority money. They are budgeted
6 currently, so it's not new -- new expenditure.

7 We have a three-year period to complete the
8 effort. It is for design and permitting of opening
9 up the seaplane basin area for commercial barge
10 activity. So this would be the first step in
11 applying for additional money. Starting next year,
12 we can reapply for construction kind of money to
13 begin dredging and/or other improvements that we
14 can match with the FIND district.

15 MR. GEORGE: Good.

16 MR. YOUMAN: This won't take three years, will
17 it?

18 MR. WUELLNER: No, no. I'm hoping to be able
19 to have the permits secured so we can apply with
20 permits in hand for money beginning next year.

21 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: The only public --

22 MR. YOUMAN: Because progress is progress.

23 MR. GEORGE: Yeah. That's another asset.

24 MR. WUELLNER: It's intermodality.

25 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: The only public card we

35

1 have filled out for this is Reba.

2 MS. LUDLOW: No comment, thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. Let's open it up for
4 board question and answers. Jack?

5 MR. GORMAN: I'd just like to reiterate how
6 really valuable the ability is to do heavy lift.
7 In other words, Carl does heavy lift now. He's
8 very -- he's in that business. And I have done it
9 myself with marine.

10 And you actually have the ability, with a
11 limited draft, but still an ability to take
12 hundreds of tons of cargo, take them off a railroad
13 using that facility and put them on a barge and
14 then bring them out into the ocean. And that --
15 that ability, it exists along the east coast, but
16 it's certainly a very good and viable thing to have
17 here. And the cost would be minimal because all
18 you've got to do is dredge that channel.

19 MR. WERTER: Ed, what kind of -- what kind of
20 cargo container, barge type of operation --

21 MR. WUELLNER: It's just -- it's just barge
22 related.

23 MR. WERTER: Barge?

24 MR. WUELLNER: It's not large ship or

25 anything.

36

1 MR. WERTER: We're talking about liquid
2 products and things of that nature?

3 MR. WUELLNER: Bulk, liquid, you know,
4 container, small container kind of things.

5 MR. WERTER: We're not going to see any Star
6 Wars kind of cranes go --

7 MR. WUELLNER: No, no.

8 MR. WERTER: Okay. That's where he got --
9 that's where Spielberg got his ideas, from those
10 cranes.

11 MR. WUELLNER: Okay.

12 MR. YOUMAN: If, for example, something came
13 in that was a large piece like Jack's talking
14 about, there's always barge cranes, floating barge
15 cranes that can pick up immense, immense weight.

16 MR. WUELLNER: The idea is we'll eventually be
17 able to do a lot of drive-on, drive-off type
18 activity versus creating crane scenarios.

19 MR. WERTER: But then we've got to start
20 looking at navigation problems for down wind, so...

21 MR. WUELLNER: If you get -- this will be
22 outside the safety area, the whole operation. But
23 everything we're talking about is not going to
24 impact aviation unless it starts going --

25 MR. WERTER: Vertical.

37

1 MR. WUELLNER: -- pretty well vertical. But
2 normally it will not.

3 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Jack?

4 MR. GORMAN: There's another -- another short
5 one I'd like to make. If you actually get
6 commercial traffic in here, I believe that an
7 airline captain, and I had -- with one of the large
8 freightliners, for instance, I might ask Mr. Cox on
9 this one, but it took over -- it took six to eight
10 truckloads to actually fill this aircraft. And if
11 you have barge capability, which could come in this
12 dredged channel and then you take the standard
13 stand-alone ability to -- for tank -- the tank
14 farm, you solve the problem.

15 MR. WUELLNER: Absolutely.

16 MR. GORMAN: So you've got a far more viable
17 ability to fill up aircraft, larger aircraft with
18 the barge ability.

19 MR. WUELLNER: Provides a great deal of
20 flexibility.

21 MR. GORMAN: You just dredge the channel.

22 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Being able to cross-utilize
23 our assets.

24 MR. GEORGE: Does this project also include

25 some -- looking for permitting of roads on the

38

1 other side? In other words, getting to that ramp
2 is -- is a toughie, and it probably, in my opinion,
3 should be included in this activity.

4 MR. WUELLNER: It -- it's actually included in
5 the safety area project.

6 MR. GEORGE: Okay. Fine.

7 MR. WUELLNER: We have a 25-foot corridor in
8 addition to the edge -- formal edge of the safety
9 area to where we can -- we can construct some road
10 or some activity along the edge there. So for the
11 first time, it wouldn't be in the safety area, that
12 activity. But it's only a -- it's only basically a
13 road easement through -- or road corridor through
14 there. That's all we were able to get in the
15 permitting process.

16 MR. GEORGE: That's fine. It's a step in the
17 right direction. And the Coast Guard will be
18 knocking on your door.

19 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Do we have a motion?

20 MR. GEORGE: I make a motion we accept staff
21 recommendation.

22 MR. YOUMAN: I second it.

23 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: All in favor, aye?

24 MR. GEORGE: Aye.

25 MR. GORMAN: Aye.

39

1 MR. YOUMAN: Aye.

2 MR. WERTER: Aye.

3 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Aye. Motion passes
4 unaniously.

5 RELEASE OF RETAINAGE - SOUTH GA DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

6 MR. WUELLNER: Okay. Next item I have is
7 release of retainage for South GA. It's
8 approximately \$380,000 in retainage equaling 10
9 percent of the project. We would request
10 conditional release of retainage, as we do in most
11 cases, subject to receipt of final paperwork and
12 releases from contractor liens. And otherwise, we
13 would -- we would recommend approval of the release
14 of the retainage to Hawkins.

15 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. We'll open it up for
16 public comment. Reba?

17 MS. LUDLOW: No comment.

18 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Come back to board comment.
19 Do we have any board questions on this?

20 (No questions.)

21 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. Hearing no board
22 questions, would we -- does anybody want to make a
23 motion on this agenda item?

24 MR. GEORGE: Go ahead, Carl.

25 MR. YOUMAN: I make a motion that the release

40

1 of retainage South GA development project be

2 accepted as --

3 MR. WUELLNER: Presented.

4 MR. YOUMAN: -- presented.

5 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Do we have a second?

6 MR. GEORGE: Second.

7 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: All in favor, aye?

8 MR. GEORGE: Aye.

9 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Aye.

10 MR. GORMAN: Aye.

11 MR. YOUMAN: Aye.

12 MR. WERTER: Aye.

13 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Motion passes unanimously.

14 MR. YOUMAN: If this computer would ever hold

15 the signal, I could follow.

16 MR. WUELLNER: It holds the signal, it just --

17 they time out. So you've got to keep touching the

18 screen periodically.

19 MR. YOUMAN: It sits there.

20 MR. WERTER: Yeah, I can't open up my

21 attachments.

22 MR. WUELLNER: He's got his own problems.

23 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. The next agenda

24 item --

25 MR. WUELLNER: We'll have a little clinic

41

1 maybe after for everyone struggling with the
2 technology.

3 LEASE POLICY AMENDMENT & RATE REALIGNMENT

4 MR. WUELLNER: Next item I have is lease
5 policy amendment and rate realignment. This is
6 actually a good thing, or I mean, we're treating it
7 as a good thing. This not something that -- it
8 does not effect 90-plus percent of the tenants on
9 the airport.

10 If you recall -- let me take you backwards
11 just a little bit. When we opened the South GA
12 area, we had a number of 50 x 50 and 50 x 60 units
13 that we elected to price, and unfortunately we
14 priced them right ahead of the decline in the
15 economy. So we've had a great deal of trouble
16 leasing these units consistently. And in fact a
17 couple of the units have remained vacant pretty
18 much continually. As a result, there's a projected
19 revenue loss on these couple of hangars that
20 equates to over 50 -- I have the spreadsheet I gave
21 to you, but it's about a \$50,000 -- \$52,800 a year
22 kind of revenue loss due to vacancy.

23 We took a look at the existing rate structures
24 and applies -- this discussion is only related to

25 50 x 50s and 50 x 60 size hangars. We looked at

42

1 the rental structure that existed in G row and H
2 row and I row.

3 We were very content not only with the
4 occupancy there, but there's also a little
5 disparity in product with some of the units because
6 they have a little higher door height, which does
7 make them a little more tenable for most people's
8 purposes. We -- we think that rate structure,
9 because we've been able to maintain occupancy in
10 those buildings, is more reflective of where
11 current market is.

12 So we are asking that we be able to reduce the
13 rent structure on the South GA hangars, these three
14 units of each type, to the same levels we're
15 charging over in G row and H row. And that equates
16 to a thousand dollars -- excuse me, \$800 and a
17 thousand dollars for 50 x 50s and 50 x 60s
18 respectively.

19 The -- there are three units each. The net
20 effect is there's about four -- instead of
21 losing -- I know this sounds ridiculous, but
22 instead of losing \$52,800 a year in revenue by not
23 being able to lease them at all, we believe with
24 this combined with the policy adjustment I'll

25 explain in a minute, we can now pare that loss down

43

1 about \$14,000 relative to the budget.

