

1 ST. AUGUSTINE - ST. JOHNS COUNTY AIRPORT AUTHORITY

2 Workshop

3 held at 4796 U.S. 1 North

4 St. Augustine, Florida

5 on Wednesday, January 19, 2005

6 from 2:00 p.m. to 3:51 p.m.

7 * * * * *

8 BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

- 9 SUZANNE GREEN, Chairman
- WAYNE "BUZZ" GEORGE, Secretary-Treasurer
- 10 JOSEPH CIRIELLO
- BOB COX
- 11 JOHN "JACK" GORMAN

12 * * * * *

13 ALSO PRESENT:

14 DOUG BURNETT, Esquire, Rogers, Towers, Bailey,
Jones & Gay, P.A., 170 Malaga Street, St. Augustine,
15 FL, 32084, Attorney for Airport Authority.

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

17 BRYAN COOPER, Assistant Airport Director.

18 PHIL JUFKO and
MARIBEN ANDERSON, LPA Group

19 * * * * *

20

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

24

25

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

2

1 I N D E X

2 PAGE

3 MASTER PLAN - LPA GROUP

4

5 1. INTRODUCTION 3

6 2. DEMAND/CAPACITY ANALYSIS & FACILITY REQUIREMENTS 7

7 3. RECOMMENDED DEVELOPMENT 11

8 4. ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS 75

9 5. IMPLEMENTATION/FINANCIAL PLAN 86

10 6. AIRPORT PLANS SET 92

11 7. QUESTIONS and NEXT STEPS 94

12

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

3

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

2 MR. GEORGE: Let's get the workshop started.

3 MR. COX: Where's Suzanne?

4 MR. GEORGE: Okay. We'll go ahead and the

5 get the agenda started. The purpose of this

6 meeting is a workshop to get a Master Plan update.

7 And I will turn it over to our consultants for the

8 Master Plan, and they will guide us through the

9 presentation.

10 MR. JUFKO: That works. Wow, that's good.

11 Let me get an agenda here. Mine disappeared.

12 I'm glad everyone could make it today. And

13 especially on the public side, thanks for your

14 participation and attendance.

15 For those that don't know me, I'm Phil Jufko

16 with the LPA Group. And we've been conducting

17 this Master Plan over the past year. And we're in

18 the final stages of this.

19 This is the second workshop, and in full

20 attendance, I might add. We're -- we're looking

21 today to get some input from the Authority, as

22 well as any last bit of public input that might

23 have been missed during the multiple opportunities

24 for public input during this process. Today,

25 there's an agenda in front of you so that we can

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

1 kind of stay on track.

2 We have a very limited amount of time and we
3 want to make sure that everyone's voice is heard
4 here. This is for you today, Authority members.
5 And I'm here to -- and I have part -- part of my
6 team here to answer questions, hopefully here
7 in -- in place. If not, we'll definitely get and
8 turn around an answer to you as soon as possible,
9 especially if it's something that we have to
10 research.

11 MR. GEORGE: Okay. Phil, this being a
12 workshop, it's going to be a little bit looser
13 than a strict, this subject and then public
14 comment, and then board comment. How do you want
15 to handle it? You want -- you said this is for
16 the board comment, but you also would like to have
17 the --

18 MR. COX: Public input.

19 MR. JUFKO: There's --

20 MR. GEORGE: -- public comment.

21 MR. JUFKO: There's an overall agenda here
22 that -- that fits in with my detailed agenda for
23 our discussion. I would prefer to keep the
24 public -- unless -- unless you'd like to do this
25 otherwise, I would prefer to keep the public

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

5

1 comment towards the end, or per the agenda that --

2 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

3 MR. JUFKO: -- is before you.

4 MR. GEORGE: I know that this board's going
5 to -- everything that you bring up that they're
6 interested in, we need that to wait.

7 MR. JUFKO: We've always done it that way.

8 MR. GEORGE: We need that to wait --

9 MR. JUFKO: Yeah. We've never had a problem.
10 We definitely need to. And if we can consolidate
11 some items, that'd be great. Otherwise, we're
12 going to go with the flow. No problem. I'm
13 flexible. You know that.

14 MR. GEORGE: Okay. Then that's the way I'll
15 run the meeting, then, that we will go with the
16 flow, and if anybody in the public, after the
17 board's made their comments, if you have something
18 that you feel strongly about, at that point, raise
19 your hand and I'll recognize you then.

20 If it gets out of hand or we're going too
21 long, then I will hold the rest of the public
22 comment until the end of the meeting.

23 MR. JUFKO: That's fine.

24 MR. GEORGE: Okay? All right.

25 MR. JUFKO: Just a note that's housekeeping,

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

6

1 if anyone does get up to talk at this microphone,
2 to make sure they speak into this microphone for
3 the record.

4 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

5 MR. JUFKO: That was a special service
6 announcement. What -- what I intended to talk

7 about -- and I know it will bring up several
8 questions. We've had questions here and there,
9 miscellaneous, over the course of several
10 Authority meetings over the last few months.

11 So, this whole workshop came about as of the
12 last Authority meeting. There were still some
13 questions. And -- and to our surprise, we -- we
14 don't want to go any further without at least
15 resolving some of those questions and clarifying
16 some issues.

17 We felt we -- we did clarify the majority of
18 the issues; otherwise, we wouldn't have moved
19 forward in the process back at the original
20 workshop.

21 But for the benefit of new Authority members,
22 as well as for members that weren't present during
23 the -- the workshop, we want to make sure that
24 everybody feels good about this and -- and we move
25 forward.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

1 We'll talk quickly about demand/capacity, the
2 key components of the Master Plan, because the
3 alternatives is based off of -- of this
4 demand/capacity analysis and requirements that we
5 did.

6 We'll -- we'll jump right into the
7 recommended development process that we went
8 through, as well as, near and dear to -- to your
9 hearts, environmental concerns.

10 And I'll briefly talk about
11 implementation/financial plan. We have some
12 preliminary numbers that we'd like to at least
13 show you and -- and let you know the kind of --
14 the nature of the beast and how we're going to
15 have to deal with phasing of projects to kind of
16 accommodate what the CIP looks like or the capital
17 development program associated with this Master
18 Plan. And we'll give you a first take.

19 Also, give you a little update on what we've
20 done in terms of the Airport Plans Set. I've got

21 the entire plans set here if -- in case you would
22 like to look at it and give you a feel for the
23 type of detail that goes into the set of plans
24 associated with the study.

25 So, with that being said, our demand/capacity

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

8

1 analysis, what -- what it shows here is a -- is a
2 graph that we had forecast. And we've gone round
3 and round on this over the course of a year. And
4 if you look at the operational forecast that we
5 ended up with and that was approved by the FAA, we
6 ended up with, over the 20-year period, about
7 150,000 operations. We're already seeing signs,
8 at least in the short term, that if we keep on
9 this track, we may exceed that. That's -- that's
10 all right.

11 What this is meant to show is that, indeed,
12 we have a certain level of demand. And when we
13 get to the 60 percent of the annual service

14 volume -- that's what ASV is -- for this airport,
15 for this configuration, we need to -- to put
16 our -- get our attention up and -- and start
17 looking at potential projects to improve capacity
18 here at the airport, which we indeed did and
19 included in our alternatives analysis.

20 You'll notice that over the 20-year period,
21 we don't exceed our ASV, which is a good thing.
22 But by time we reach the 80 percent mark or
23 higher, we should have some of those projects in
24 place so that we don't experience an excess amount
25 of delay.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

9

1 MR. COX: What is -- what's our volume at
2 right now on an annual basis? I mean, just --
3 just --

4 MR. JUFKO: Based on the -- when we started
5 this --

6 MR. COX: Extrapolated, I mean.

7 MR. JUFKO: I can give you what we -- we did
8 here. I knew you would ask that. We have 175,000
9 operations, give or take. And that carries out
10 for most of the planning period.

11 As we change the fleet mix out near year 20,
12 that actually gets increased to a level of about
13 188-, 190,000. So, we're still under. You're not
14 going to be experiencing delays, but when we --
15 when we make plans for an airport, we take the
16 time to go ahead and -- and plan prudently. We
17 want to make sure that these projects are in place
18 because funding for them takes years to set up.

19 MR. GEORGE: How does this relate to the
20 135,000 we had last year? Is that a different
21 type of number?

22 MR. JUFKO: Well, we -- we knew start --
23 right from the get -- no, it's the same type of
24 number. From the get-go, we know that we're
25 already, if -- if you look at the very beginning,

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

1 the 2002 number as -- those were the last full
2 year of data at the time we started the study --
3 we're already at the point where we should be
4 planning. And we've -- we've mentioned that
5 several times where, okay, guys, we're there now.

6 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

7 MR. JUFKO: We need to be considering these
8 things. And the types of improvements, which I'll
9 point out again, connectors to taxiways to
10 increase the --

11 MR. GEORGE: Right.

12 MR. JUFKO: -- reduce the dwell time on
13 the -- on the runway, these types of things.

14 Our facility requirements, it just pours
15 right into this. There's the airfield we -- as we
16 know and love (indicating). We have a runway here
17 (indicating). It's in great shape overall. And
18 we have some RSA issues at the other end, at the
19 31 approach end, that we will have to deal with.
20 That's addressed in the alternatives.

21 Our crosswind, if we go according to FAA

22 standards, we would want to improve that runway to
23 a length of at least 3,000 or more, preferably, if
24 we're able to do that. And some of the
25 alternatives we looked at indeed looked at that,

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

11

1 and you'll see the results of that.

2 We also, at the -- at the time when we looked
3 at this, we were talking about using 2/20 as a
4 taxiway runway. Now we know that that is going to
5 revert back to runway per recommendations of not
6 just the users, the Master Plan as well. So,
7 that's a good sign. We're already acting upon
8 some of these recommendations.

9 The taxiway improvements that we see, we'd
10 love to use -- there's some new aerial photography
11 that we received from Staff; however, it's -- it's
12 mostly graphical in nature. We're not going to be
13 able to use it, unfortunately, for our plans
14 because it's not rectified.

15 However, we may change some of the graphics
16 in the report, just -- just for your knowledge, to
17 show the recent changes to the airfield,
18 specifically Taxiway Bravo extension.

19 There are a number of improvements that we
20 recommend that you'll see in the alternatives
21 drawings that will improve the actual capacity of
22 the airfield as it is today.

23 There's a number of support facility-type
24 improvements that were also considered.

25 They're -- they're listed here, fencing, fuel

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

12

1 tanks. There's some things that are required if
2 we're going to continue to maintain a seaplane
3 base. There's some issues in that area we have to
4 resolve as well. And with the new Part 139
5 certification, there's some issues on wind cones
6 and -- that are part of that.

7 In our general aviation needs, we spent a lot

8 of time talking about general aviation, and I'm
9 sure we'll be talking more about that this
10 afternoon.

11 As you see, the minimum -- these minimum
12 requirements are -- are hardly reflective of what
13 the capability of this airport is right now today,
14 given the waiting list that -- that we have for
15 hangar space and for the interest that we've
16 already seen up in the corporate side of the
17 house. If somebody comes along, approaches the
18 Airport Authority, they -- they want to develop,
19 and if given the right rate of return, so on and
20 so forth, you build it. So, this is the
21 mechanical calculated way. This is what we --
22 where we start, and then we start taking reality
23 into consideration.

24 And then we also have some commercial
25 passenger needs that came about of that -- that

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

1 auxiliary forecast that was part of this Master
2 Plan as well. Not that we were going to just jump
3 right into this, but why don't we?

4 We first had to start with a -- with airfield
5 improvements and looking at configuration of the
6 existing and the future air -- airfield here,
7 before we started considering general
8 aviation-type hangar improvements, because those
9 improvements would be based upon what -- what did
10 we decide to do with runway 13/31, and if -- if we
11 indeed tried to -- to go across the street,
12 what -- what impact that would have.

13 As you'll see, here's some characteristics,
14 some positive and some negative, but that --
15 that's the facts. And this -- this is what
16 this -- excuse me -- recommended airfield
17 development does for the airport. Most of the
18 development stays on the existing airfield right
19 now, as -- as we know it. Of course, it makes
20 sense to develop the airfield before we start
21 going to -- to the other side and -- and laying

22 pavement. But I will -- we'll touch upon the west

23 side of the airport -- airfield in just a moment.

24 When we looked at this, the key thing that we

25 wanted to -- to get to was to improve our runway

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

14

1 length and -- and correct the RSA, the runway

2 safety area issues associated with 13/31, as well

3 as at the ends of the other two runways. We

4 indeed did that with this alternative.

5 Actually, this alternative, this recommended

6 airfield development, is a hybrid, and you've

7 heard me talk about that before. We must have --

8 we must have accomplished probably about six or

9 seven variations of airfield alternatives over the

10 course of this alternatives analysis, and we ended

11 up with three, four in the report.

12 MR. GORMAN: When is the time for board

13 comment on these things?

14 MR. JUFKO: I'm sorry?

15 MR. GORMAN: When is the time for board

16 comment on these things?

17 MR. GEORGE: Anytime you want to.

18 MR. JUFKO: Anytime.

19 MR. GORMAN: Okay. Here goes. In a meeting

20 with Mr. Wuellner, he had said that Hernando

21 County had a -- had a spur in it, which was a --

22 MR. GEORGE: Could you speak up? Get your

23 mic.

24 MR. WUELLNER: Railroad spur.

25 MR. GEORGE: The people can't hear you.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

15

1 MR. GORMAN: Right. When I talked to

2 Mr. Wuellner before in a meeting with him, he said

3 he -- in Hernando County, which is a small airport

4 that he had run before, a growing one, but small,

5 that there was a railroad spur in it. But -- and

6 that that was not a problem.

7 Any of these configurations where you're

8 actually going across the -- to the west side, to
9 this land where we have on the west side, requires
10 that you actually operationally have -- cross a
11 major railroad, an active major railroad, and an
12 active major highway, which is becoming more
13 heavily traveled every day. And that total
14 barrier to crossing, it looks like, over to me,
15 just looking at a -- plat maps, over a thousand
16 feet of barrier.

17 And is there any precedent that -- that --
18 that we would actually develop yet a separate
19 airport which would require yet a separate tower,
20 which would have a thousand-foot barrier to the
21 cross of aircraft between one side of the -- of
22 the -- of the airport and the other?

23 I believe Mr. Cox brought up that problem. I
24 mean, I cannot envision waiting with a corporate
25 jet to taxi across, waiting for a train. I cannot

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

1 envision any of that. It seems very completely
2 impractical to me.

3 MR. GEORGE: I -- I think that my envisioning
4 of -- of the plans -- and I could be wrong -- and
5 it could be changed 18 years from now when we get
6 to the point where we actually need to consider
7 doing that. But my plans were, if you land on the
8 west field, that's where your airplane stays. So,
9 if you land on the east side, that's where you
10 stay.

11 Now, if you've got a mechanical problem, the
12 mechanic crosses U.S. 1 and the railroad.

13 MR. GORMAN: Is there any precedent from
14 anybody else doing that with that large amount of
15 separation between actually -- which would -- to
16 me, that's two separate airports --

17 MR. GEORGE: Yeah.

18 MR. GORMAN: Certainly adjacent, but two
19 separate airports. We've already ascertained the
20 fact that we'd require a separate tower because of
21 the field of vision.

22 MR. COX: Is that in the plan, a separate

23 tower in there?

24 MR. GORMAN: Yeah, it'd have to be.

25 According to our conversations before, we would

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

17

1 require a separate tower because of the line of

2 vision.

3 MR. WUELLNER: I think originally, the

4 discuss -- the discussion had -- because it was

5 out 20 years, was actually looking at a different

6 tower facility that would accomplish all of it.

7 It's -- you know, it wouldn't -- you know, you're

8 absolutely correct in that it could not be

9 accomplished from where the existing tower is.

10 But at that point, you were at probably,

11 what -- Dave could probably better define it than

12 I, but at least a Level II type tower, which is

13 not only likely to be funded by FAA versus local

14 funds, like our Level I tower is, it could even be

15 fund -- it could even be staffed by actual FAA at

16 that point, too, unless the guidelines change over
17 the next 15, 20 years. But that tower would be
18 sited so that it -- it accomplished all that.

19 Now, obviously, you're talking about a
20 significantly higher tower in order to accomplish
21 all those goals. You're not -- you're not looking
22 at an 80-foot tower like we have today.

23 MR. GEORGE: Now, if you look at the
24 congestion at Melbourne, Melbourne has two
25 parallel runways, and they have FBO operations on

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

18

1 both sides and an air terminal. The vehicular
2 traffic to get from one side to the other is --

3 MR. WUELLNER: Significant.

4 MR. GEORGE: -- inconvenient, okay? I don't
5 see any way that it wouldn't be inconvenient.

6 But I think what you're saying, if you're
7 serious about it, we might want to bring it up
8 after this Master Plan is over and hire a

9 consulting firm to do a quick analysis of find
10 another location in the county and abandon this
11 field, you know, all together.

12 MR. GORMAN: That would be my point.

13 MR. GEORGE: Yeah.

14 MR. GORMAN: That would be my point. In
15 other words -- well, not abandon this field, but
16 abandon -- this field would grow to a certain
17 extent, and then if you were going to address
18 overcapacity needs, then you would do them in some
19 area in the county --

20 MR. GEORGE: Yeah.

21 MR. GORMAN: -- to the west of here where
22 land is more readily available, where it is not --
23 you know, where it's just a more practical thing
24 to do.

25 MR. GEORGE: Well, one of the interesting

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

1 things about the land that we were talking about

2 there, is most of it is wetlands. And when you
3 start talking about putting a runway in, you've
4 got plenty of wetlands, and so the cost of that
5 land, not anywhere close to the cost of the land
6 to the east of U.S. 1, I don't know how it
7 compares to the cost of land in -- in Hastings or
8 other areas.

9 MR. GORMAN: Well, of course, it's going up.
10 My point to the whole -- this course I'm doing, is
11 that now is the time to actually address the issue
12 of actually disposing of that land to the public
13 good. And even though FAA is not ready for site
14 selection, if we had a trade in place or something
15 for land in the Hastings area, then we would be
16 able to address overcapacity issues in a far more
17 practical way than having actually two airports
18 with a thousand feet between them. That's all.

19 MR. GEORGE: Phil, what -- what would it cost
20 for a consulting firm to do a project like that?
21 That's looking at --

22 MR. JUFKO: It'd be comparable --

23 MR. GEORGE: -- other areas --

24 MR. JUFKO: -- to like doing a Master Plan,

25 if not less. It just depends on what extent

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

20

1 you're going to go in looking for the site. Just

2 to give you a basic feel for this, the process

3 involves a feasibility study that could actually

4 be lot -- much less expensive than let's say a

5 detailed master plan.

6 MR. GEORGE: Uh-huh.

7 MR. JUFKO: And that would determine whether

8 this is even possible. It looked generally at

9 what kind of land is available, the lay of the

10 land, environmental characteristics, these kinds

11 of things, before you go into a detailed site

12 selection study, which is the next step, which --

13 where you're going with this.

14 And this way, you're not spending not only

15 your own money, but the government's funds,

16 both -- it most likely would be a DOT funding at
17 this stage probably. And you would -- you'd move
18 forward.

19 Now, along those lines, these are all great
20 thoughts. You're thinking along the same lines.

21 But in the same token, you have the ability to
22 control some of the development in and around
23 your -- your facility.

24 So, part of this process is to reserve some
25 of the area, which you have done so far in your

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

21

1 current Master Plan, and all this is, is
2 revisiting that action, and -- and making sure
3 that this -- it indeed, or some of the assumptions
4 that were made, makes sense for today's
5 St. Augustine-St. Johns County Airport. That's
6 all we're doing. We're reserving this area for
7 aviation-type development so that you don't get to
8 the point -- let's say you do a feasibility study

9 and a site selection. And what -- what happens if
10 you don't find a site suitable and you didn't
11 reserve? Now you're -- you're stuck without an
12 option.

13 MR. GEORGE: Well, I don't think that Mr. --
14 Mr. Gorman is saying --

15 MR. JUFKO: No, I'm just -- I'm just laying
16 it out.

17 MR. GEORGE: -- in the next 30 to 60 days,
18 make a decision, stop any reservation. Because --
19 and -- and jump on this. He's saying, while
20 that's going on, let's start looking, because it
21 might be a year from now or two years from now,
22 think, bingo, there's a real good reason, like
23 Mr. Ciriello has mentioned several times, you
24 know, going to another part of the county, which
25 gives us the ability to service that part of the

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

1 county a little bit better.

2 MR. JUFKO: Now, I mentioned this briefly

3 during --

4 MR. GEORGE: Is that easier to get fed

5 funding for that?

6 MR. WUELLNER: You're going to have to do --

7 you're going to have to do two things. One is get

8 it included into the State's system plan as a --

9 as a recommendation that a new airport, you know,

10 be -- be looked at generically --

11 MR. JUFKO: In this region.

12 MR. WUELLNER: -- out in the area.

13 MR. GEORGE: Okay. In other words, be

14 considered.

15 MR. WUELLNER: Which currently does not

16 exist.

17 MR. GORMAN: The SIS plan, you're talking

18 about?

19 MR. WUELLNER: The CFASPP plan.

20 MR. JUFKO: No, the CFASPP.

21 MR. GORMAN: The CFASPP.

22 MR. WUELLNER: It's Continuing Florida

23 Aviation System Planning. Once that's identified,

24 it will also -- then at that point gets picked up,
25 or in theory, gets picked up by the National Plan

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

23

1 of Integrated Airport System plan, which is the
2 federal version of airports planning over the
3 country. It will pick up -- once those two flags
4 are met, which is not -- I mean, it's not out of
5 the question; it's just you've got to go through
6 the hoops to get there. At which point, it would
7 become generally eligible for FAA funding and/or
8 FDOT funding for the feasibility aspect. Then,
9 you know, that will take its process. May or may
10 not prove to be feasible from any myriad of
11 directions.

12 MR. GORMAN: My point is waiting any longer
13 due to the rapid growth of this area. Then you're
14 actually out of the --

15 MR. WUELLNER: Of a property reservation.

16 MR. GORMAN: -- practical ability to do so.

17 And it seems so impractical to me, with that
18 thousand-foot barrier, to actually expand into two
19 airports. It seems this -- this alternative is
20 not a practical one. It makes no sense.

21 MR. WUELLNER: It -- it actually -- well, I
22 mean, we could debate the merits of that. But,
23 you know, the reality is this board has, at least
24 at this point, looked at isolating the two
25 aviation operation areas. You've consciously had

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

24

1 the discussion and decision to effectively not try
2 to connect the two, at least at this point.

3 Now, realizing that other runway is way out
4 there, odds are, as the need develops and/or the
5 project develops over the years, which again, is
6 out there a ways, they're going to want to explore
7 the feasibility of linking the two, you know, and
8 then exhaust those discussions and -- and methods
9 and the like that are available to do that.

10 You know, in the event they sig -- you know,
11 they just really can't be connected practically,
12 then I think then you really open the door for
13 separating.

14 MR. GORMAN: And my point would be they can't
15 be connected practically now. It -- it would
16 be -- it's not logical.

17 MR. WUELLNER: Well, you can.

18 MR. JUFKO: Technically, they can.

19 MR. GORMAN: Technically, they can, but would
20 you do it? I mean, who's going to wait with their
21 corporate jet for the train to go by?

22 MR. WUELLNER: Well, you're talking
23 ground-level access.

24 MR. GEORGE: First of all, your comment is 18
25 years premature, okay? There never was in the

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

25

1 plan --

2 MR. COX: You'll be able to hover over by

3 then.

4 MR. GEORGE: There never was in the plan for
5 an -- for an airplane to taxi across U.S. 1,
6 and -- not to my recollection of it, so...

7 MR. GORMAN: So, for planning purposes it's
8 not premature whatsoever to start trying to select
9 land --

10 MR. GEORGE: Oh, absolutely not.

11 MR. GORMAN: -- in Hastings now, because
12 you're never going to afford it in the future --

13 MR. GEORGE: But if you justify that on the
14 assumption that a corporate jet doesn't want to
15 taxi across a railroad, that's no -- that
16 justification won't fly, you know, in -- in
17 getting the feasibility study.

18 MR. WUELLNER: Well, I don't think anyone
19 seriously gave consideration -- I know it wasn't a
20 staff or consultant consideration of ground-level
21 crossing. I mean, I'm not aware of that being
22 done anywhere, anywhere in the country.

23 MR. GEORGE: Well, I will note in the

24 previous plan, there was talk of a flyover --

25 MR. WUELLNER: Aviation flyover.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

26

1 MR. GEORGE: -- you know, where there was a
2 bridge where the planes had to come way too far
3 over because they can't taxi it more to this
4 angle, and -- and that's not in this plan at all.

5 So, that was a result of us talking about it.
6 It's two separate airfield operations, but the
7 businesses share it.

8 MR. JUFKO: Just -- just -- just for your
9 knowledge, Mr. Gorman, you could -- and it's not
10 that we're recommending it because of the nature
11 of this discussion, but it can be done where we
12 have this type of flyover that we're talking about
13 where it starts back here to meet the criteria
14 (indicating), the slope criteria, grading --
15 grading, and go over at this point (indicating).
16 It could be a crossing over here.