2 That would put all those units on parity in
3 terms of rent, so no matter, it's just a case of
4 what's open and what aircraft fit hangars to -- at
5 this point, whether in the South GA area or in G
6 row, H row, or I row. So we think -- we think that
7 makes a lot of sense not only from an
8 administrative point of view, but I think it will
9 be the catal -- part of the catalyst needed to
10 allow those hangars to be rented fully, which is --
11 which is a positive thing.

12 Hand in hand to that, we are suggesting a
13 tweak if you will to the section of the lease
14 policy, which is 6.3. It applies to
15 Authority-owned T-hangar related units, which
16 includes these kinds of hangars, which are -- we --
17 I mean, I kind of inherited the term box hangar for
18 these -- these hangars.

19 Anyway, what we're saying is that that we
20 would like to relieve or -- relieve the requirement
21 or allow sharing of hangars for aircraft owners.
22 Now -- without incurring a liability on ourselves.
23 So people who can find somebody they would like to
24 share a hangar with, the policy would be -- if this

25 is approved, would now allow that activity to

44

1 happen.

2 Currently, that would not -- dissimilar
3 ownership, they'd have to tie it together in some
4 legal means, through an LLC or some other method,
5 and I'm not sure it provides any more benefit, but
6 it's a whole lot more work for everybody.

7 It's -- it would allow up to two aircraft in a
8 hangar. I think that routinely we'll be able to
9 approve a third hang -- a third aircraft in there.

10 Especially in the 50 x 60 units, we'll be able to
11 make that work. I don't have any issues with that.

12 But we want to make sure that all parties that
13 enter into these leases have had a chance to -- to
14 talk through the -- you know, how they're going to
15 move airplanes, how they -- you know, make sure
16 that they're completely aware of the -- that that
17 risk and exposure is on themselves as joint owners
18 of the lease.

19 The language reflects that they are
20 individually responsible for the entirety of the
21 lease. So that in the event somebody bails on them
22 or fails to make the lease payment or whatever, if
23 your name's on that lease, you're as responsible.

24 You know, how they carve up the rent is not

25 really -- I don't really care, as long as the check

45

1 shows up. And they need to -- you know, we want to
2 make sure they understand that. So all this policy
3 does is facilitate that.

4 MR. BURNETT: And on that particular note, it
5 gets too hard for Cindy to be the policeman trying
6 to figure out what's going on and resolve those
7 types of issues.

8 MR. WUELLNER: That's an excellent point. And
9 that's really what was -- we were going for in the
10 original policy draft, was to avoid that scenario.
11 And if you force them to be legally affiliated,
12 then you kind of pull it off of us. They're only
13 arguing with themselves. This kind of steps it
14 back a notch, as long as all the parties understand
15 their risks and obligations related to the lease.

16 Probably more importantly, because the hangars
17 especially on the South GA area are lower door
18 height -- lower than G, H and I row in most cases,
19 it opens up the opportunity for single-engine
20 aircraft. It's priced to be very similar numbers
21 as if you rented three individual -- or two or
22 three individual T-hangars.

23 So it's not a -- it's not an economic
24 advantage for somebody to share, but it does get

25 somebody in a hangar that might want to be in a

46

1 hangar on a more expedited basis.

2 So it's our recommendation you adopt the
3 proposed changes. They're in yellow, for those --
4 those that are following that. And also, we would
5 recommend that you make the rate adjustments and
6 normalize the South GA -- GA area hangars to the
7 same rates and charge the \$800 and \$1,000 a month.

8 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. We'll open this up
9 for public comment. Reba?

10 MS. LUDLOW: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: If you'll go over to the
12 mic.

13 MS. LUDLOW: Okay. Ed, you're going to have
14 to explain -- Reba Ludlow, Ponte Vedra.

15 On the 50 x 50, they're 385 -- \$3.85 for the
16 2500 square foot ones. And for the 50 x 60, \$4 for
17 3000 square foot. Now these are all -- are these
18 new hangars on this side?

19 MR. WUELLNER: If -- if they approve this, we
20 would effectively have the same rates all across
21 the property for similar square footage.

22 MS. LUDLOW: Okay. So the ones that are
23 50 x 50, those are like H row, H and I?

24 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: And G.

25 MR. WUELLNER: It's G -- the four units air --

47

1 toward the airfield side in G row, the lower door

2 height ones would be the \$800 units.

3 MS. LUDLOW: Uh-huh.

4 MR. WUELLNER: Also, the three units on this

5 end of the South GA area --

6 MS. LUDLOW: Uh-huh.

7 MR. WUELLNER: -- that are the same size, the

8 50 x 50s, would all be at \$800 per month. The 3000

9 square foot low door, which are only on the south

10 end here --

11 MS. LUDLOW: Right. Okay.

12 MR. WUELLNER: -- which the three units down

13 here would be at the thousand dollar rate.

14 Everything else, like H and I row for the most part

15 are higher doors --

16 MS. LUDLOW: Okay.

17 MR. WUELLNER: -- so there is a -- they are a

18 little more pricey than -- than the south end as a

19 result.

20 MS. LUDLOW: Okay. And so, then on to the

21 sharing. So what you're saying is let these people

22 in these 50 x 60 -- 50 x 50 and 50 x 60 share if

23 they want to, and all names have to be on the

24 lease?

25 MR. WUELLNER: That is correct.

48

1 MS. LUDLOW: All names have to be on the lease
2 and they all must have an airplane? Of course
3 you --

4 MR. WUELLNER: We don't technically require
5 you to have an airplane to have a hangar lease.

6 MS. LUDLOW: Okay. Okay. So, and then how
7 are they --

8 MR. WUELLNER: You just can't use it for
9 anything else.

10 MS. LUDLOW: Yeah, I understand. Okay. And
11 it has nothing to do with our -- the other rows,
12 the port-a-ports, the --

13 MR. WUELLNER: No, no impact at all.

14 MS. LUDLOW: Okay. Thank you.

15 MR. WUELLNER: In fact, people who have G row
16 hangars now would have the ability to do sharing
17 also.

18 MS. LUDLOW: Oh. You mean -- okay. What
19 you're saying then is the hangar rows, like the
20 port-a-ports down to M --

21 MR. WUELLNER: Not port-a-ports or T-hangars.
22 Just the 50 x 50.

23 MS. LUDLOW: Only the T-hangars. To what, H,
24 I, J, K, L, M?

25 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Only the 50 x 50.

49

1 MR. WUELLNER: Only the 50 x 50s and 50 x 60s.

2 MS. LUDLOW: Only the -- oh, okay. That's

3 good. Thank you.

4 MR. WUELLNER: There's no other change to

5 T-hangar. You still can't share a T-hangar.

6 MS. LUDLOW: Nothing.

7 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. We'll open it up for

8 board discussion. Do we have any board comments or

9 questions? Carl?

10 MR. YOUMAN: Was this precipitated by an

11 outside suggestion or an internal review by the --

12 MR. WUELLNER: We had gotten feedback that

13 that would help the situation. We do have people

14 who ask to share. The -- you know, of course the

15 vacancy rate has been on our mind for a while.

16 We've been trying to find tenants for that. Cindy

17 has been through that list any number of times

18 trying to -- trying to scare up tenants for that.

19 And in some cases, it's a -- it's a physical

20 limitation, meaning the tail height of the

21 particular aircraft will not work down here, or in

22 of course some cases it has to do with the type of

23 airplane.

24 But in most cases, it's just a case of -- it

25 seems to be the part of the economy that's really

50

1 been difficult in aviation is that above light GA
2 and below high-end corporate stuff, guys that own
3 the light twins and smaller turb -- turbine -- or
4 turboprop kinds of aircraft, the King Airs, the
5 Queen Airs, that size aircraft, it's an expensive
6 single occupancy hangar for guys who own those
7 airplanes at this point. They're not getting the
8 return on the airplane use like they were.

9 MR. YOUMAN: Will somebody on the list
10 immediately rent one of these with the --

11 MR. WUELLNER: Well, we haven't started
12 calling until the policy was approved. I can't
13 really rustle -- rustle the bushes so to speak.
14 But I -- I'm pretty optimistic. We still have a
15 decent T-hangar waiting list. So I think we'll --
16 we'll scare some people up. Even if it's as
17 placeholder leases, meaning they'll occupy the
18 hangar for six months or a year till a stand-alone
19 hangar comes available for them. So it serves as a
20 nice stopgap opportunity for many of them.

21 MR. YOUMAN: And Doug has checked everything
22 for liability purposes so the airport will not
23 be --

24 MR. WUELLNER: We'll work through the specific

25 lease clause after the policy is done. But it -- I

51

1 don't suspect -- he's pretty good at that.

2 MR. YOUMAN: And how will it affect the ROI on
3 those units?

4 MR. WUELLNER: It shouldn't at all.

5 MR. YOUMAN: Okay.

6 MR. WUELLNER: It's the same.

7 MR. YOUMAN: We'll just actually get some
8 money out of them finally. Okay.

9 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Jack?