17 What it would require is it would require the
18 relocation of the threshold to 6/24. But because
19 6/24 is being looked at for extension, it would
20 still be a usable runway. So, there are ways to
21 do it. I'm not saying it's -- it's the number
22 one --

23 MR. GEORGE: But that's not in our Master
24 Plan now, right?

25 MR. JUFKO: Right. So -- because we looked

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

27

1 at this as a separate airport, I felt, and in some
2 discussions even with you folks, that we should at
3 least look at the ability to connect the two,
4 because you know that that's going to come back
5 and somebody's going to ask that question. So, to
6 let you know, we did look at it.

7 MR. GEORGE: All right.

8 MR. WUELLNER: I think you've got a question.

9 MR. GEORGE: I think we need to make sure

10 that we consider looking into a survey now, rather
11 than waiting the 18 years.

12 MR. GORMAN: It's too late later.

13 MR. GEORGE: Yeah, absolutely, yes.

14 MR. BRUNSON: Buzz, since this is a workshop,
15 he's got some comments, if you don't mind.

16 MR. GEORGE: No. Then this gentleman back
17 here's got some comments, too. Let's let David go
18 first. Go ahead, David.

19 MR. KNIGHT: I just have --

20 MR. WUELLNER: Is that on?

21 MR. JUFKO: It is now.

22 MR. GEORGE: And David is our airport
23 tower --

24 MR. KNIGHT: I'm Dave Knight, the manager at
25 the St. Augustine control tower. I cannot foresee

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

28

1 this being as two separate facilities. The reason
2 being is this: There's no way that you could

3 build a coordination process to enable aircraft to
4 land to the southwest while you have aircraft
5 departing to the northwest.

6 The only way that you could have something
7 like this is a single air traffic control
8 facility. It'd have to be quite tall to be able
9 to see the distances and to see over the buildings
10 that are there now. Even as a, let's say an
11 uncontrolled facility off on that left-hand side
12 there, sorry, I just can't see it from a safety
13 perspective.

14 MR. GEORGE: Wait a minute, David. You can't
15 see --

16 MR. WUELLNER: I think we're confusing
17 separate entity from separately -- separately
18 operated, which is not -- even as it's laid out
19 here, you're not talking about that facility and
20 runway being noncontrolled or outside of the
21 purview of existing air traffic control.

22 MR. GEORGE: The term "separate" that I was
23 using was --

24 MR. WUELLNER: They don't connect,

25 physically.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

29

1 MR. GEORGE: They're not physically
2 connected. They've got a railroad and a road that
3 goes between them.

4 MR. KNIGHT: I understand that.

5 MR. GEORGE: But there's one tower that
6 controls it, there's one security force that
7 controls it, there's one --

8 MR. KNIGHT: I can buy that. I just wanted
9 to put in that little two cents.

10 MR. GEORGE: Yeah. Okay. Okay. Yes, sir.
11 And if you wouldn't mind stating your name and --
12 and where you're from.

13 MR. SESONA: My name is Al Sesona and we live
14 at 394 North Boulevard. And I'm a little late
15 getting into this whole process, so forgive me if
16 anything I say is redundant. But in all of this
17 planning and all, has there been any kind of a

18 three-dimensional model made up of any kind?

19 MR. GEORGE: Phil?

20 MR. JUFKO: Sir, there's -- as part of our

21 Airport Layout Plans set, which is this big set of

22 drawings that accompanies the plan, there's a --

23 what they call air -- there's several

24 airspace-related drawings. And what we have to do

25 is look at the actual runways, both existing and

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

30

1 future planned runways, and look what the impact

2 airspace-wise. We have to protect various

3 surfaces, what we call imaginary surfaces, that go

4 up at different distances and slopes. And

5 we're -- in most cases, we're not allowed to have

6 penetrations to those surfaces. Especially if

7 we're planning a new facility, we want to avoid

8 that. And -- and that's included in this study.

9 MR. SESONA: I'm old Air Force, so a lot of

10 you -- what you're saying is well understood by

11 me, but for the sake of those private citizens who
12 can't walk up to a nice layout like that and get
13 the feel for it, I was wondering -- it was just a
14 question I'd ask. And if there isn't one, can we
15 look forward to getting one?

16 MR. JUFKO: Absolutely.

17 MR. SESONA: You know --

18 MR. JUFKO: Actually, towards the end of
19 this -- this workshop, I might be able to look on
20 my computer and see if I have a version available
21 I might be able to show up on the screen.

22 MR. SESONA: Will that be actual 3-D,
23 something --

24 MR. JUFKO: It won't be 3 -- it will be two
25 dimensional, but it shows that third dimensional

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

31

1 surface.

2 MR. SESONA: No, I'm actually talking about a
3 model, you know.

4 MR. JUFKO: No, sir.

5 MR. SESONA: Okay. Thank you.

6 MR. GEORGE: Any other public comment? Yes,

7 sir. The Honorable Joe Ciriello.

8 MR. CIRIELLO: Joe Ciriello, 5318 Shore

9 Drive. A couple of thoughts.

10 On this runway across the road, I could see

11 that at a point, but as you mentioned earlier,

12 I've mentioned different times of a different

13 airport all together south of 206, between the

14 intracoastal or the ocean and 95 or -- the last

15 time I drove down that way, there was a lot of

16 room on either side of the road if you're going

17 down, whether any of that would be available or

18 not.

19 But as Mr. Gorman also pointed out, and I

20 think you mentioned 18 years, if you're thinking

21 of another runway here or another airport, and the

22 way this county is growing, in ten years, you

23 might not have any -- enough area in one spot to

24 build an airport, even a small one. So, you need

25 to start thinking seriously pretty quick on that.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

32

1 I had one other point. If you thought --
2 doggone it. It slipped my mind, that I wanted to
3 say before I made that comment.

4 Oh, the crossover. A couple of years ago,
5 when I first came upon the idea of putting a
6 crossover across the road to get over on the other
7 side, and another runway over there, at that
8 particular time, I thought it was the dumbest idea
9 I've ever heard, even putting a runway over there.

10 But what makes anybody think that the
11 government or anybody would approve putting a
12 crossover for an airport that's only going to be
13 used, I say a few times a day. You'll probably
14 tell me from the traffic here it will be used 500
15 times a day. I doubt it.

16 But if you go and look in St. Johns County,
17 there's only one place in the whole county where

18 there's a crossover a railroad track, and that's
19 at 312. And how many cars go up and down U.S. 1,
20 every day, total cars, and how many of them want
21 to make a left turn or come across the railroad
22 tracks and get held up because a great big long
23 slow train is coming?

24 I would say that they would have more of an
25 excuse for having a crossover for the expense of

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

33

1 building that than for a few airplanes in a day's
2 time to cross over. So, I -- I think that idea
3 won't even fly. So, you -- you need to think of
4 another airport in another area, is the way I look
5 at it.

6 MR. WUELLNER: Comment to that.

7 MR. GEORGE: Well, what if we -- what if we
8 do this? Let's see if we can't stick to the
9 Master Plan, you know, that -- that we have, which
10 does not require any connection of the two? It

11 doesn't require any flyover.

12 But at the same time, Mr. Gorman, would you
13 feel comfortable in us giving Staff direction to
14 prepare an outline of what it takes for us to get
15 a feasibility study started with the cost
16 associated with it for another airport, and then
17 bring that up as an action item at one of our
18 regular meetings? Then we can approve the
19 expending of funds to go and start that operation.

20 At least we'll have it down in black and white,
21 here's what it's going to take, step by step, to
22 get FAA to participate in a study to go find
23 another one; here's the time frame.

24 MR. GORMAN: Once you get Staff to give the
25 parameters, what we need to do, then I would

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

34

1 suggest using that and then forming a committee to
2 look into it a little further.

3 MR. GEORGE: Well, that's what we can do at a

4 regular meeting --

5 MR. GORMAN: That's fine.

6 MR. GEORGE: -- and not at the workshop.

7 MR. GORMAN: That would make sense.

8 MR. GEORGE: Okay?

9 MR. WUELLNER: I do want to just make one

10 comment relative to Mr. Ciriello. The issue of

11 why or when you'd build a crossing of it is not

12 really as much a function of the number of

13 crossings that would occur, as it would be the --

14 for safety reasons, isolating aviation traffic

15 from automobile traffic. So, there's a whole

16 different series of events or reasons behind

17 crossing over, versus a road crossing.

18 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

19 MR. COX: And there will be 506 operations a

20 day.

21 MR. GEORGE: That's right.

22 MR. BRUNSON: Buzz.

23 MR. GEORGE: Yes.

24 MR. BRUNSON: I'd like to ask David, on this

25 Master Plan for this new runway, do you see that a

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

35

1 control tower could be put and have one control
2 tower that would safely handle -- that you think
3 FAA would approve?

4 MR. GEORGE: A yes or no would be sufficient.

5 MR. KNIGHT: I'm not sure I'm qualified to
6 answer that.

7 MR. BRUNSON: You're better than anybody
8 else.

9 MR. GEORGE: That's something we'll have to
10 look at it.

11 MR. JUFKO: I can answer that yes.

12 MR. WUELLNER: Actually --

13 MR. GEORGE: Our consultants.

14 MR. WUELLNER: -- we -- I was going to say,
15 actually it was -- the first blush of that concept
16 was addressed in the original siting survey that
17 was done for the tower before it was ever built
18 and -- and a location identified as --

19 MR. JUFKO: We currently, just -- just from
20 the nature of the business that I work in, work
21 with other airports to do this. We work hand in
22 hand with the FAA test center up in Atlantic City
23 to do simulation and virtual reality-type
24 simulations of tower siting studies. And you
25 could easily -- yes, it would be a little higher

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

36

1 than the average tower, especially what we have
2 here currently, but it's definitely doable. And
3 it's not -- it's not something we don't see around
4 the state.

5 MR. GEORGE: Yeah. But we don't need to
6 solve it now, because we're at the master
7 workshop. So, if you're satisfied, you know, with
8 that approach, getting us started toward what you
9 wanted, then we'll go on to -- is that okay? What
10 we -- what we told -- what we asked Staff to do.

11 MR. GORMAN: Well --

12 MR. GEORGE: Put together a plan of how we
13 get, you know, a site survey to get a second
14 airport started.

15 MR. WUELLNER: Feasibility of the process.

16 MR. GORMAN: In my own mind, not being snide,
17 but this whole Master Plan is just a -- is a piece
18 of the puzzle to fit into the pie that the FAA
19 wants for funding.

20 MR. GEORGE: Okay. Now, is this an editorial
21 comment or --

22 MR. GORMAN: A little bit.

23 MR. GEORGE: Okay. All right.

24 MR. GORMAN: A little bit. And the fact is,
25 is that that isn't, to my own mind practical, and

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

37

1 you wouldn't sell it to me now or later. So, I
2 mean, yes, if you're going to look at the -- the
3 feasibility of an -- of an alternative site --

4 MR. GEORGE: Well, you and I might not even

5 be on the board when they come up with that, so it
6 won't make any difference whether we approve it or
7 not so...

8 MR. GORMAN: Well, that's probably another
9 point.

10 MR. GEORGE: But we're getting -- yeah. But
11 we're trying to get it started so that we take
12 your idea and go forward with it in a positive
13 manner to get something done. And I just want to
14 make sure that that meets your approval.

15 MR. GORMAN: We'll look at -- let's look at,
16 well, the steps we need, and then we -- then take
17 it further and assign a small committee to take a
18 look at it further.

19 MR. GEORGE: Okay. Fine.

20 MR. JUFKO: One last comment I'd like to make
21 on this. And with any of the large infrastructure
22 projects that we're talking about, there is
23 commonly a couple of things we have to deal with.
24 One's called the benefit-cost analysis that the
25 FAA will have us do on definitely a project like

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

38

1 this. If we ever even go down the road to build
2 this other runway, you have to be able to pass
3 that. And if you can't, you won't move forward.

4 The other part is the environmental side of
5 the house. You have to get through both of those
6 hoops to even move forward with design and so on.

7 So, there are a number of steps. This isn't
8 going to tie our hands or anything. But it's
9 going to be -- let -- allow you some flexibility
10 to plan for the future.

11 MR. GEORGE: All right.

12 MR. JUFKO: As we move back -- back on the --
13 this side of the airfield, we -- we've divided the
14 general aviation development into two areas, north
15 and south, to keep it nice and clean.

16 We went through a couple of alternatives
17 in -- in various variations of those two
18 alternatives. And we had one that was utilizing,

19 if you see how the road goes underneath here,

20 that's kind of where --

21 MR. GEORGE: That's not an underpass.

22 MR. JUFKO: -- the property is. Yeah.

23 That's an underpass. Excuse me.

24 MR. WUELLNER: Going to be a wetland.

25 MR. JUFKO: We looked at maximizing the

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

39

1 potential of this area. We realized that there
2 would be some environmental concerns, some land
3 acquisition involved. However, we wanted to give
4 you some sort of concept to show you this is how
5 you could develop it.

6 And rest assured, in going with this, this
7 gave us some flexibility, because if we went with
8 this concept, at least, the airport could develop
9 as many as eight hangars without probably
10 impacting much off the airport. You could do it
11 within your own envelope. And we'd have to deal

12 with some drainage issues and some environmental,
13 of course, but not to the extent that this entire
14 concept would deal with.

15 So, it allows you some phasing potential
16 here. And that's -- that's always important when
17 we move through the Master Plan process.

18 This is primarily reserved for what were
19 called the corporate-type hangars, the larger
20 hangars. You'll see the word "corporate" used
21 throughout, especially not only up here, but
22 you'll see it from time to time used down in the
23 south area. Not to say we're going to put
24 corporate large hangars down in the south area,
25 but it also takes into account some FBO-style type

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

40

1 hangars.

2 MR. GORMAN: What would your definition of
3 "corporate" be, 4,000 feet and above?

4 MR. JUFKO: At least, yeah.

5 MR. GORMAN: Okay. That's a rough

6 definition.

7 MR. JUFKO: I mean, there -- it is -- there

8 is a clear distinction between this type of a

9 hangar and the type of what we'll call a box

10 hangar where you might have one or two aircraft in

11 it.

12 MR. GEORGE: So, the hangars that we have the

13 material for out in the field out there would be

14 considered less than 4,000 feet.

15 MR. JUFKO: They may be less than -- but it's

16 still that type of --

17 MR. WUELLNER: Those actually are 4,000.

18 MR. JUFKO: They are four right there?

19 MR. WUELLNER: They're a smidge more.

20 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

21 MR. JUFKO: They would be at the low end.

22 But they wouldn't be as small as some of these

23 smaller hangars.

24 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

25 MR. JUFKO: Then we move down to the south

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

41

1 general aviation area. As you know, and for the
2 sake of those that weren't part of the process
3 earlier, we went through several concepts here.
4 And there are some key considerations that we had
5 to take -- take into account along the way.

6 One of the things had to deal with, okay, how
7 would we phase this? Do these alternatives indeed
8 take in the phasing of facilities? And -- and the
9 answer to that is yes.

10 This particular development that we ended up
11 with was in mostly one of the alternatives with a
12 little bit of -- one of the other alternatives
13 added to it. This indeed is the hybrid. And it
14 needed to -- to meet that phasing criteria.

15 It also needed to, because when we're in the
16 middle of -- of the condemnation and -- and the
17 property acquisitions down here, we had to
18 consider, well, how would you go ahead and build
19 this facility while we're still in the middle of

20 this process?

21 And we indeed show that the airport could
22 move ahead and develop -- and not only design and
23 do the environmental analyses, but develop apron
24 and some T-hangar facilities very soon. We're in
25 the middle of that now.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

42

1 Also, part of this deals with a second FBO.
2 And we also wanted to be able to -- to show,
3 whenever we -- we look at new development on an
4 airport, we always want to build in that land use
5 component, as you see here.

6 We have an area that's reserved for land use
7 compatibility, to make sure that there is no
8 incompatible uses adjacent to these facilities in
9 the future. There was also a great concern for
10 any area designed for public use, as well as a
11 community-type center. So, we have that area
12 shown right in this area (indicating).

13 These are the types of facilities that you
14 can get here. Here's the other thing, and -- and
15 this was a good point. It was one -- probably a
16 couple of Authority meetings ago. This indeed was
17 the alternative that maximized the potential of
18 the Araquay Park area, you know, the south GA
19 area. And we have many discussions over
20 preserving old-growth trees and so on.

21 The beauty of this is although we're showing
22 all these hangars there, at any time you can
23 develop this and space the hangars more widely,
24 develop less hangars. At least now you have
25 potential to develop it, if you needed to, but if

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

43

1 you design -- during the survey component of this
2 design process, they determine that in a
3 particular area there's trees that you want to
4 preserve and we have the ability to do that, that
5 the designer can do that, then you have that

6 ability.

7 The purpose of this alternative, and any of

8 the alternatives, is one, can we meet our

9 requirements that we identified in the Master

10 Plan? The answer is yes.

11 Can we do it in the area that we are trying

12 to put general aviation facilities in? The answer

13 is yes.

14 We -- we showed three or more ways that we

15 could do that. This was just the way that we

16 ended up going towards.

17 And the other part had to do with can I phase

18 those in such a manner that I take in my

19 environmental considerations and costs and so on?

20 Yes, sir.

21 MR. GORMAN: I've shown this, because this is

22 hanging up where it can be seen in the public, to

23 many people, and there's always this angst about

24 this large reserved area that you can see, this

25 big yellow area (indicating). And actually what

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

1 that's for --

2 MR. JUFKO: This area here (indicating), sir?

3 MR. GORMAN: No. Here. Let -- can I borrow
4 your --

5 MR. JUFKO: This is the apron (indicating).

6 MR. COX: Ramp.

7 MR. WUELLNER: The button's on the bottom.

8 MR. BRUNSON: That's ramp.

9 MR. GORMAN: Yeah. The button's on the
10 button.

11 MR. BRUNSON: He's got that.

12 MR. JUFKO: If you -- yeah.

13 MR. GORMAN: All right. See this right here
14 (indicating)? That's it. In other words, what
15 are we doing here? In other words, is this for
16 commercial? Is that reserved for commercial
17 development later?

18 MR. JUFKO: No, that's actually ramp.

19 MR. GORMAN: I read -- I read in this -- this

20 bible of yours here that --

21 MR. COX: We're going to park --

22 MR. JUFKO: You're going to park --

23 MR. COX: -- 40 airplanes there.

24 MR. JUFKO: You're going to park aircraft on

25 that ramp.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

45

1 MR. COX: For the FBO.

2 MR. GORMAN: So, that -- and that requires
3 that much area? Because of the tremendous cost of
4 getting all this space could -- in other words,
5 this would not be initially thought of to -- for
6 hangar development? Why such a large reserved
7 area?

8 MR. JUFKO: We had an actual requirement for
9 a large apron area, and the only area that you
10 could get that kind of apron on the airport was
11 down in the south GA area.

12 MR. GORMAN: Okay. I, as a board member,

13 haven't discussed with anybody the large reserve
14 of area like that. And I don't know if the other
15 board members have.

16 MR. WUELLNER: It came out of your
17 requirements chapter. I mean, that -- that's
18 where the --

19 MR. GORMAN: In other words, that's a
20 federally mandated requirement?

21 MR. WUELLNER: It's a function of the
22 expected base aircraft through the fore-- through
23 the forecast period. The -- you know, I would
24 also just make the distinction, too, that your
25 current apron project, as -- as we know it today,

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

46

1 that we're beginning the design efforts on, is
2 only approximately, and I don't know the exact
3 number, but approximately 25 percent of the number
4 that's -- if you -- on your right-hand margin,
5 almost 45,000 square yards of apron identified.

6 You're only looking at about 25 percent of
7 that, is what this current project even talks
8 about. So, you're -- there's no one actively out
9 there designing or -- or creating, you know, an
10 apron that looks like what it is today -- or what
11 it is shown on this drawing, rather.

12 MR. GORMAN: In other words, this particular
13 concept does not include paving that immediately
14 or anything else in this design concept.

15 MR. WUELLNER: No, absolutely not.
16 Absolutely not. It's -- it's looking 20 years out
17 and going, and gee, you know, if every design or
18 expectation of the Master Plan happens, at
19 somewhere around 20 years, you could expect a need
20 for that size of apron. Whether it's developed
21 all there, or other areas are identified in future
22 master plans --

23 MR. GORMAN: And then this is a reserved
24 area, but not --

25 MR. WUELLNER: In a sense. The whole area is

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

1 in a reserved area. That depicts 20 years and
2 beyond of development. It does not depict what
3 two years from now Araquay Park looks like.

4 It's -- it's obvious -- you know, it's kind
5 of like how we developed the east side corporate
6 area, even the existing terminal area. It didn't
7 all show up one year. It's been a -- you know, a
8 constant metamorphosis over 20 or 30 years of
9 adding a building here and adding another section
10 of apron and another building and that type of
11 thing.

12 MR. GORMAN: And the second question -- I'm
13 not going to go on and on, but the second
14 question, this is your public use area here
15 (indicating).

16 MR. WUELLNER: Uh-huh.

17 MR. GORMAN: Have you ever -- is there any
18 other considerations, because we have no -- I did
19 request a survey here that we could have a tree
20 survey or whatever just to start to talking about

21 it.

22 MR. WUELLNER: Uh-huh.

23 MR. GORMAN: But is there any other areas

24 here that -- small areas for public view that have

25 been -- that concept-wise have been thought about?

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

48

1 I don't see any other area --

2 MR. WUELLNER: Interior to Araquay Park, no.

3 MR. GORMAN: -- that's public use, but this.

4 MR. WUELLNER: Interior to Araquay Park, no.

5 There's not -- not a practical location for a

6 viewing area as such. It's basically been in a

7 sense shoved to the other side where it's

8 actually -- actually more proximate to the runway

9 environment eventually in terms of visibility,

10 being able to see something meaningful.

11 MR. GORMAN: I'm disappointed we hadn't --

12 didn't have a survey we could look at right now,

13 because that was a question.

14 MR. WUELLNER: Well, you've got a different
15 consultant involved, and they've got some data for
16 you to look at in the next meeting. I mean, at
17 least, yeah, per your -- our discussion.

18 MR. GORMAN: You don't feel it's relevant for
19 us to look at that survey data now?

20 MR. WUELLNER: Not from a planning
21 standpoint. I think as we -- we look at the
22 individual projects that will ultimately make up
23 this, absolutely. It's a -- it's an engineering
24 item, not a --

25 MR. JUFKO: Now, there were areas, maybe not

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

49

1 as large as what we ended up with here, but when
2 we had started looking at viewing-type facilities,
3 you'll notice there was a viewing area in each of
4 the alternatives. Some of them -- some of that
5 was up in this general vicinity here, Mr. Gorman
6 (indicating). And we -- we had considered those.

7 We ended up with this area here (indicating).

8 When you kind of looked at all three and -- and

9 the various subalternatives, this is where we

10 ended up with as -- as a selected -- or a

11 recommended GA area of development.

12 The purpose of this is to give whatever

13 consultant comes along, or airport staff, the

14 Airport Authority some general guidance in how

15 this area could be developed. What's really going

16 to determine that is, what's my waiting list

17 today? What kind of corporate or FBO or

18 maintenance-type activities come along and

19 approach the airport and say, "I want to operate

20 at this airport? Can you accommodate me?"

21 And the answer is, yes, we can. We've proven

22 that we can do it. If you didn't have this in

23 your Master Plan, you didn't think this -- that

24 far ahead 20 years, you might get a business that

25 comes to the Airport Authority saying, "I'd like

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

1 to locate at your airport," and you don't have a
2 place to put them.

3 MR. WUELLNER: And -- and a classic example
4 of -- of what I would consider really, really poor
5 planning in regard to trying to deal with
6 individual requests without a big picture plan on
7 how to develop that in a way that makes sense, is
8 Merritt Island Airport.

9 If you've ever been into that -- that
10 particular airport and tried to literally create
11 a -- kind of a winding street environment between
12 hangars and -- and the like, because it just
13 never, you know, until recent years has not even
14 conceptualized a plan that laid it out so that it
15 was efficiently and safely used and -- and made
16 good use of the property they had.

17 MR. GEORGE: Phil, your company has spent a
18 lot of time with the volume, the forecast and, you
19 know, volumes and aircraft based here, this, that,
20 and the other, and your charts are oriented toward

21 what we have a need for over the next 20 years.

22 Have you put any kind of charts together that

23 say what we need now, what we need next year, what

24 we need the next year? This might be helpful in

25 people visualizing that, okay, this is a plan for

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

51

1 20 years, but that FBO, that FBO is, you know,

2 based on the volumes you're telling me, is out

3 nine years.

4 Now, I realize I've got to think about it

5 every year and don't take all of my space for it,

6 but my immediate need is for T-hangars and small

7 corporate hangars. And so, we need to, after this

8 Master Plan, focus our attention on how do we ease

9 into that. Have you done any kind of --

10 MR. JUFKO: Yes, sir.

11 MR. GEORGE: -- list like that?

12 MR. JUFKO: We're in -- you're -- you're

13 right on. And it's one of the very last stages

14 of -- of the -- of the study. It has to deal with
15 developing the capital development program.
16 There's a short, intermediate, and a long-term
17 breakout of that.

18 The short term, we usually break it year by
19 year for a period of five years, so that you --
20 you can make some fairly concise decisions
21 regarding financing both here locally as well as
22 obtaining grant, available grants through FAA
23 and -- and DOT.