10 MR. GORMAN: It's -- it's good common sense,
11 because it's allowing multiple people to use a
12 hangar that's large enough to use multiple
13 airplanes and pulls the airport out of the loop of
14 this collections. In other words, they just --
15 they don't have that complexity. If your name's on
16 the lease, you pay, in other words. And if you're
17 not ended up, well then Doug collects because it's
18 a lease.

19 So it's good common sense I think. Because
20 there's only so much you're going to pay per month
21 to store a light airplane. And like Ed
22 was reiterating, I mean, it's -- a \$1,000 a month
23 for a light airplane is -- is a lot, but you put
24 two in there and the cost is down.

25 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Do we have any further

52

1 board comment or discussion?

2 (None.)

3 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: We can open it up for a
4 motion.

5 MR. GEORGE: I make a motion we accept Staff's
6 recommendation and let's get the money in.

7 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Do we have a second?

8 MR. GORMAN: I'll second.

9 MR. YOUMAN: I'll second it.

10 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Motion and second. All in
11 favor, aye?

12 MR. GEORGE: Aye.

13 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Aye.

14 MR. GORMAN: Aye.

15 MR. YOUMAN: Aye.

16 MR. WERTER: Aye.

17 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Motion passes unanimously.

18 FUEL FARM PROJECT

19 MR. WUELLNER: Okay. The last item we have
20 for you, I need you to kind of follow the bouncing
21 ball on.

22 At last month's meeting, we asked and got
23 approval for you -- from you to the apparent low
24 bidder, Great Dane Petroleum out of Lauderhill,

25 Florida for the fuel farm construction project.

53

1 You want to --

2 MR. BURNETT: Yeah. Let me -- let me jump in
3 and say where we're at now.

4 What we received after the last meeting was a
5 letter from MDM Services, inc., which was the
6 second lowest bidder -- or apparent second lower
7 bidder. And MDM services, Inc. informed us that --
8 or raised the issue that Great Dane was not
9 qualified and did not meet the minimum
10 qualifications that were specified in the bid
11 documents. The information we had at the time, it
12 appeared that MDM was incorrect. MDM has filed
13 suit against the Airport Authority.

14 We have spent a pretty good amount of effort
15 and are of the opinion now, I can tell you, that
16 the bid by Great Dane should have been rejected and
17 they are not the low bidder. They are not the
18 lowest bidder. MDM who has filed suit is the low
19 bidder.

20 And I don't usually take this effort, but if I
21 could -- not to take this effort, but to
22 overcomplicate things with legalese, I want to hand
23 you a case so that you can understand what we're
24 looking at. I apologize. And if you'll flip to

25 the second page, if you look on the right-hand

54

1 column, you'll see -- and this is a case that was

2 decided by a Florida court within the last year.

3 This isn't old law; this is something that's pretty

4 new and fresh. In this --

5 MR. GEORGE: Are you in agreement, then, that

6 they do not meet the bid specifications and that's

7 why you're coming to the conclusion --

8 MR. BURNETT: Yes.

9 MR. GEORGE: -- that they're not the low

10 bidder?

11 MR. BURNETT: Yes. Great Dane is -- does not

12 meet the requirements.

13 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

14 MR. BURNETT: And what the case says that's

15 here that I've given you is in -- in this case, it

16 appeared that they might meet the requirements. In

17 reality, they didn't meet the requirements and

18 therefore, in this particular case that I've handed

19 you, this American Engineering case, the Town of

20 Highland Beach could reject the low bidder and go

21 to the -- to the second low bidder because the

22 second low bidder was actually the lowest

23 responsive bidder.

24 There's also the seminal case on this, a 1932

25 case here in Florida by the Florida Supreme Court,

55

1 it's the Wester case, and what it says is if
2 your -- if you don't actually comply with the bid
3 documents, then even if the contract is issued,
4 your contract is void.

5 So we're at a situation now where the Airport
6 Authority at its last meeting did select Great Dane
7 based on the information that was there at the
8 time. The contract hasn't been signed. Even if
9 the contract had been signed, under the Wester
10 case, it's a -- it's a void contract. So we're
11 really at a situation to say where we're at now is
12 MDM has filed suit. They actually are the lowest
13 responsive bidder.

14 And we discussed with the legal counsel for
15 MDM services -- and I'll hand you this. I've got
16 one other handout I've got to give you. Just so
17 you have this and are aware of it. MDM has agreed
18 that if the Airport Authority will reject, take the
19 action to reject the bid of Great Dane, which isn't
20 again the lowest bid because it's nonconforming,
21 that MDM will agree to indemnify the Airport
22 Authority should Great Dane sue the Airport
23 Authority, and it will agree to dismiss its lawsuit
24 and indemnify the Airport Authority if Great Dane

25 sues not only for damages, but attorney's fees and

56

1 costs and those sort of things.

2 So they're really in a strong position from
3 what we see related to this and our recommendation
4 to you would be to do exactly that, to agree to the
5 terms of the settlement, get this lawsuit put
6 behind you. The reality is from a down -- from a
7 downside, if again great -- the downside to you is
8 if Great Dane files suit, MDM has agreed to
9 indemnify the Airport Authority. So, that's --
10 that's really where we're at now.

11 It's unfortunate the situation's arisen and
12 you can -- you've had to deal with it but, you
13 know, in these tough times, folks are looking at
14 things more closely. And MDM looked at this bid
15 more closely. And Great Dane, although is probably
16 a fine contracting company, their initial bid did
17 not show that they were the prime contractor on
18 prior fuel farm jobs at airports. And they weren't
19 the prime contractor on at least three of those
20 jobs that were over 50,000 square feet of fuel
21 facility.

22 A subcontractor that they have determined that
23 they are going to use meets those requirements, but
24 that subcontractor wasn't part of their bid

25 documents and that subcontractor's not the prime

57

1 contractor. So even though they have that
2 additional depth, it still doesn't meet the initial
3 bid. So, therefore, the -- their bid's
4 nonconforming.

5 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: We'll have to open this up
6 for public comment and then we can get into board
7 discussion. Do we have any public comment on this?

8 (None.)

9 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Seeing no public comment,
10 we can open it up for board discussion, and Jack
11 was the first person who wanted to speak on this.

12 MR. GORMAN: I just have to ask, since that's
13 how I got into this board situation in the first
14 place, who was responsible to review the documents?
15 Because it got to our hands and we approved it.
16 And so as far as the nonconformance of the
17 contract, what entity was -- was responsible to
18 review this contract for its conformance before we
19 awarded it?

20 MR. BURNETT: I -- Ed, correct me if I'm
21 wrong, but the first that Mr. Wuellner and I
22 learned of this issue was when the letter came in
23 from MDM timely filed protesting the bid. That was
24 after the decision had been made that -- that MDM

25 was the low bidder after your engineering

58

1 consulting firm had requested the additional
2 information.

3 And they requested additional information from
4 Great Dane, which revealed this -- the
5 subcontractor -- the subcontractor in honesty has
6 the qualifications. But it's still the technical
7 issue of they didn't have that in their bid
8 documents, so they -- they don't conform.

9 MR. WUELLNER: And they're not the prime.

10 MR. BURNETT: Yeah. If you're asking for the
11 specific name of the consulting engineer? I'm not
12 sure.

13 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I don't think that's what
14 he's asking. He just wanted to know where the
15 problem lie. Jim?

16 MR. WERTER: Yeah. Actually a few questions.
17 Number one, at -- so at the time of the bid, the
18 subcontractor wasn't included in the presentation
19 for the bid. It's not so much the contract itself,
20 but the bid. That's where the problem lies, number
21 one.

22 MR. WUELLNER: Correct.

23 MR. WERTER: Number two. Okay. We have this
24 letter from MDM through Gray Robinson that says

25 we'll -- we'll indemnify you guys. To me, that

59

1 presents a conflict. I don't know if we can do

2 that. A conflict of interest.

3 They're a bidding party. They have an

4 interest in winning this lawsuit. Have they been

5 joined in -- they haven't been joined in this

6 lawsuit because the contract has not been signed by

7 them, or else they'd have to be joined in the

8 lawsuit; is that right?

9 MR. BURNETT: No. They would indemnify the

10 airport. Therefore, if Great Dane filed suit, they

11 would retain lawyers to defend the Airport

12 Authority. If --

13 MR. WERTER: Is that a permissible operation?

14 MR. BURNETT: Yes. And if -- if those lawyers

15 were not successful in defending the Airport

16 Authority, then MDM would pay whatever the damages

17 were incurred by the Airport Authority as a result

18 of that suit.

19 MR. WERTER: Oh.

20 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Carl?