24 You have a JACIP program through the State of
25 Florida -- the State of Florida and FDOT and the

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

52

1 FAA that you work with, with those representatives
2 on a year-to-year basis.

3 We've taken the projects that come out of
4 this Master Plan that are likely to occur, not
5 only based on requirements that we see in
6 activity -- that's -- that's one of the first

7 concerns. We start there. But then we start
8 taking in common-sense-type things, like where's
9 our waiting list? How many people have approached
10 us and we had to put them off because we didn't
11 have a Master Plan complete yet? Those kinds of
12 things.

13 And we can push projects up sooner than
14 later, because it takes that much lead time.
15 We'll talk about that towards the end of my
16 presentation.

17 MR. GEORGE: Okay. Okay. The one thing, Ed,
18 that you mentioned, you said that the apron
19 project that we're presently working on -- and --
20 and I'm not sure that I'm aware of what project
21 we're working on, other than attempting to try to
22 find funding to help us with the clearance of that
23 area and to put in the basic understructure. Is
24 that what you --

25 MR. WUELLNER: That's correct. I mean,

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

1 that's -- keep turning this thing off, but --

2 MR. GEORGE: I wish you wouldn't breathe so
3 hard.

4 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, that's part of the
5 problem. Is it on now?

6 MR. JUFKO: Yes.

7 MR. WUELLNER: The first phase of the apron,
8 as it's being, you know, being proffered with FAA
9 and we currently have design funds from FAA to do,
10 is -- is truly oriented at opening up the area.

11 It -- it's not a -- a huge apron area in and of
12 itself to go park airplanes out in the open, as
13 you might traditionally think of it.

14 If we were expanding the existing FBO apron,
15 clearly, that's all that purpose is, is to make
16 that area bigger to park more airplanes.

17 This first phase does two things. It
18 provides the access, those two little pieces of
19 taxiway that open up the area, will likely provide
20 a glorified or slightly wider version of a taxiway
21 access into what is now Araquay Park to facilitate

22 the development of T-hangars and other hangars,
23 primarily the area between what is Casa Cola and
24 what is our -- what is our new maintenance
25 building.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

54

1 MR. GEORGE: At what point in time do we
2 select some engineering firm to tell us, here's
3 your initial needs for four rows of T-hangars, 48,
4 and here's where we suggest the board consider
5 approving to put them?

6 MR. WUELLNER: You -- you are beginning the
7 first phase of that now. You are doing -- they're
8 doing the preliminary engineering, for lack of
9 better terms. They're doing the data-gathering
10 necessary, the topographic information, the
11 geotechnical information, the tree survey
12 information that will assist them in giving you
13 some alternatives as to how they want to
14 facilitate the access.

15 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

16 MR. WUELLNER: The next piece of the puzzle
17 is, all right, exactly where or how do we want to
18 develop hangars? That will be later this year,
19 moving into, you know, an 18-month to two-year
20 period for realization of new T-hangars and/or new
21 other types of hangars.

22 MR. GEORGE: So, we've got a lot more input
23 than --

24 MR. WUELLNER: Oh, you've got a lot of
25 engineering input coming. This is just saying,

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

55

1 you know, some day, this -- this would maximize
2 use of the property. It's not necessarily the
3 practical application of the property back there.

4 MR. GEORGE: Yeah. Okay.

5 One of the things that I foresee is, as we're
6 coming up with our first project, you know, it
7 could be to somehow or another take this further

8 out (indicating), so that this road can be used
9 for a park right here (indicating). Because a
10 park is going to be, you know, grass and some
11 structure. It's not -- it's not going to cost us
12 that much if five years from now we tear it down
13 because now we have to use that and we put it over
14 here. But at least we're getting something of
15 that now, you know. And that --

16 MR. GORMAN: Exactly. Do the reservations
17 now for public use as part of a concept.

18 MR. WUELLNER: The time to really jump on
19 that is as we're developing the engineered
20 documents. You know, as you -- if you want to
21 reserve areas of old-growth trees as, you know,
22 milling areas, for lack of better terms, or
23 whatever you want to do, you know, as those
24 engineering projects that piece together
25 ultimately 44,000 square yards of apron over the

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

1 next 20 years, that -- that's where you say, all
2 right, we're reserving this corner of old-growth
3 trees as a do-not-disturb area from this point
4 forward in our -- in our planning and development.

5 And you'll have those areas identified as a
6 part of the -- this first effort that Passero is
7 doing for you on the initial engineering. You can
8 start making those decisions based on something
9 tangible, either visibility of runway or
10 old-growth trees or whatever you -- whatever you
11 want to throw out as parameter.

12 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

13 MR. JUFKO: Just to give you an idea, this
14 first five years, you may have been looking at
15 somewhere between, I don't know, as for T-hangars,
16 36 to 48 T-hangars, as we envision, based on
17 demand. And then that's just to give you a
18 magnitude. Obviously, there's more than that
19 there. So -- but in the first five years, you may
20 develop plans to develop those hangars.

21 Yes, sir?

22 MR. GORMAN: Following Buzz's thread there,
23 in other words, with the here and now, if we don't
24 have any more impediments to -- what do you see 36
25 T-hangars going in the ground at, one year, two

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

57

1 years?

2 MR. JUFKO: Over the course --

3 MR. WUELLNER: If all goes well, I think
4 you're -- you're looking at occupancy in
5 approximately 24 months. I mean, it will take
6 that long to get there.

7 MR. JUFKO: And just to recap, this is the
8 overall development program where we take
9 reserving this area here (indicating) for future
10 development. That's way off in the long term and
11 beyond the 20 years, most likely.

12 We also have -- we've discussed the -- the
13 south GA area, the north GA area, and then there's
14 runway improvements that are more short term to

15 beginning of the intermediate term, six -- five,
16 six, seven years to actually make these
17 improvements here on the main runway.

18 As we also move into the intermediate term,
19 you know, a good ten years into our planning
20 study, we could look at the potential for an
21 extension of this runway. And a lot of this stuff
22 has to do with the ability of -- of the airport to
23 get grants, to fund them, to pass the hurdles of
24 benefit-cost analyses and environmental studies.
25 But this is the start. This is the beginning.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

58

1 We've also talked about much of a long-term
2 type of thought, if indeed we started going over
3 here, that, you know, perhaps we now open up this
4 area for some sort of development on the airport
5 (indicating). Very long-term-type thinking.
6 That's why it's just shaded.

7 MR. GEORGE: We have a public comment.

8 MS. BADGER: Sherry Badger, 2772 South
9 Collins Avenue. I don't really have anything to
10 do with this. I am a taxpayer. But how can you
11 develop a master plan when you're considering
12 using land across the highway? And then now
13 you're not going -- you're considering that, but
14 you're also considering looking at other plans.
15 Y'all are talking in circles, because he's talking
16 if this was across the highway, you would have
17 this many airplane hangars here.

18 Not only are you stealing people's --
19 considering stealing people's property, our
20 taxpayers pay, give y'all money. And, you know,
21 it's not going to go over very well. Well, how --
22 how can they sit here and say this is the Master
23 Plan and you're going to go across the highway and
24 you need all this hangar space if you're going to
25 be looking at other land to build somewhere else?

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

1 MR. GEORGE: My daughter had a master plan
2 that she wanted to get married when she was 25, at
3 five years, and there were some changes that
4 occurred. She didn't get married when she was 25.
5 She got married at 26.

6 So -- but the point is, this is a concept
7 that shows that we have thought about what the
8 needs of the county are for aviation, and we've
9 come up with something that we can put on paper
10 that the County Commission can go back and
11 reference, that this is a possibility, that this
12 can go back that they could reference, this is a
13 possibility. Okay?

14 MS. BADGER: My point is, this -- this gives
15 y'all the right to eminent domain people and take
16 their land if they don't want to sell it? Well,
17 you know, I mean, these people are being pushed
18 out of their land.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It exists by law.

20 MS. BADGER: Our taxpayers' dollars are
21 paying for it. How can they say they're
22 developing a master plan --

23 MR. GEORGE: Right. I think I've got --

24 MS. BADGER: -- when you're considering

25 moving the airport somewhere else?

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

60

1 MR. GEORGE: I think that we have two -- two

2 subjects. One is to be able to plan for 20, 25

3 years down the road and look at the alternatives.

4 The other one is to meet the needs today.

5 MS. BADGER: Where are you planning --

6 MR. GEORGE: And in 1985, someone did a

7 forecast and said, "You're going to outgrow your

8 limitations of this airport based on what we know

9 now." And in '92-- '95, I guess it was, the

10 Master Plan said you're going to do it again. And

11 I think three years ago, the board members says,

12 yeah, looks like we're going to do it. Well, we

13 are here.

14 MS. BADGER: Well, shame on --

15 MR. GEORGE: The daughter's getting married.

16 MS. BADGER: -- the board for not buying

17 Hastings 13 years ago.

18 MR. HICKOX: You can't blame this board for

19 that.

20 MR. GEORGE: Yes, ma'am.

21 MS. McELROY: Carolyn McElroy, Araquay Park.

22 I'm interested. I got here late. What is the

23 green right along the bottom where my house is

24 there? I noticed it on the other -- the one, the

25 first back. What does that mean?

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

61

1 MR. JUFKO: Where are you?

2 MR. COX: It was --

3 MS. McELROY: Along the marsh.

4 MR. BURNETT: The paved area.

5 MS. McELROY: The sea green or the different

6 color green right along the marsh there.

7 MR. JUFKO: This here?

8 MS. McELROY: Yes, that.

9 MR. JUFKO: Those are roadways.

10 MS. McELROY: Roadways. Roadways to where?

11 MR. JUFKO: To access these -- these hangar

12 facilities.

13 MS. McELROY: Where's the hangars?

14 MR. JUFKO: There, there, there.

15 MR. GEORGE: Those are the medium green.

16 MS. BADGER: What they're building in 20

17 years.

18 MS. McELROY: Those are -- wait, wait, wait.

19 Those are hangars. You have hangars in green up

20 there. Then you have this turquoisey-green down

21 here along the bottom. What is that?

22 MR. JUFKO: They're different -- they're

23 different types of hangars. That's the reason

24 they're given different colors.

25 MS. McELROY: Okay. What kind of hangars are

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

1 those?

2 MR. JUFKO: Which ones, these?

3 MS. McELROY: The turquoisey-green.

4 MR. GEORGE: Those are the corporate hangars
5 we were talking about.

6 MR. JUFKO: Corporate-style, box-style
7 hangars we were talking about.

8 MS. McELROY: You're going to put them right
9 there. That's what you're going to go on February
10 1st to court and say that that's what you're going
11 to do with that land?

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

13 MS. McELROY: No? That's not what you're
14 going to do?

15 MR. BURNETT: Let me -- let me jump -- let me
16 jump in. Let me jump in and say one thing. For
17 the record, Doug Burnett, the attorney for the
18 Airport Authority. No one's going to -- there's
19 not going to be a comment on the airport's behalf
20 unless the board decides otherwise. As far as
21 what's going to be said on the February hearing,
22 that taking hearing relates to the Airport

23 Authority's Master Plan as it's already been
24 adopted, which is a separate issue than this
25 issue.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

63

1 This is a Master Plan consideration that's
2 under consideration that continues to be
3 developed.

4 MS. McELROY: Oh, it's the past Master Plan,
5 the one that was done five years ago that you're
6 using to go to court with?

7 MR. WUELLNER: Nine years ago.

8 MS. McELROY: And -- and you think that we're
9 not going to bring up that there's a new Master
10 Plan?

11 MR. BURNETT: There is not a new Master Plan.
12 This -- this has not been adopted.

13 MS. McELROY: You just said there was a new
14 Master Plan. Well, a Master Plan that is being
15 considered, which is what you're going forward on,

16 actually.

17 MR. BURNETT: I'm not going to comment on the
18 legal issues, and I don't know that this is the
19 appropriate place for it. This is a workshop for
20 the Master Plan that's being considered and being
21 developed by LPA, the airport's consultants. This
22 has not been adopted yet.

23 MS. McELROY: True. True. All right. So,
24 the old Master Plan would be what is being used
25 for the February court business.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

64

1 MR. WUELLNER: Correct.

2 MR. BURNETT: To the extent it's necessary to
3 use it.

4 MS. McELROY: Yeah. Thank you.

5 MR. GEORGE: Okay. Any other public comment?

6 MR. GARDNER: Yes. I'd like to --

7 MR. GEORGE: You have to get to the mic and
8 say who you are, Bill.

9 MR. BRUNSON: Want to know your address, too.

10 MR. GARDNER: I am Bill Gardner on behalf of

11 the citizens of St. Augustine. I'd like to -- if

12 I can, do we have any other graph --

13 MR. GEORGE: Citizens of St. Augustine, is

14 that an organization that you're representing

15 here?

16 MR. GARDNER: No. Just --

17 MR. GEORGE: You said "on behalf of." I

18 didn't know if that was an organization.