21 MR. BURNETT: The other one thing -- and it's

22 not just a function of them not listing their

23 subcontractor in their bid. The -- the bid

24 documents themselves actually state that the bidder

25 must have been the prime contractor on three prior

60

1 airport jobs --

2 MR. WERTER: Uh-huh.

3 MR. BURNETT: -- for fuel farms, which --

4 MR. WUELLNER: Of at least 50,000 gallons.

5 MR. BURNETT: And of at least 50,000 gallons,
6 which they don't meet those requirements.

7 MR. WERTER: But they could have a
8 subcontractor that they work with that would
9 qualify that --

10 MR. BURNETT: No, because they -- that
11 subcontractor who would be qualified actually
12 should be the bidder --

13 MR. WERTER: The bidder themselves. I
14 understand that.

15 MR. BURNETT: -- on the job.

16 MR. WUELLNER: If he had been the bidder --

17 MR. WERTER: Okay. You can't act as a
18 supplement to.

19 MR. BURNETT: Yes.

20 MR. WERTER: I'm still having issues with a
21 private agency helping us defend against any
22 possible lawsuit from Great -- the name of the
23 first bidder great --

24 MR. BURNETT: Great Dane.

25 MR. WERTER: -- Great Dane. So I'm just a

61

1 little concerned about conflicts. If we can do
2 that, that would be great. I think that's very
3 nice of them, but...

4 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Carl?

5 MR. YOUMAN: The Great Dane then in effect
6 lied; is that correct?

7 MR. BURNETT: I don't believe they lied. They
8 submitted nonconforming --

9 MR. YOUMAN: Then it was false --

10 MR. BURNETT: -- bid documents.

11 MR. YOUMAN: -- false -- false information,
12 was it not?

13 MR. BURNETT: I -- I think that if you --

14 MR. GEORGE: Misleading maybe.

15 MR. BURNETT: If you -- the bid documents --
16 and I see Bill Cranford over there. The bid
17 documents are about this thick. You've got
18 probably a hundred or more questions that you've
19 got to answer. You wind up with a bid package that
20 you submit, and usually they're bound and they're
21 this thick. The fact that they didn't meet every
22 requirement's not uncommon and not necessarily that
23 they intended to mislead or -- or that kind of
24 thing.

1 their intent. It just -- it speaks to
2 incorrectness of the bid, which has been corrected
3 now through not -- not exercising the contract.
4 And now we have the opportunity to go ahead and
5 exercise the contract with the next lowest bidder,
6 which is also the bidder that noticed the problem
7 with the -- with the first contract.

8 MR. BURNETT: Sure. They may not have
9 intended any fraud. They may have thought that
10 having the subcontractor and being able to reveal
11 that subcontractor meant that they would meet the
12 requirements. And when you look at it, you know,
13 if I was in private business, maybe I'd look at it
14 and say that was okay.

15 MR. YOUMAN: That was their interpretation.

16 MR. BURNETT: But we're dealing with Florida
17 Statutes where we have to accept the lowest
18 responsive bidder. And the response is key. It's
19 got to mirror what the bid asks for.

20 MR. YOUMAN: So this company did us a favor by
21 doing it so fast instead of waiting until the
22 contract was let and everything else.

23 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah.

24 MR. BURNETT: Well, interestingly enough it

25 does create more of a problem later because there's

63

1 pretty good law out there from the -- from the
2 State of Florida. That 1932 case, for example, is
3 the main one that sort of started all of this,
4 which says that those contracts are void.

5 MR. YOUMAN: Yeah. That's what I meant, that
6 they saved us a lot of problem for the future by
7 bringing the issue up now.

8 MR. WERTER: I --

9 MR. YOUMAN: If they had started construction,
10 they could have stopped construction and -- right
11 in the middle of everything because the contract
12 was void.

13 MR. BURNETT: I'm sure we'd have a lot more of
14 an aggravation.

15 MR. YOUMAN: Right.

16 MR. WERTER: I don't think Great Dane's going
17 to institute a lawsuit if they see that -- their
18 own lawyers advise them properly that they didn't
19 comply with the bid. So, yeah, it stops it ahead
20 of time.

21 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Jack is next and then you,
22 Buzz, and then we can move on.

23 MR. GORMAN: My only concern was, is that one,
24 is -- is this good for the Airport Authority? In

25 other words, is -- is this technicality bulletproof

64

1 enough that we are completely absolved of any -- in
2 other words, just because another company will take
3 the liability, does that completely absolve us from
4 liability?

5 In other words, can -- can one company say or
6 allude to the fact that, oh, the Airport Authority,
7 all of a sudden for some reason that they don't
8 specify decided afterwards to accept this other
9 bid? In other words, this is what they've alluded
10 to. And I just want to know really how strong this
11 technicality will hold up in court. Because
12 otherwise, you are liable for that to be brought
13 out in court.

14 MR. BURNETT: I think where you're at right
15 now is we've got a pending lawsuit where the best
16 information and the best analysis that we can put
17 towards it shows that the lowest bidder that was
18 selected, Great Dane, did not have a responsive
19 bid.

20 MR. GORMAN: So that technicality is that
21 strong an issue.

22 MR. BURNETT: Yes, sir. And so therefore
23 we've got MDM, the second lowest -- the apparent
24 second lowest bidder, in reality lowest responsive

25 bidder, saying that they -- that they want the

65

1 Airport Authority to reject the bid and take their
2 bid since they're the lowest responsive and that
3 they will indemnify the airport from liability
4 related to it.

5 Now as for the issue of potential liability --
6 and this is just my ballpark; you can't hold me to
7 this, but I -- if you look at a \$550,000 bid -- and
8 Bill Cranford's here; I guess he can speak to this
9 if I'm too far off, but you're looking at probably
10 a 20 percent margin, if that, for the profit on the
11 job. So, a hundred thousand dollars in damage is
12 the margin.

13 MR. CRANFORD: I'd say it's smaller than that.

14 MR. BURNETT: Yeah. In this economy, it's
15 probably much smaller than that but, you know,
16 that's probably --

17 MR. WUELLNER: Plus attorney's fees, plus --

18 MR. BURNETT: Sure.

19 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Buzz?

20 MR. WERTER: And based on -- I'm sorry.

21 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Buzz.

22 MR. GEORGE: A couple of questions. One, what
23 have we learned from this whole thing and what are
24 we going to do different on the next contract?

25 MR. YOUMAN: That's what I was --

66

1 MR. GEORGE: Because it basically sounds like
2 we're putting out specifications and we're taking
3 it on face value that the specifications are 100
4 percent complied with. So in this case, it's not.
5 And it's getting into a bucket of worms. I'm just
6 worried about what we can do in the future to make
7 sure that this doesn't happen again.

8 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: May I make a suggestion?
9 Could we create a bid checklist that goes with the
10 bid, that whoever submits it goes through and makes
11 sure that they have -- they have checked all of the
12 following areas?

13 MR. BURNETT: The bid documents typically are
14 pretty lengthy.

15 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I saw that.

16 MR. BURNETT: I don't know that a checklist is
17 going to save anybody, I -- because I think that
18 where you start is, is whenever you have to
19 exercise discretion. Whenever the consultant needs
20 to exercise discretion to make a judgment call,
21 then my recommendation on that would be that they
22 consult Mr. Wuellner and myself. That way, we're
23 involved earlier on in those types of
24 decision-making processes.

25 MR. GEORGE: Well, since I still have the

67

1 floor, we -- we seem to be caught between a rock
2 and a hard place. We've got federal statutes that
3 say you will take the lowest bidder. And we went
4 out there and defined in the specifications, this
5 is what you're supposed to bid to.

6 MR. BURNETT: Uh-huh.

7 MR. GEORGE: Now someone has come up and said,
8 hey, they're really not because of this paragraph
9 and, you know, lightbulb, yes, you're absolutely
10 correct. Is this the only option, we haven't
11 signed this contract yet, or is there another
12 option that says we go back out for bid --

13 MR. BURNETT: We could --

14 MR. GEORGE: -- with stronger verbiage on it?
15 I don't necessarily want to do that, but --

16 MR. WUELLNER: You could --

17 MR. BURNETT: You -- that is an option, that
18 you could reject all of the bids and go back out
19 for -- and advertise it again.

20 MR. WERTER: But does that --

21 MR. GEORGE: Does -- does that make it easier
22 on us as an entity for some lawsuit down the road,
23 or does it make it rougher?

24 MR. BURNETT: I don't know that it impacts you

25 one way or the other related to that. If you're

68

1 looking at saying I really hate the fact that I
2 have someone with the lowest price that now I'm
3 having to reject and take someone with what I think
4 is the second lowest price, if I -- I think I can
5 pretty well relieve you from that concern or that
6 heartburn that you have. Because there's a lot of
7 public policy, and it's not until you really start
8 delving into this area of the law that you say,
9 that makes sense.

10 You -- there's cases, for example, where a
11 bidder puts in the wrong -- specifies in their bid
12 documents that they're responding to the request
13 the wrong material. And they do it potentially
14 with a malicious intent that if the government
15 entity accepts their bid and they decide, oh, you
16 know what, in reality now that we've got -- now
17 that we've looked at this and priced out everything
18 we're not actually going to be able to perform,
19 they'll back out because they're not -- their bid's
20 not really responsive. So the public --

21 MR. WUELLNER: To protect themselves.

22 MR. BURNETT: Yeah, the public policy is
23 really to say, hey, we've got -- let's make an
24 equal playing field and you say what the rules are,

25 local government. You say what the bids have to

69

1 look like in your bid specifications, and they've
2 got to come back to that. That way, everybody's on
3 the same even playing field. And they submit
4 sealed bids and whoever's the lowest cheapest
5 price, that's the winner.

6 And when you get sealed bids where someone's
7 bid in their package is the lowest cheapest price
8 but they don't meet the qualifications that
9 everybody else had to meet, then you've got a
10 problem.

11 MR. WERTER: Yeah.

12 MR. GEORGE: That's the problem we have.

13 MR. BURNETT: Yes, sir.

14 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Carl's next.

15 MR. GEORGE: And you're saying that this is
16 the -- the best approach from the Airport Authority
17 and the St. Johns taxpayers, is to go with what
18 you're presenting here.

19 MR. WUELLNER: It -- it's my belief this is
20 the best approach.

21 MR. GEORGE: Well, you deal with it all the
22 time. My only other question I had at this time
23 was what does FDOT have to say about -- who knows
24 this situation exists? I don't want to destroy any

25 of our relationships up.

70

1 MR. WUELLNER: At -- at the current time, FDOT
2 is unaware of the conflict. FDOT on our
3 recommendation is they do not evaluate bids.

4 MR. GEORGE: I understand that.

5 MR. WUELLNER: FDOT accepted Great Dane as the
6 low bidder and concurred in our ability to award.
7 If this resolution is fine, I will brief FDOT on it
8 tomorrow and they will reissue their approval based
9 on that. They're not going to get in the way of --

10 MR. GEORGE: I just don't want them to have
11 any ill will feelings toward our decision-making
12 ability or the ability to go through these
13 contracts.

14 MR. WUELLNER: I don't see any impact.
15 It's --

16 MR. GEORGE: All right. Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Carl?

18 MR. YOUMAN: My questions were asked already.
19 Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Jim?

21 MR. WERTER: I don't know if it's questions or
22 comments mainly, but first of all, to send this out
23 for rebidding, it was the frailty of the bid
24 presented by Great Dane who was supposed to present

25 a timely bid. All bid -- it was advertised

71

1 properly.

2 MR. GEORGE: I understand that.

3 MR. WERTER: All bidders were put in there.

4 And what we're doing is even if this was to be
5 reopened, the bidding process, they still would not
6 qualify according to our standards to come in for
7 the contract because of their lack of experience.

8 So, on that level, the issue of
9 readvertising -- if there was a major defect in the
10 bidding process itself, then you fix the problem
11 and put it out for bidding again. For instance, we
12 forgot to put in -- advertise this requirement.

13 MR. WUELLNER: Absolutely.

14 MR. WERTER: Then it would go for a bidding
15 process. I don't see it affecting our relationship
16 with FDOT. They've probably run across this
17 before. We're not the only agency in the state.

18 As far as the fact pattern as laid out by --
19 by Doug, I'm comfortable with how we're going at
20 this point by rescinding that offer of contract to
21 Great Dane, because they ultimately were
22 responsible for compliance with the bid and they
23 did not. So --

24 MR. WUELLNER: If --

25 MR. WERTER: -- whether it was due to

72

1 negligence or fraud, it doesn't matter, you know.

2 So I have no problem with that.

3 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

4 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: No, Jack's next.

5 MR. GEORGE: I want to come back after Jack.

6 MR. GORMAN: I -- I'll be short. I mean, Jim

7 started to answer my question, and it's -- and I

8 know he has -- is certainly involved with law.

9 That's why I asked originally who was responsible

10 for the bid review.

11 MR. WERTER: Oh, the bid review.

12 MR. GORMAN: Because -- what?

13 MR. WERTER: The bid review.

14 MR. GORMAN: The bid review. In other words,

15 whether it was in compliance. Because then, two,

16 he may have answered my question, but I'm -- maybe

17 I'm not completely convinced, would not rebidding

18 it be the absolute way to resolve any liability for

19 the airport board?

20 MR. WERTER: No, I don't think so.

21 MR. GORMAN: That's -- Jim started to answer

22 my question.

23 MR. WERTER: It's a unilateral question. A

24 contract can be revoked due to a unilateral or a

25 bilateral mistake. Am I right? Unilateral being

73

1 someone makes a mistake on one end. Bilateral is
2 both parties make a mistake in the -- in the
3 negotiation or in the formulation of a contract.

4 But in this particular case, there was a
5 unilateral mistake maybe in the review of the
6 bidding, but on the other hand, there's a mistake
7 on their part that they didn't comply -- completely
8 come forth with their requirements. So, you know,
9 there's mistakes all around. I -- I see no -- if
10 the fact pattern is as it is, I see no exposure.

11 MR. GORMAN: So you don't see any -- any
12 advantage to just washing the playing field and
13 clearing it off and rebidding?

14 MR. WERTER: No. They could -- I would think
15 it would be a summary judgment against them.

16 MR. WUELLNER: We actually have more risk
17 relative to the grant by rebidding it only because
18 we'll be really extending the deadline on the grant
19 document.

20 MR. GEORGE: Okay. Jim --

21 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Buzz?

22 MR. GEORGE: To explain to Jim a little bit
23 more about where my line was going. Doug had made
24 the comment earlier that a document that thick,

25 there's always things in there that are not

74

1 complied with. That to me says, okay, now we've
2 opened it up to Great Dane and somebody else going
3 through MDM's contract and saying they're not,
4 because on Page 946, paragraph so and so. And then
5 that gets corrected and it just gets mushroomed
6 out.

7 So my question of laying on the table an
8 option to cancel it was a prelude into what does
9 FDOT say, because you just got through saying that
10 FDOT has lots of contracts. Fine. My reason for
11 asking them was, have you had this before, and what
12 do you think is the best approach to take to it.

13 MR. WERTER: Oh, asking FDOT that or --

14 MR. GEORGE: FDOT, yes.

15 MR. WERTER: -- their opinion, getting their
16 opinion.

17 MR. GEORGE: That was just a clarification.

18 MR. WUELLNER: I think it's important we make
19 a distinction, too, between the specifications
20 relative to the work actually being performed and
21 the qualifications of the contractor authorized to
22 do the work or accepted to do the work.

23 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Right.

24 MR. WUELLNER: We are not talking about the

25 specifications of how the work's done or whether

75

1 it's -- every nuance of every item is done at the
2 end. That's up to us to determine compliance with
3 that at -- during construction.

4 What we're talking about now is the
5 qualifications of a bidder who submitted a bid.
6 And it does not appear that this -- this contractor
7 met the minimum requirements of the bid. So in
8 all -- in the simplest form, they are technically
9 not qualified to do the work that we -- we at this
10 point tentatively awarded them.

11 MR. WERTER: And as far as --

12 MR. GEORGE: Have we -- have we covered our
13 anatomy by going back to Great Dane and saying, "It
14 appears that because of so and so and so and so,
15 there's a qualification problem. If you can
16 correct that, please let me know"?

17 MR. WUELLNER: That was done in a sense.

18 MR. BURNETT: That's -- that's -- that's what
19 happened with your -- your consultant as we
20 understand it. Your consultant opened the bids,
21 reviews the bids, tallies the bids from a dollar
22 standpoint and reviews the qualifications. And the
23 qualifications, it appeared Great Dane did not meet
24 the qualifications. And so additional information

25 was requested of Great Dane and Great Dane pulls

76

1 out -- as I understand it, pulls out subcontractor

2 and says, "This is my subcontractor on the job."

3 And it's almost like if you -- if you had a

4 bid -- and this is why it's easy from a practical

5 human standpoint to have gotten where we're at. If

6 you bid for companies to build you a truck and

7 you've got General Motors that responded to build

8 trucks and you got John Doe, and you say, "John

9 Doe, what qualifications do you have?" And John

10 Doe says, "Well, Ford's my subcontractor." Well of

11 course Ford can build trucks.

12 So that's sort of how we -- by analogy how we

13 get where we're at because the subcontractor that

14 Great Dane shows up with is a subcontractor that

15 apparently is very well recognized for doing this

16 kind of work --

17 MR. GEORGE: But my point is we have --

18 MR. BURNETT: -- and has the experience.

19 MR. GEORGE: -- we have something in black and

20 white that we have notified Great Danes of our

21 concern --

22 MR. WUELLNER: Yes.

23 MR. GEORGE: -- you know, and they have

24 responded down a different tact rather than saying,

25 "No, you're wrong, I am qualified for the following

77

1 reasons." So --

2 MR. WUELLNER: The response to that was the
3 provision of the subcontractor information.

4 MR. GEORGE: Right. Fine.

5 MR. BURNETT: Yeah.

6 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

7 MR. BURNETT: Yes, sir.

8 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Do we have any further
9 discussion?