19 MR. GARDNER: No, it's not an organization.

20 MR. GEORGE: Okay. I'm sorry.

21 MR. GARDNER: That's okay. Do we have

22 another slide that shows the hangar area and the

23 terminal area a little more?

24 MR. JUFKO: Over in this facility -- this

25 area?

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

65

1 MR. GARDNER: No, just below -- below there.

2 Yeah, that area with the hangars. Do we have
3 another one?

4 MR. WUELLNER: There are no hangars in that
5 area.

6 MR. JUFKO: Right. There are -- actually are
7 no hangars below that area there that you're
8 pointing to, but let's see here.

9 MR. WUELLNER: Get out of the FBO area.

10 MR. COX: There was the FBO office where
11 you're talking about -- where you're talking
12 about.

13 MR. GARDNER: Yeah. I'm talking about the
14 FBO all the way down to where we are.

15 MR. GORMAN: Can we use an aerial photograph
16 on the wall there?

17 MR. GEORGE: What do you want to --

18 MR. GARDNER: We have the plan. I saw it,
19 you know, in the -- in the -- in our little
20 clubhouse, we had that plan. I thought maybe that
21 might have had a graph of the same thing.

22 MR. JUFKO: We have the overall. Yeah, I
23 know what you're saying there. They --

24 MR. GARDNER: Well, I'd like to walk up there
25 and point. It's probably easier for me than to be

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

66

1 at this microphone. Okay. Great.

2 MR. COX: Bill, does it have -- does it
3 pertain to the Master Plan as we're discussing it
4 now?

5 MR. GARDNER: Yes.

6 MR. COX: Okay.

7 MR. GARDNER: On the Master Plan, about a
8 year ago, I had mentioned -- I forget your name,
9 I'm sorry -- about having something for people
10 that normally sometimes would be driving by and
11 they'll have their cars parked on the side of the
12 road, watching airplanes or whatever.

13 I know we were talking about putting some
14 kind of park down here. But at that time, when I
15 was at the meeting, I had mentioned that this area
16 right here where the hangars are, there's a little

17 creek right along here. And I believe the fence
18 is just right on the side there (indicating).
19 Talking about putting a little place there where
20 we could have some picnic tables and maybe a
21 little overhang for the sun so that we could have
22 people, if they wanted to, watch airplanes.
23 And it's in an area where you can see the
24 most activity. And I think it's a wonderful place
25 to, you know, for anybody who wants to --

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

67

1 MR. GEORGE: Phil, was that considered?
2 MR. JUFKO: It was considered. And -- and
3 depending, the magnitude of -- that -- that had
4 limited options for development there. And
5 depending on the magnitude of development, that is
6 indeed in the approaches to both runways, so
7 those -- there are some considerations associated
8 with that due to safety.
9 But it is possible, and it just depends on

10 what we're talking about putting there. If
11 it's -- if it's area for parking or if it's an
12 area just for viewing and the parking occurs maybe
13 out of the approach a little bit --

14 MR. GARDNER: Yeah, this -- the area I was
15 pointing out, yes, it's -- it's in the approach
16 for this runway. I understand what you're talking
17 about there. Whether -- and I don't know. Are we
18 actually going to be closing down one of these
19 runways, or is that the plan, to close down one of
20 these runways?

21 MR. GEORGE: That's not the plan.

22 MR. JUFKO: Not at this point.

23 MR. GARDNER: Okay. Well, another -- another
24 thought would be, on this side of the creek where
25 this taxiway is here, you could use this area here

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

1 as well (indicating). And -- or if you wanted to
2 get out of the approach, you could use this area

3 (indicating).

4 But I thought that -- either -- either
5 somewhere along this side here (indicating) or
6 here, somewhere where just inside, you just move
7 the fence a bit -- a bit inward or whatever to --

8 MR. COX: But those fences are there
9 specifically for the runway safety environment. I
10 mean, because of the approaches, it's going to --
11 you're going to impinge on the approach safety
12 environment there.

13 MR. GARDNER: By moving the -- by moving the
14 fence in?

15 MR. JUFKO: Moving the fence would -- and
16 then, also, the height of it is part of the
17 equation.

18 MR. GEORGE: Bill, I think that the Master
19 Plan identifies the need for a viewing area as we
20 have back there. And as we were talking, as we
21 get into implementation of building one hangar or
22 whatever, that's the time to bring that up again,
23 to see if we want to go ahead and add at that

24 point.

25 MR. GARDNER: Okay.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

69

1 MR. GEORGE: But the need for putting in a
2 viewing area in the best place that the
3 consultants have come up with at this point is
4 there. But we can consider that as we start
5 getting into building projects, because this is
6 not a building project, but just a plan.

7 MR. GARDNER: I wish you would, because I've
8 had a lot of input from parents of my Young
9 Eagles.

10 MR. GEORGE: Okay. That's good. We are --
11 we -- I don't mean to cut you off, but --

12 MR. GARDNER: I just wanted -- one thing.
13 Aero Sport, also talking to Aero Sport, they were
14 saying that that would be a great thing, as well.
15 So, it wasn't just me. There's other backing
16 behind it.

17 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

18 MR. GORMAN: So, what you're saying, Buzz, is
19 then that's going to be part of the engineering
20 implementation, and that my only input would be
21 that we could use more than one, but that would be
22 part of the engineering implementation.

23 MR. GEORGE: I would think so, yes.

24 MR. GORMAN: Yeah. But we -- but then the
25 board should get direct involvement with it.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

70

1 MR. GEORGE: Absolutely, we should. Right.

2 MR. JUFKO: We needed to identify a need for
3 it, which we did, based on what the public comment
4 was, and at least give some sort of alternatives
5 to accommodate that.

6 MR. GEORGE: Right.

7 MR. JUFKO: And I think that's a good point
8 that you made, that during the design process, you
9 could add more than one if you so desire.

10 MR. GEORGE: Right. Mr. Ciriello.

11 MR. GARDNER: Okay. Great. Thank you.

12 MR. CIRIELLO: Yes. I have a few questions
13 and a comment. One quick question. Is a master
14 plan considered a legal document?

15 MR. GEORGE: Doug?

16 MR. COX: Excuse me for a minute, folks. I
17 tell you what. If you guys have external comments
18 without being recognized by the board, would you
19 mind taking them outside, because you two have
20 been conversing throughout this whole meeting
21 outside of our conversations, and it's beginning
22 to get on my nerves because I can't pay attention
23 to what he's saying. So, if you have external
24 conversations without being recognized by the
25 Chair, please take it outside, okay?

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

71

1 MR. BURNETT: I guess, Mr. Ciriello, to

2 answer your question, I'm trying to figure out the

3 context of -- of why -- for what reason would it
4 be a legal document. I guess I'm trying to
5 understand the motivation of the question --

6 MR. CIRIELLO: Well, let me --

7 MR. BURNETT: -- to be able to answer it.

8 MR. CIRIELLO: Let me clarify it.

9 MR. BURNETT: Is it a legal document that the
10 airport's required to make -- to plan?

11 MR. CIRIELLO: No, no. That's not what my
12 thinking was. Right now, we are working on a
13 Master Plan that has been approved, what, six,
14 seven, eight years ago?

15 MR. GEORGE: Seven.

16 MR. CIRIELLO: And that's --

17 MR. BURNETT: It may have been -- may have
18 been longer.

19 MR. CIRIELLO: Well, yeah. But, I mean,
20 we're working on the Master Plan.

21 MR. GEORGE: There was an update in '95, I
22 think.

23 MR. CIRIELLO: Now, this Master Plan, until
24 the board approves it, sends it to the FAA, and

25 they send it back and say it's okay, is -- is

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

72

1 nothing. I mean, you go -- we're going by the old

2 Master Plan.

3 Now, a question I have, is there -- can

4 anybody think of anytime when an airport -- I

5 don't know what it would be -- came up with

6 something they wanted to do that wasn't in the

7 Master Plan, approved? I mean, you know, say,

8 well, somebody got an idea to do something.

9 MR. GEORGE: Yeah, relocate the VOR.

10 MR. CIRIELLO: Huh?

11 MR. GEORGE: Relocate the VOR. That was not

12 in the last Master Plan.

13 MR. CIRIELLO: Okay.

14 MR. HICKOX: You voted on that.

15 MR. CIRIELLO: All right. Yeah. Okay. But

16 that's why I wanted to know if it was a legal

17 document, meaning you had to go by what the Master

18 Plan said.

19 MR. HICKOX: You're asking if it's a

20 binding --

21 MR. GEORGE: It's not a binding document.

22 MR. HICKOX: Not a binding document.

23 MR. CIRIELLO: Okay. Right. Now, a comment,

24 more or less I guess in defense of the board,

25 whatever shows on this Master Plan, the one we're

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

73

1 working on now or whatever, doesn't necessarily

2 mean the board has to definitely do it.

3 MR. COX: Right.

4 MR. CIRIELLO: A lot of this stuff in this

5 Master Plan is just -- it might happen, or it's

6 something that could happen, but we don't have to

7 do it. So, even though -- you know, I'm not

8 really happy with the old Master Plan. There's a

9 few things I don't like in this one. It really

10 comes down to at the time that the boards are in

11 effect, what they do. But whatever's in these

12 Master Plans does not say you have to do it.

13 MR. GEORGE: Absolutely correct. Any other

14 comments?

15 (No further public comment.)

16 MR. GEORGE: Phil?

17 MR. JUFKO: This is our overall plan. It

18 will be represented in the Airport Layout Plans

19 set.

20 In answer -- and to -- to tack on to what

21 Mr. Ciriello was saying, when we do projects that

22 aren't in the Master Plan that didn't make that

23 last cycle, if you're going to go for federal

24 funding, it still has to end up on the Airport

25 Layout Plans set as -- as an item.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

74

1 So, it does get taken into consideration.

2 There is some sort of limited planning analysis

3 done on a case-by-case basis when you add projects

4 outside of the master planning process.

5 What that means is it takes us to another
6 area that I wanted to break out on the agenda, had
7 to do with environmental requirements. And I
8 asked Mariben Anderson from our -- our staff to
9 come and briefly talk about these next three
10 slides, some of the high points and low points as
11 they relate -- where did she go? I missed it?
12 Okay.

13 MR. COX: She left.

14 MR. JUFKO: Okay. I'll tap --

15 MR. COX: She knew she was up.

16 MR. GEORGE: That's right.

17 MR. JUFKO: I'll tap dance for a little
18 while. It's not a problem, actually. We
19 basically, during these -- the entire process, in
20 the beginning of the -- the inventory process, we
21 gathered all of the information on the airport so
22 we can get our hands around it.

23 And as we finally moved towards the
24 alternatives, we got to get into the nuts and

25 bolts of, okay, you guys want to develop this.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

75

1 What's the specific impact that you foresee?

2 And we did talk about those during not only the
3 public meetings, the alternatives workshop with
4 the TAC and the -- and the Authority.

5 We know, as -- as an example, in the north
6 area, south area, and the west area, there are
7 impacts. And there are varying types of impacts
8 that -- that Mariben will talk about briefly here.

9 And Mariben, your timing's perfect. But why
10 don't you go over to the microphone and just hit
11 on the high points of these kind of considerations
12 that we uncovered.

13 MS. ANDERSON: Hi. My name is Mariben
14 Anderson. I'm with the LPA Group. I'm your
15 environmental consultant for this Master Plan.
16 Just kind of want to briefly discuss with you the
17 difference between a planning document, which is

18 the Master Plan environmental requirements or
19 environmental data that we collect for master
20 planning or planning documents.

21 You basically do a literature data
22 collection. That means all of the regulatory
23 agencies are contacted. Their databases are
24 accessed. That includes the Florida Fish &
25 Wildlife Conservation Commission, the Department

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

76

1 of Environmental Protection, your National
2 Conservation Service for soils information, the
3 St. Johns River Water Management District for
4 your, what we call the Florida Land Use, Cover and
5 Forms Classification System. Those are the
6 different uplands and wetland habitats that
7 surround it.

8 Now, know that these data right now are 2000
9 and 2002 data and they're not updated. That is
10 the best that we -- we have. And we are very

11 fortunate in Florida, because those are -- are
12 pretty much up to date compared to other states.
13 And then using those documents, including
14 other studies that were done in the airport, we
15 looked at protection of environmental impacts, and
16 we identified those for you. That includes
17 threatened and endangered species, wetlands,
18 stormwater because it has environmental regulatory
19 requirement impacts.

20 From there, we look at the permitting
21 requirements, and we look at the -- what we call
22 the permitability of your alternatives. In other
23 words, it wouldn't be in front of you if it wasn't
24 permitable and if we cannot mitigate for the
25 impacts. We have to prove that there is a need,

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

77

1 and the need would have environmental public use,
2 environmental consequence, avoidance and
3 minimization of the impacts. And from there, we

4 do a cost-benefit analysis, which is the cost.