10 (None.)

11 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Do we have a motion?

12 MR. GEORGE: Your turn.

13 MR. YOUMAN: I make a motion that -- I'm not
14 sure if I'm wording this right; you can straighten
15 me out, Doug -- that the recommendation to utilize
16 the second subcontractor as the lowest bid due
17 to --

18 MR. WUELLNER: No.

19 MR. YOUMAN: See, I've got it wrong.

20 MR. BURNETT: The recommendation -- I guess
21 the motion to be would accept Staff's
22 recommendation and to direct -- through
23 Mr. Wuellner, and to direct Mr. Wuellner to
24 communicate the Airport Authority's acceptance of

25 the settlement offer that's been made by MDM

78

1 Services, Inc.

2 MR. YOUMAN: That's what it is, what Doug just
3 said.

4 MR. GEORGE: If you can repeat it, I can
5 second it.

6 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Do we have a second?

7 MR. GEORGE: I'll second.

8 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. All in favor, aye?

9 MR. GEORGE: Aye.

10 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Aye.

11 MR. GORMAN: Aye.

12 MR. YOUMAN: Aye.

13 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Jim?

14 MR. WERTER: Abstain.

15 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. Can you abstain? I
16 don't know that you can.

17 MR. WERTER: I can't abstain?

18 MR. BURNETT: You -- you can't abstain unless
19 you have a special pecuniary gain or loss that's a
20 conflict of interest. Otherwise you have to vote
21 one way or the other.

22 MR. WERTER: You're saying there's no
23 conflict?

24 MR. BURNETT: To the best of my knowledge,

25 there's no conflict with someone agreeing to

79

1 indemnify another party.

2 MR. WERTER: Aye.

3 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. Then the motion
4 passes unanimously.

5 MR. WUELLNER: And I know you're dying to
6 know. The difference is about \$14,000.

7 MR. YOUMAN: Wow.

8 OLD BUSINESS

9 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. Our next agenda item
10 is old business. We have been asked to discuss the
11 conferences per year, and I wanted to open this up
12 for different board members attending different
13 conferences. Do we have -- Reba, did you have any
14 public comment on this agenda item?

15 MS. LUDLOW: On -- I'm sorry, on old business?

16 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Uh-huh.

17 MS. LUDLOW: On conferences per year. No.
18 I'm good. Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: All right. We'll open it
20 up for board discussion on this item. Buzz?

21 MR. GEORGE: Okay. As far as the conferences,
22 when I first came on the board, I went to several
23 of those conferences and there is a lot of
24 information that board members get from that. I

25 think that they were well worth the money that was

80

1 spent, and in some cases, I couldn't go to some of
2 the other ones that I think I should go on. But at
3 the same time, I don't think -- I think we need to
4 have some limits -- some -- excuse me, guidelines,
5 on the number and the purpose of the visits.

6 I would not want to get into a -- the
7 situation like the St. Augustine City Commission
8 did recently in all of them going to Aviles. I
9 think that the conferences that we go to are great.

10 A lot of times, it's duplication with two people
11 going there, so if there's another conference that
12 can add something, maybe that's another
13 alternative. But I do think that we need some
14 guidelines, and once we start exceeding those
15 guidelines, then it needs to come back to the
16 board.

17 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. What would -- and my
18 thought on this, we have opportunities to attend
19 different national conferences and opportunities to
20 attend state conferences. And then there's
21 subject-specific conferences.

22 Within that, from -- from my viewpoint is that
23 our members should be able to attend a national
24 conference, a state conference, and depending on

25 need, whether or not a local conference or a -- an

81

1 item-specific conference. And if they -- but I
2 don't want to get into -- and as you well know and
3 everybody here, there's a conference a week. And I
4 certainly am not looking for that.

5 So I think there has to be limits. I think
6 two conferences a year is plenty for any board
7 member. And for our -- for our budget. Carl?

8 MR. GEORGE: I -- let me finish.

9 MR. YOUMAN: Go ahead.

10 MR. GEORGE: Maybe a- a twist on that. When
11 we get to look at the budget for the upcoming year,
12 somewhere buried down in that budget is a budget
13 for board members to take trips on.

14 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Uh-huh. Travel --

15 MR. GEORGE: Maybe we should establish what
16 that is, and any time it's deviated, you know, then
17 it's got to come back to the board for -- for one
18 individual to have it deviated. But at least we
19 get it more specific.

20 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I think I'd be open to that
21 type of a discussion. How does the rest of the
22 board feel?

23 MR. GORMAN: Has it been a problem before?

24 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I -- I think that one -- it

25 came back to me that one of the board members

82

1 wanted to have this as an agenda discussion.

2 And I think because now that we're a part of
3 the ACI network and there are so many different
4 conferences on so many different subjects, it --
5 it's become something that as board members we're
6 more aware of opportunity. But trying to be
7 mindful of -- with that opportunity, trying to use
8 restraint for what's -- what's deemed important.

9 MR. GORMAN: Can I make a suggestion that we
10 kind of debrief some of these board members?
11 Because some of these conferences are certainly
12 more useful than others. And -- then, you know,
13 following sunshine law guidelines, whatever, with a
14 debrief, we can discuss whether the -- the merits
15 of each one.

16 MR. GEORGE: That's not a bad idea, to maybe
17 get -- are you suggesting maybe getting a report,
18 you know, within say a month of the time that
19 they're back, that they give a report that gets
20 distributed to the public, you know, and to any of
21 the public who wants it, but all of the board
22 members so that we can see what went on and --

23 MR. GORMAN: A quick little journal.

24 MR. GEORGE: Yeah.

25 MR. GORMAN: Wouldn't be a bad idea. That's

83

1 not -- that's a good idea.

2 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Carl?

3 MR. YOUMAN: From my viewpoint, these -- the
4 two conferences that I attended were phenomenal for
5 my educational purposes as a board member. And
6 what we're talking about may be voluntarily as
7 board members to select out of all of these
8 conferences ones that we all can attend and tie it
9 into the review process so that we get better
10 coverage for all the conferences. But like one --
11 if one person has one interest and the others
12 branch out their interests amongst all these
13 conferences, but stay within the budget.

14 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Let's let Jim go ahead and
15 have his say, and then I can --

16 MR. WERTER: Well, this past year we have a
17 prime example of what you're talking about. I saw
18 an opportunity to go to D.C. to -- you know, for
19 the spring conference AC -- or excuse me, not the
20 FAC -- FAC or ACI?

21 MR. WUELLNER: It was ACI.

22 MR. WERTER: ACI and I came back and gave a
23 report on that, and that was with the -- the
24 understanding from the board, specifically the

25 chairman, that I was swapping out the -- one ACI

84

1 annual conference for that trip. So I did trade
2 off.

3 So what you're addressing here is something
4 that in practice has already been enacted. You
5 know, and I'm an example of that. There are plenty
6 of conferences, you know, interesting conferences
7 out there, but we are kind of restricted as to our
8 two a year. And --

9 MR. GEORGE: Well --

10 MR. WERTER: -- that should come up on a
11 per -- per item, should we send someone to an extra
12 conference to the board, you know, a couple of
13 months ahead of time when it's on the schedule.
14 But to get to a very involved procedure and
15 assignment of various conferences, ACI, FAC and
16 whatever, might be a little too cumbersome.

17 MR. GEORGE: I think it is.

18 MR. WERTER: So --

19 MR. GEORGE: But as a point of clarification
20 for you, it was discussed at the board. It was
21 never voted on --

22 MR. WERTER: No, it wasn't.

23 MR. GEORGE: -- for the two. And so even
24 though you and somebody else agreed that you were

25 substituting one, that was not what the board had

85

1 agreed to.

2 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: No, but he was asking for
3 the board's feedback. He wasn't asking for a
4 policy decision. And that's what he got at that
5 meeting with the board members that were present.

6 MR. GEORGE: Okay. All right.

7 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: And, Ed, did you want to
8 say something?

9 MR. WUELLNER: My comment is that rather than
10 get caught up in discussing the number of
11 conferences, that we maybe refine the conversation
12 in the future to the context of budget. And -- and
13 I think that when we discuss it on an annual basis,
14 we'll begin to call attention to that -- that
15 travel line item for lack of better words.

16 MR. GEORGE: Yeah.

17 MR. WUELLNER: And we can -- I mean, we don't
18 have a conflict in -- in a staff side with however
19 many travel things you deem appropriate for your
20 education relative to the job, but the -- when it
21 begins to impact the budget, meaning we're going to
22 go outside the budget line items for the trips and
23 travel, then we probably need to talk about it.

24 But we'll -- I -- we haven't really made it

25 a -- it really hasn't been a problem yet. But, for

86

1 instance, if we were to spring on us say this year
2 that all five want to go to AAAE, all five want to
3 go to FAC, all five want to go through ACI, I can
4 pretty much tell you we're going to blow through
5 the travel -- the current travel. That's never
6 really happened. So it's never really been an
7 issue.

8 I think probably the most heavily traveled
9 conference that the board attends is FAC. There's
10 probably three or more that try to attend that.
11 That's more relevant to state issues. It's also
12 the least expensive travel historically we do
13 because it doesn't involve airfare and all kinds of
14 other things in the typical fashion. So --

15 MR. WERTER: I could see that it be a -- an
16 agenda item for voting if anything above the two
17 usual conferences or swapping out conferences if it
18 goes above that means of things, unless there's a
19 special swap -- a swapout, like someone wants to go
20 to the Paris air show, you know, then it becomes a
21 voteable item at that point.

22 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: That's where we get --

23 MR. WERTER: Something innocuous like what I
24 did is unin -- uninjurious? Not injurious or fatal

25 to the situation.

87

1 So if it's like going on to an additional
2 conference for someone specific for a specific
3 reason, for a specific material voted by the board.
4 If it's a swapout or something unusual in the
5 swapout, like it's a foreign -- when I say foreign,
6 I mean like Europe or whatever for a specific
7 conference, subject for the board and vote. But
8 you know, as it stands right now, the normal
9 procedures I don't think needs to be more
10 formalized.

11 MR. WUELLNER: Well, as a stopgap, if it's all
12 right, what we'll do in advance of next year's
13 budget discussions, so if there -- if somebody
14 needs to make an adjustment in the total travel, we
15 can deal with it in that context.

16 But in the -- in the interim, you know, we'll
17 advise you if we're going to get close on travel
18 and make the board aware of it and you can make
19 travel decisions from that point forward for the
20 balance of the year based on the available budget.
21 You can amend the budget. You can do whatever you
22 choose to -- choose to at the point it's been
23 called attention to. But at this point, it's not
24 an issue in terms of financial yet. We're just

25 starting the year, too.

88

1 MR. GORMAN: You might reassure the public
2 it's not a tremendous amount of money.

3 MR. WUELLNER: No, it is not. The aggregate
4 travel of staff and board members on annual basis
5 is about a \$15,000 total item. So, it --

6 MR. GORMAN: Thank you.

7 MR. WUELLNER: It's not a -- you know, this is
8 not a \$150,000 item in the budget.

9 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

10 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Carl?

11 MR. YOUMAN: I suggest we just table the issue
12 because it's -- instead of creating a problem, we
13 don't have a problem right at this point in time.

14 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I think that this is -- I
15 don't think that either one of these things are
16 items that we're going to be voting on today. I
17 think that they were just old business items that
18 needed to be addressed as a board. Do we have any
19 other discussion on -- on this?

20 MR. GEORGE: One other point. I feel very
21 strongly that new members of the board should be
22 encouraged their first year to go to both the
23 national and the state. If nothing more than just
24 being able to put names and faces of the people

25 that we deal with around the state. Because

89

1 knowing them or having lists, you know, can help
2 out immensely in their invest -- personal
3 investigations they do on projects.

4 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I would hope that any new
5 board member would be committed and attend as much
6 as they could of the Airport Authority business.

7 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

8 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Certainly. The next --
9 next item for under old business is the annual
10 evaluation for our executive director. I passed
11 out those at the end -- after the last meeting.
12 I'd like to see if I could get those back before
13 the next meeting and have it as an agenda item on
14 the next meeting, and we can -- we can address it
15 once they've been gathered and compiled. Jack?

16 MR. GORMAN: At -- in other words, this is --
17 will you gather, you compile them, and then at the
18 next meeting, you expect then to finalize --

19 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: And discuss them.

20 MR. GORMAN: -- this evaluation? Okay.

21 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Review them and discuss
22 them.

23 MR. GORMAN: We're going to discuss them in
24 public, in other words.

25 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I'm not going to -- we're

90

1 not going to go through a hashing where we're going
2 to hash every -- every item in public.

3 MR. GORMAN: Of course not.

4 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I think we'll review the
5 evaluation as a whole and the compil -- how they've
6 been compiled.

7 MR. GORMAN: So we're just going to have a
8 discussion as to the evaluation.

9 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: (Nods head.)

10 MR. GORMAN: Okay. That's fine.

11 HOUSEKEEPING

12 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Okay. The last items are
13 housekeeping. We had the MS-150, and we want to
14 extend a special thanks to Kevin and his staff for
15 the work that they did. It was a very successful
16 event. Ed, did you want to add anything else --

17 MR. WUELLNER: No, it --

18 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: -- on it? The pictures on
19 it were beautiful.

20 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. As usual, did a great
21 job. Great results. Over 2,000 riders again.
22 They expect to raise well in excess of \$1 million
23 this year again off that event. And it's been
24 nothing but a positive experience for us as a

25 sponsor. And our sponsorship, I'll emphasize again

91

1 is strictly related to the facility and our staff

2 time and all that involved in setting it up.

3 But it -- it gets better and better every

4 year. It's -- I'm speaking for the maintenance

5 guys, but it gets easier and easier every year,

6 too, because we know what to expect of each other

7 and it becomes easier to manage each year. So

8 it -- it's a great event, and add my thanks to

9 Kevin and his -- and the guys for doing a great

10 job.

11 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: And the next item is the

12 annual audit, and it's going to begin on the 25th.

13 Will we have that for our December meeting?

14 MR. WUELLNER: We'll be targeting in December

15 typically, but they'll do their fieldwork in our

16 office beginning the 25th for typically four days,

17 five days.

18 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: And I know that you sent

19 out an e-mail to all of the board members about the

20 Facebook, Twitter and YouTube accounts as we move

21 into the social media. Do we have any board

22 feedback on that?

23 MR. WERTER: What do you Twitter?

24 MR. WUELLNER: I actually, even from sitting

25 here in a meeting can put out there results of

92

1 agenda items or whatever. Instantaneously

2 available if anyone wants to know.

3 MR. WERTER: Do you Twitter --

4 MR. WUELLNER: Before we left the table last

5 time, I believe I had uploaded the -- trying to

6 remember what it was, but it was out there before

7 we even left the table last time.

8 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: It was the passing of the

9 resolution to --

10 MR. WUELLNER: Oh, yeah.

11 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: -- adopt a zero millage

12 rate.

13 MR. WUELLNER: A zero millage. Yeah. It was

14 on our web site. It was on our Facebook. It was

15 on our Twitter before we left the meeting, that it

16 was formal.

17 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Jack?

18 MR. GORMAN: Gives the airport a voice or an

19 alternative to just the normal media, which

20 would -- is good, because you can just -- with an

21 unbiased standpoint, just report.

22 MR. WUELLNER: You might find it interesting

23 to know you have at least one airline following

24 you, too.

25 MR. WERTER: On Twitter?

93

1 MR. WUELLNER: On Twitter.

2 MR. GORMAN: It's amazing the generational gap
3 that goes on between Facebook and Twitter. It just
4 is, because -- but there's such a tremendous
5 ability to communicate.

6 MR. WUELLNER: And I put out on Twitter today,
7 if you haven't seen it, but we've put out that
8 we've made a small web site enhancement that went
9 live today. So if you haven't gone to the web site
10 flynf.com and come up, you'll see the change in the
11 front page right away. I think you'll find that
12 an enhancement that's kind of interesting. And --

13 MR. GEORGE: That will make us all look to
14 find out what it is, right?

15 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, exactly.

16 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Carl, did you have a
17 comment to make?

18 MR. YOUMAN: Yeah, I'm very excited because
19 this was -- this was emphasized in two meetings
20 that I attended, the importance of utilizing
21 Facebook, Twitter, and the social media. And
22 what's happening out there in the interpersonal
23 relationships between the public and their
24 customers is phenomenal.

25 And we came back and had a meeting with the

94

1 marketing gentleman, and Bryan and I -- and Bryan
2 presented it to Ed, and Ed -- Ed went with it. And
3 it sounds like you're kind of enthusiastic about it
4 now, which is --

5 MR. WUELLNER: It's not as difficult as I
6 envisioned, let's put it that way. We'll leave it
7 at that.

8 MR. YOUMAN: And I'll be very honest with
9 you --

10 MR. WUELLNER: I still don't completely get
11 it, but --

12 MR. YOUMAN: -- I haven't followed it too
13 much, but now when I have to really follow it, have
14 we had any negative responses from our so-called 1
15 percenters that of that column?

16 MR. WUELLNER: No, sir. I don't know that
17 they know we exist.

18 MR. YOUMAN: That'd be interesting.

19 MR. WUELLNER: Yet.

20 MR. YOUMAN: You know, I guess maybe -- well,
21 I'll wait till my turn.

22 PUBLIC COMMENT

23 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: I'd like to go ahead and
24 open up the meeting for public comment. Reba?

25 MS. LUDLOW: No comment.

95

1 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Mr. Zimmerman?