5 Now, after you have your plan, you basically
6 put together your options, and this is what you
7 want to do or what you may choose to do or not
8 choose to do in the future. When you go into
9 design and construction, then we will update the
10 data that was considered in the Master Plan. And
11 then from there, we do field verification. The
12 mic died.

13 MR. HICKOX: The battery's dead.

14 MS. ANDERSON: It's beeping.

15 MR. JUFKO: You can take my mic.

16 MS. ANDERSON: Thanks. I appreciate that.

17 So, we again look at the data that was used. If
18 it was updated, and they're updated anywhere from
19 two to four years, we gather those from all of the
20 regulatory agencies, all of the literature,
21 everything else, and then we conduct environmental
22 field surveys.

23 This is where everything is -- it's looking
24 from if -- you can compare it to looking from what
25 I can see with the naked eye to looking with

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

78

1 something with the microscope. This is where we
2 dissect stuff and say, okay, we don't -- we don't
3 have just wetlands; we have mangroves, we have sea
4 grass, we have oyster beds. We classify those and
5 we identify those areas. We delineate them. We
6 have to find out the limits of them.

7 And then we apply for -- for a wetland
8 limits. Those boundaries that we apply for the
9 agencies are good for state five years; for the
10 feds, it's ten years.

11 All of this information is given to your
12 design engineer, and your design engineer takes
13 this into consideration, works with planners and
14 scientists and the engineers and the drainage
15 folks to figure out how we can minimize the
16 impacts, if there are other alternatives.

17 And then from there, we -- when you have a
18 preferred design for your FBO or for your

19 T-hangars, for your corporate hangars or your
20 runway extension, you identify the impacts and we
21 find ways to compensate for those impacts. And
22 then from there, you get your permit.

23 So, the process between a planning document,
24 versus design and construction, where you actually
25 get your permits, the level of detail is like from

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

79

1 a Phase I to all the way to Phase IV.

2 Now, going back to your Master Plan -- may I
3 have one more slide? What we potentially have
4 used was, using existing available data, we have
5 identified in your lower GA development, that you
6 have potential threatened and endangered species
7 impacts. And the reason why that is, is because
8 you have a bald eagle nest about four miles from
9 here, and those have regulatory considerations for
10 construction, not for design.

11 (Whereupon, Suzanne Green enters the room.)

12 MS. ANDERSON: You also have impacts for
13 estuarine wetlands. And estuarine wetlands are
14 salt, tolerant wetlands. Those are a little bit
15 more stringent when it comes to regulations.
16 They're more valuable. That's what the permitting
17 agencies look at. And, of course, stormwater
18 impacts.

19 For your south GA development, you also
20 have -- equally, you have wetland impacts. This
21 time, it's both saltwater and freshwater. For the
22 west development, it's the same. And your
23 mitigation costs right now, mitigation banks
24 around this area is \$45- to \$95,000 an acre.

25 The difficulty with St. Johns County is that

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

80

1 the mitigation banks don't service this county.
2 However, in central Florida, there is new
3 mitigation service areas that are being
4 negotiated. Like a year ago, the only -- there

5 was only one mitigation bank that service --
6 services Broward County. And now there's three,
7 because the one that was there sold out.

8 So, you know, as we go in the future,
9 hopefully more mitigation banks. You also have
10 other potential mitigation, because you have a lot
11 of preservation, you have state organizations
12 preserving land, and we can trade with them.

13 MR. GEORGE: Mariben, thank you. I think you
14 were telling us that -- that you have been
15 involved in this planning process --

16 MS. ANDERSON: From the beginning.

17 MR. GEORGE: -- for this Master Plan, and you
18 have analyzed the impact on these and think that
19 they are solvable problems.

20 MS. ANDERSON: Yes, sir. And that's all I
21 have. Up to you, Phil.

22 MR. COX: Yeah. Very good.

23 MR. JUFKO: Have questions?

24 MR. CIRIELLO: I'm not sure if one of the
25 statements that Mary Beth (sic) made, that I got

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

81

1 it right.

2 Did you say that you already have, not you
3 individually or something, made requests of the
4 environmental people and such that you know that
5 when the time comes for this airport to do certain
6 things that I personally am against, that you know
7 it's going to happen, that in other words, like
8 extending that runway a thousand feet out into the
9 marsh, and that you already know that there's no
10 way that whoever's involved will say no, that we
11 can't do that?

12 MS. ANDERSON: I didn't say it in that
13 context. I said that the projects recommended in
14 the Master Plan are permissible. The level of
15 permitting goes from simple to very complex. In
16 other words, if you were to -- to answer your
17 question, if you were to extend the runway, would
18 we be able to build it and obtain a permit?

19 And the answer to that is yes. Now, how much
20 is it going to cost you, and how complex the
21 permitting process would be is an answer that I
22 would say is going to be very complex.

23 MR. CIRIELLO: Okay. That -- my problem's
24 not with the cost or anything; it's with the idea.
25 But from what you're telling me, that whenever the

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

82

1 airport gets ready to do that -- and I have no
2 doubt they're going to do it. But if any groups,
3 environmental groups, bird groups, or anybody
4 comes and protests or anything, if they don't want
5 to see that disturbed, they don't want that done,
6 that they're spitting in the wind? In other
7 words, the airport's going to do it and they can
8 go -- you know, and nobody's going to be able to
9 tell them they can't.

10 So, it's already a done deal. So, why should
11 any of these environmental people come before

12 anybody and say, hey, we don't like that idea,
13 don't do it? I mean, if it's already a done deal,
14 people might as well just sit back and shut up and
15 never oppose anything anybody wants to do.

16 MR. GEORGE: Joe, I think what Mariben is
17 saying is that based on the environmental groups
18 and their -- that she knows of, and their internal
19 concerns, what we are trying to do is permit --
20 permissible, which means that there is a way of
21 getting their approval.

22 Now, let's say that four months from now a
23 group goes in and gets something changed in one of
24 them's regulation; we can could wind up with a
25 stumbling block there that, you know, that we

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

83

1 can't do it.

2 But we had to have -- it had -- for it to get
3 into the Master Plan, it had to be feasible at
4 some cost, but it had to be feasible. And I think

5 she's saying that under today's rules and

6 regulations, it is feasible.

7 MS. ANDERSON: I would also like to add that

8 your environmental concerns are very important.

9 Your environmental concerns are very important.

10 The regulatory agencies for the State of Florida

11 and the Federal Government protects wetlands and

12 threatened and endangered species. There are

13 certain requirements that have to be met.

14 Currently, there are ways of mitigating for

15 those impacts through mitigation banks for

16 wetlands and through mitigation banks for

17 threatened and endangered species. And the reason

18 why I say that is because being a biologist and an

19 ecologist -- and it is not a profession; it's a

20 lifestyle -- we are committed to helping you

21 develop land while balancing the needs so wildlife

22 and other species that live together with us.

23 And the reason why I say that is because it

24 has been proven for the last ten years in a study

25 that's based on literature, studies, researches

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

84

1 from all of the agencies throughout the United
2 States, that it is better to have a large
3 preserve, because you have diversity, you have a
4 complete food web cycle than these little
5 mitigation sites that we have, which after a few
6 years, their -- their life, they do not function
7 properly because it's encroached upon.

8 So, mitigation banks work because there's
9 thousands and thousands of acres of them and you
10 can have several species there. You can have
11 several communities there. You can have wetlands
12 and uplands together. And it's a mosaic of
13 network. And that's the approach we would use for
14 your airport development.

15 Yes, sir?

16 MR. GORMAN: Just a real quick -- just a real
17 quick question, and don't have to go on and on.

18 In other words, if you've got an acre and you've
19 got a -- you've got a mitigation cost between --

20 let's say you've got an acre and you've got to use
21 it. So, between \$45- and \$95,000 will -- it will
22 cost per acre to move it or to put it into a --
23 into a mitigation bank or -- explain that just
24 real briefly. Not --
25 MS. ANDERSON: No, sir.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

85

1 MR. GORMAN: Just very briefly.

2 MS. ANDERSON: That's my fault. I should
3 have said per credit. There is a difference.
4 There is a difference. The quality of wetland has
5 a rating from 0 to say 10, okay? If the rating of
6 the wetland, and it's a high quality wetland, it
7 can be rated as five mitigation credits per acre.
8 And that's my fault. That was an oversight on my
9 part.

10 So, the cost right now on the mitigation bank
11 surrounding St. Johns County is \$45- to \$95,000
12 per acre, but it varies from a fresh water marsh,

13 an opacous marsh, an estuarine wetland, and
14 sometimes some of them don't have available for
15 certain types of habitat. So, we would have to do
16 an analysis of the quality of wetland based on
17 state and federal, and those two rule -- those two
18 methods are exactly -- are different.

19 So, the state may require to say two credits,
20 but the feds may require to just say five credits,
21 which means this state get more bang for their
22 buck.

23 MR. GEORGE: One of the areas that you were
24 concerned about was that north commercial
25 development area, where we would be acquiring, I

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

86

1 think it's 10.6 acres from the property owner
2 adjacent, which happens to be the Gun Club.

3 But you had said that that area had a creek
4 running through it, and it was some -- some --
5 these are my terms -- high-quality wetlands in

6 there, and for us to have to mitigate that, it was
7 going to be real expensive to do.

8 MS. ANDERSON: Sir, anytime you mitigate for
9 high-quality wetlands, it always is expensive.

10 And the reason why that is, is because there are
11 becoming more rare habitats in Florida.

12 MR. GEORGE: Do you remember saying that
13 about that particular area?

14 MS. ANDERSON: Yes, sir.

15 MR. GEORGE: Thank you. Okay, Phil. All
16 right.

17 MR. JUFKO: Where we go next here, is we put
18 together some preliminary -- we've had a couple of
19 meetings with -- with Staff to kind of deal with
20 what's currently in the capital improvement
21 program and get a handle on what is actually being
22 developed or is -- is near development at the
23 airport, and compare that against what we have
24 foreseen as potential projects in the Master Plan,
25 try to marry the two.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

1 We're pretty much complete with that, except
2 there's -- there's a couple of steps that we have
3 to take to actually locate projects over different
4 time frames.

5 The first, we -- we look at the projects in
6 terms of constructability and when they would
7 actually be accomplished in terms of time line,
8 what -- what steps you have to actually take. For
9 example, before you build or design some of these
10 projects, you have to go through the environmental
11 process. We might have to go through benefit of
12 cost analysis, these kinds of things.

13 So, all of those would have to precede the
14 actual project or the design of the project in
15 the -- in the CIP. That's pretty straightforward.

16 We wanted to give you some order of magnitude
17 here to let you know where some of the projects
18 would go, at least at this point, in terms of
19 dollar -- dollars and cents in these time periods.

20 Now, we're not recommending that you
21 undertake this -- all of these projects during
22 these time frames at this -- at this stage.
23 However, we have to have a starting point as we
24 move into a financial plan. We look at your
25 revenues and your costs associated with the

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

88

1 Authority. Now we've put this into a model, and
2 we -- and we put -- allocate them to various
3 years, specifically in the short term. And we're
4 able to come up with where the actual shortfalls
5 will lie.

6 And then indeed some of these projects will
7 shift, for example, from the short term to the
8 intermediate, and perhaps from intermediate to
9 long, just because of -- of funding and grant
10 processes and so on.

11 This next stage, we've already developed the
12 model for and we're waiting to just get --

13 finalize some of these projects in the initial
14 take at this, we'll be looking at updating that
15 model and populating it with these costs over a
16 period of about ten years. It may even be eleven.
17 I think we're going to coordinate with the actual
18 model that you kind of develop for your -- for
19 your own internal purposes. Since that data was
20 available, we felt we might as well use that.

21 MR. GEORGE: You're talking about the
22 seven-year --

23 MR. JUFKO: Yes, sir.

24 MR. GEORGE: -- financial model that we put
25 together. Okay.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

89

1 MR. WUELLNER: Eleven. Eleven.

2 MR. GEORGE: I'm sorry. Eleven-year that
3 showed at seven.

4 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Potentially.

5 MR. JUFKO: That's correct. And -- and

6 what's key about that is we don't take that for
7 face value. We take -- however, we do take a lot
8 of the key assumptions in there to develop that
9 model and apply it to ours, so that we are dealing
10 with apples and apples wherever possible. And the
11 same thing with the way that you break out your
12 actual categories, we keep in line with that as
13 well. So, it's just a tool that you can take and
14 use from year to year if you so desire.

15 MR. GEORGE: The -- the previous chart --
16 don't go back to it -- but it showed the -- the
17 initial phase, 2004 to '08, whatever, at \$71
18 million. That's estimated project cost. That's
19 not estimated St. Johns County resident
20 participation cost.