2 MR. ZIMMERMAN: Yes.

3 MR. BRUNSON: Randy Brunson, 1110 Woodlawn

4 Road, St. Augustine. Just briefly, Madam Chairman,

5 I hope I'm not -- I hope this doesn't take a vote.

6 It's not on the agenda, but I called Cindy and

7 checked the date of October the 30th that the

8 parking lot might be available, and some

9 nonpartisan citizens of the county would like to

10 gather there on Saturday morning at 9 o'clock.

11 And what's happening is that they're going to

12 parade to Middleburg where they will meet up with

13 people from Jacksonville, northwest Florida,

14 central Florida, and they're going to wear

15 different-colored shirts to form a giant American

16 flag. So, just like the MS is good PR, I think

17 this will be good PR for the airport.

18 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Hopefully they'll come out

19 and see our antique airplanes.

20 MR. BRUNSON: And, you know, another comment,

21 what you were just talking about, lately there have

22 been a tremendous amount of functions here in the

23 conference room. This -- this has been with

24 national dignitaries, elected officials, and I

25 think this conference center is giving us more good

96

1 PR than anything I know of lately. So, I hope we
2 can continue that.

3 And repeating what Ron said, without being too
4 political, John Mica has a very good chance of
5 being Secretary of Transportation -- or chairman of
6 the transportation. So I hope that that happens,
7 because he is so enthusiastic about this airport
8 and -- and transportation, that it's going to be a
9 real plus. And that's all I have. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Thank you, Randy. Please
11 continue to spread the word about the facility that
12 we have here --

13 MR. BRUNSON: Okay.

14 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: -- because we look forward
15 to the additional income it provides.

16 Mr. Zimmerman?

17 MR. WUELLNER: For real this time.

18 MR. ZIMMERMAN: Last -- is this on?

19 MR. WUELLNER: No.

20 MS. HOLLINGSWORTH: It should be.

21 MR. BURNETT: It's on.

22 MR. ZIMMERMAN: Last Thursday at our
23 Industrial Development Authority meeting, Ed came
24 and made a presentation about the multimodal

25 facility, which was nice. And our members, IDA

97

1 members were asking questions that relate mostly to
2 personal things, like feasibility of the station
3 and who and why and where and how.

4 Ed maneuvered the conversation around to what
5 the IDA is interested in, and that's industrial
6 development, economic development, bottom line jobs
7 in St. Johns County. And that was the context of
8 the big part of the meeting, which I think was
9 important because we all have our opinion, personal
10 opinions about the station of where it should go.

11 But given what Mr. George said before about
12 taking a new approach on promoting the station
13 here, you might want to think in the context -- a
14 larger context that the intermodal facility, what
15 that means. People don't know what that means.
16 It's how many jobs are going to be here.

17 The barge improvement. The -- the train
18 facility and other things that you might have
19 planned, as opposed to what would be the advantage
20 to the community at large given St. Johns County if
21 the train station was put at San Marco. And I
22 think that doesn't take much thinking to figure
23 that out.

24 So again, in terms of going in another

25 direction about promoting it, promoting yourself,

98

1 in terms of -- think in terms of jobs, we don't
2 have many jobs here -- how many more would be here.
3 Thank you. It was very nice Ed came.

4 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Thank you, Mr. Zimmerman.

5 Any other opportunities for Ed to speak, please --
6 please notify him or Cindy, because we do need to
7 get that message out. We need to build support in
8 the community. Because this will have a huge
9 economic impact. And the possibilities are even
10 further than I think that people realize, as you
11 mentioned, with the barge and the ability to
12 transfer cargo. Thank you.

13 AUTHORITY MEMBERS

14 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Let's go on to our
15 authority member comments. Mr. Werter?

16 MR. WERTER: I thought it was a very
17 interesting meeting, and some very interesting
18 issues, particularly with the bidding thing.

19 Just a comment on last -- I think the board
20 members -- I mean, I'm more than willing also, I do
21 it through the EDC, to put ourselves out there as
22 representatives at any special occasions. We just
23 have to brief ourselves real well as to give a --
24 an accurate and filling presentation to whoever

25 we're invited to. I saw Ed grimace at the thought

99

1 of more presentations, you know. So on that note,
2 I'd be happy also to help. I promise to keep my
3 sense of humor to myself when I do go out.

4 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: You can keep your sense of
5 humor. I think that would be great, and I -- I
6 think that --

7 MR. WERTER: What, keeping my sense of humor
8 to myself?

9 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: -- having the different
10 board members go out and speak to the public about
11 the different issues, especially when it comes to
12 the intermodal transportation center. And I would
13 invite any board member to also bring Ed along so
14 if there are questions that come up, that he's --
15 he's available to answer them so that we can get
16 the correct information out there and not have to
17 have people wait on it. But I think that's
18 wonderful. Okay. Mr. Gorman, Jack?

19 MR. GORMAN: It was a good meeting. I'm
20 watching this board evolve rapidly. I think it's
21 going to be interesting that we're going to have a
22 return of a board members that's already
23 well-trained, and it will probably just be -- you
24 know, stay efficient. I think we're doing pretty

25 well here. Maybe I'm bragging, but it seems to be

100

1 working.

2 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: It does. Agreed. Buzz?

3 MR. GEORGE: One piece of old business that I

4 don't know if we've -- have brought up and

5 discussed it, I think needs to be, and that is we

6 have another naming opportunity with this airport

7 conference center.

8 And maybe "Airport Conference Center" is the

9 best name, but I know that some of the people from

10 the public have bought it -- brought it up, trying

11 to get us to discuss it. And I think it's worthy

12 of some work done behind the scenes to come up with

13 something. Not by me. But I think we ought to

14 consider it.

15 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Thank you. Carl?

16 MR. YOUMAN: I don't know where to start.

17 Well, first off with the PR part, I'm exhilarated

18 with the Facebook and Twitter, that it's been

19 adopted and progress is being made there and we're

20 going to get a fact page on the web site tie into

21 everything.

22 And Jim's comments about going out to speak,

23 I'm -- I'm for that 100 percent. And I believe

24 Bryan and the PR committee had -- they had put

25 together a -- a good package for us to use, and I

101

1 know that that package may or may not have passed
2 through the system, but I would sure like to get
3 pieces of it, because it -- it was great when I saw
4 it. And I -- I volunteer to go out and speak, too
5 because I -- this airport's the economic engine of
6 St. Johns County in my opinion, as everybody
7 else's. And part of it is the positive PR that we
8 generate.

9 And just going around since we voted for the
10 no millage, I've had nothing but positive comments
11 from people, and they were kind of excited about
12 that. And the general tenor of the publicity we
13 were getting in The Record, which has been fairly
14 positive, is generating a positive response back
15 from the community just in my contacts. "You guys
16 are doing a great job out there," et cetera, et
17 cetera, which is really a change from some of the
18 few -- few, very minor things that I read in the
19 staugustine.com and in the paper which I collect
20 and tabulate just to see where it's coming from.

21 And it's been exciting being part of this
22 board with Jack and Buzz here. I'll tell you, you
23 guys have been fantastic. It's been great working
24 with you guys. I know that you've got one more

25 meeting to go, right?

102

1 MR. WUELLNER: Two.

2 MR. YOUMAN: Two. Maybe I'm ahead of myself
3 so I can keep patting you on the back for two more
4 meetings.

5 MR. GEORGE: Okay. Don't stop.

6 MR. YOUMAN: And -- no. And -- and with an
7 entity like this, if we don't grow, if we don't
8 progress, if we don't go forward, which -- which
9 we're doing and it's so exciting, this place would
10 die. And we can't let that happen. It's too
11 important to St. Johns County and St. Augustine.
12 Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN BARRERA: Thank you, Carl. I just
14 wanted to touch on one of the agenda items I'd like
15 to have brought up at the next board meeting and
16 that's going to be the park area and the
17 development of the park and opportunities to -- for
18 the board to think about, to look at ways that we
19 can develop it and build support for the park.

20 So I'm going to ask that we have a guest
21 speaker come to speak on Bird Island Park that was
22 just opened on Friday. And I've also asked Ed, and
23 I'd like for Bryan to go out and visit that park
24 and see what was done with a really barren piece of

25 land and how it's developed and then some of the

103

1 opportunities that we might have going forward.

2 It was a long -- it was a long process before
3 that park was done, and I would expect our park
4 would probably take a long time. But I'd like to
5 see what could be done with that as we go forward.

6 Thank you all for being here, and it was a
7 productive meeting. I think that our airport
8 continues to move forward. And I appreciate the
9 help of the members of the public that come and
10 attend every meeting and the working together of
11 the different agencies, the PR committee, SAAPA and
12 the businesses all come together working here. We
13 truly appreciate our tenants, and our tenants help
14 to make this airport the great airport that it is.
15 So thank you all. Meeting adjourned. Our next
16 meeting will be on November 15th at 4 p.m.

17 (Meeting adjourned at 5:51 p.m.)

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 29th day of October, 2010.

12

13

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

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