21 MR. JUFKO: No. That's actual cost of the
22 project with the engineering design fees.

23 MR. GEORGE: And some of the projects, if we
24 get 90 percent funding from the feds, then it's
25 only 10 percent of our money.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

1 MR. JUFKO: Oh, absolutely. And --

2 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

3 MR. JUFKO: And that's where we start.

4 MR. GEORGE: I just didn't want anybody to

5 think that we're getting ready to spend \$71

6 million --

7 MR. JUFKO: Absolutely not. Absolutely not.

8 But we have to start with those costs. And just

9 to give you an idea -- these aren't finalized, but

10 just to give you an idea exactly what you're

11 talking about, if you'll look at some -- this is

12 what's currently in our JACIP program here for

13 2004. You're dealing with some costs, some

14 projects such as these. And here's the actual

15 costs that you're kind of dealing with in terms of

16 those grants.

17 MR. GEORGE: Like line item 11 shows the

18 total cost of \$350,000 for 12 years.

19 MR. JUFKO: Yeah. That might be \$70,000 to

20 the Authority.

21 MR. GEORGE: \$70,000 is what the Authority
22 would pay.

23 MR. JUFKO: That's correct. So, just to give
24 you a feel for it. And if I take you back to the
25 financial plan here. We're looking at

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

91

1 feasibility. The state and the feds are looking
2 at feasibility, financial feasibility. Can you
3 afford it?

4 Now, that's a -- that's a tough question.

5 MR. GEORGE: Yeah.

6 MR. JUFKO: But we look at it, the ability of
7 the airport, based on the way that you currently
8 operate, can you indeed deal with this, and if
9 not, we can come up with some other means of doing
10 that, whether it means a loan or a bond or taxes,
11 what -- any of the above, or some nontraditional
12 means. We can definitely think out of the box.

13 But we need to identify those years where the

14 shortfalls exist. If we can't address that
15 through a shifting of a project or phasing it over
16 several years, then we look as a last resort to
17 those other means of funding it, or not doing the
18 project. That's always an option. At that time,
19 I should say.

20 We would also look at -- we look at the
21 scenarios, what I just discussed. And we have one
22 more working paper that will represent our
23 findings from this portion of the study. It is
24 indeed the last working paper set.

25 MR. GEORGE: When will that be?

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

92

1 MR. JUFKO: That will be this month in --

2 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

3 MR. JUFKO: -- specifically February.

4 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

5 MR. JUFKO: We're almost done with the actual
6 modeling portion, so it's just a chapter that

7 needs to be written.

8 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Time for our meeting in
9 February?

10 MR. JUFKO: What date is that, this meeting?

11 MR. WUELLNER: The 28th, currently.

12 MR. GEORGE: We don't know yet, but February
13 the 28th is proposed.

14 MR. JUFKO: It looks like that'll -- that
15 will occur.

16 MR. COX: February 28th?

17 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We get to vote on that
18 later.

19 MR. JUFKO: Related to that working paper,
20 there will be another short chapter that's part of
21 that working paper. It deals with the Airport
22 Layout Plans set. The plan has been floating
23 around the airport here for a couple of months and
24 shown to a couple of different groups in draft
25 form, just to give you a feel for where we're

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

1 going with the ultimate development concept.

2 It's a fairly extensive set. We pulled it
3 out, just to give you an idea, not knowing how
4 much time we would have, but they are available
5 there. And it's quite extensive. Deals with the
6 ultimate layout, which we have looked at several
7 times over the course of this.

8 Another blowup of the terminal area. And
9 also dealing with -- with actual airspace in the
10 approaches to each end of the runways existing and
11 future.

12 We also have an overall airspace set of
13 drawings that deal with the airport configuration
14 as a whole and do we meet the FAA's criteria for
15 obstacle clearance and protection from an airspace
16 perspective.

17 Another sheet that's part of this is the land
18 use plan, looking at the future land uses
19 surrounding the airport, identifying how we plan
20 to develop the airport, both on and off airport in

21 terms of land use.

22 And then last, which -- and there's a reason
23 it's in progress, because we are in progress, is
24 the airport property map. This property map, in
25 terms of this set, will actually show a future

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

94

1 property line, which for the most part has been
2 determined; however, there are some tweaking of
3 recent transactions that need to be taken into
4 account.

5 Also, the property map isn't just sticking a
6 bunch of lines on a map and saying here's our
7 property line. We actually have to show
8 transactions and a table and who -- who the
9 property belonged to initially and then show
10 this -- the chain of events. That -- that's very
11 time consuming, and that's why we're in the
12 process of that at this point.

13 So that -- that's the latest on the Airport

14 Plans Set. With the exception of that sheet,
15 we're already complete with the draft set and it
16 is being looked at by Staff currently.

17 So, it comes up to some next steps. I'm sure
18 the bottom line is, what have we got to do to
19 finish this thing? We're finalizing that sheet on
20 the Airport Layout Plan drawing. And as I said,
21 in February, the chapter dealing with the CIP
22 and -- and the financial plan will also be
23 submitted at that time. And then we'll go forth
24 and begin assembling the draft report.

25 The draft report consists of all the previous

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

95

1 submitted working papers and has the comments
2 already inputted into the chapters, because we
3 had -- that was an ongoing process. So basically,
4 it's just preparing the report and -- and copying
5 it.

6 It comes down to, at some point, if that's

7 next month or the very following month, it comes
8 down to some acceptance by this group, agreeing
9 that, okay, we're -- we're good with this, and we
10 will -- we recommend that you send this to the FAA
11 staff for their review and approval.

12 And at that time, we would submit the Master
13 Plan draft and the ALP. Typically, that process
14 takes three months. I'm here to tell you that it
15 will probably take longer. That's just the way --
16 the way they're working lately. If -- if they put
17 a priority on it for some reason, maybe we'll see
18 it in three months, but I've seen some take as
19 long as a year.

20 MR. GORMAN: Question. After submission of
21 the Master Plan, let's say that all of a sudden,
22 we have some epiphany and we decide that we want
23 to change it. I know these things are always a
24 work in progress. Then is -- what is -- is there
25 any consternation with the FAA to change this

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

1 thing?

2 MR. JUFKO: Well, there are -- there are
3 means to -- to change -- make changes. If we're
4 still in the Master Plan and it hasn't been
5 approved, you could always go back and -- and
6 depending on the magnitude of the change, you
7 could go back and address it in the Master Plan
8 document.

9 Or, let's say it's been approved, and now
10 you've had a change of heart. What I was
11 referring to before on the ALP, you would have --
12 you would make the change on the Airport Layout
13 Plans set and resubmit that sheet only to the FAA.

14 But for some types of projects, you have to
15 show justification for the project. So, there
16 might have to be a little narrative report showing
17 your analysis of why you feel that that had to
18 change.

19 MR. WUELLNER: After adoption, it's a much
20 simpler -- in terms of scope of effort, it's much
21 simpler effort to submit the change to FAA. They

22 still sign off on it. You go through that process
23 much -- typically much quicker.

24 MR. GORMAN: What if the scope of change is
25 rather large? In other words, let's say you've

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

97

1 ascertained another site. Let's say you did that.
2 Let's say that happened. Then all of a sudden you
3 want to submit this to FAA. Does this foil your
4 funding? Because all of this, as far as I'm
5 concerned, is an exercise to get funding.

6 MR. WUELLNER: I don't know that, because of
7 the frequency in which you do Master Plans, I
8 don't -- I don't know that you'd initiate any real
9 Master Plan change for something like you're
10 talking about. I think what you do is generate a
11 stand-alone separate project with FAA for the new
12 site, whatever that would be, because that's not a
13 airport Master Plan item in and of itself. And
14 then let it die its death, if you will, at the

15 next Master Plan revision.

16 And the other one is, obviously, creating its
17 own -- its own planning, you know, process. It's
18 independent from this one. So, it would just --
19 as you were saying, let's say you found an
20 alternate site or a second site or whatever --
21 whatever happens, that becomes its own stand-alone
22 airport study, its own entity for planning
23 purposes, everything stand-alone from this
24 facility. And that what you're showing west of
25 U.S. 1, if you choose to dissolve that as a part

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

98

1 of taking another airport location or a second
2 airport location, whatever comes to life, you
3 would just simply eliminate it out of the next
4 planning revision and simply say there are no
5 plans in the next Master Plan to reserve space
6 west of you. So, it would just fall out naturally
7 at the next revision. There wouldn't be any real

8 need to go back and revise the Master Plan for
9 that. The other would have its own entity for
10 planning purposes.

11 MR. GEORGE: Ed, how -- how far in advance
12 are you working with FAA? Isn't it something like
13 over the next five years to identify funds for
14 property acquisition and funds for taxiway --

15 MR. WUELLNER: Technically --

16 MR. GEORGE: -- and stuff like that?

17 MR. WUELLNER: I'd say technically, we are
18 programming funds out beyond ten years. Now,
19 the -- the reliability of the -- of that planning
20 is, you know, is -- gets squirrely as you --

21 MR. GEORGE: As an item or --

22 MR. WUELLNER: The FDOT aspect of it, which
23 is probably our single most significant source of
24 sheer number of projects, if nothing else, is more
25 of a five-year program that's updated annually,

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

1 and they add the next year out. We program for
2 identification of capital projects that is used
3 both by FAA and DOT to project what future needs
4 are in all of the airports collectively out
5 ten-plus years.

6 So, we're actively programming. You actually
7 have projects programmed sitting in FDOT
8 documents, if you will, in their database out
9 through at least a ten-year period right now.

10 MR. GEORGE: And they're --

11 MR. WUELLNER: You have funding commitments;
12 that is, if all goes well with the normal
13 budgeting cycle with the state, they're -- they're
14 committing to fund out for about year five,
15 working into year six right now.

16 So, there are projects where they've divvied
17 up money, so to speak, among the airports in -- in
18 District 2, as an example, and we've got projects
19 with money attached to it, assuming all those
20 budgets get adopted by the legislature and all
21 that moving forward.

22 MR. GEORGE: Isn't it -- isn't it a true
23 statement that DOT also has funds in their slush
24 fund, I'm going to call it -- that's probably a
25 bad term.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

100

1 MR. WUELLNER: It is.

2 MR. GEORGE: But for unique requirements that
3 come up if they can fund. For instance, if an
4 airport came up with a real need to do a
5 feasibility study of putting another airport
6 somewhere else, and their -- the impact would be
7 changing the Master Plan, shifting the
8 satisfaction of needs to another location, there
9 are funds available that we could make our
10 presentation and possibly get funding to do that,
11 without waiting five years or ten years to get
12 that funding. Is that a true statement?

13 MR. WUELLNER: Actually, as long as the
14 computer system is open and -- and they do, they

15 lock it out periodically to where we can't enter
16 new projects or make adjustments, but if that --
17 if that's open, you could literally go in today
18 and add it as a project for funding consideration.

19 Now, it's going to have to go through a
20 legislative cycle to be -- to get money attached
21 to it, assuming there's money to attach to it.

22 But you could -- you could get it in the queue, so
23 to speak, for consideration as early as --

24 MR. GEORGE: So, there's -- the 2005 and '06,
25 budget could include it.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

101

1 MR. WUELLNER: I would tell you that
2 realistically, in terms of inserting projects,
3 you're a minimum of -- of 18 months when you
4 insert a new project, because it has to go through
5 an entire legislative process, and it's -- I will
6 tell you today, it's too late to do that for the
7 current legislative session. They do that back in

8 September/October time line for the current year.

9 So, you're looking about 18 months from, quote,

10 unquote, funding consideration.

11 MR. GEORGE: Okay. You'll -- you'll tell us

12 that in -- in your response to our previous

13 direction to --

14 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, sure.

15 MR. GEORGE: Okay. Fine.

16 MR. WUELLNER: We'll give you -- give you an

17 idea what -- you know, what the time lines

18 would -- you know, what we can put our hands

19 around.

20 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

21 MR. WUELLNER: In terms of what the scope is.

22 That's easy enough to do.

23 MR. GEORGE: Carolyn?

24 MS. McELROY: Carolyn McElroy again. What

25 happens if, in 2006, there's not a loaded pilot

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

1 board, and the board decides to, you know, nix
2 everything? We can come to a giant slowdown.
3 What happens to all the money and all the plans
4 and all that?

5 MR. GEORGE: I think the answer to that would
6 be the same thing if -- if another governor comes
7 in, other than Bush, and he decides he doesn't
8 want to fund some of this. That's -- that's
9 always an option, you know, that it's going to
10 happen.

11 MS. McELROY: We're on the burner --

12 MR. GEORGE: We are trying to -- to make our
13 decisions based on what we think are the best
14 needs for the county, and that's going to change.
15 Look at the '95 Master Plan versus what we've
16 done.

17 MS. McELROY: I think you don't know the mood
18 of the county and that you're not planning for the
19 best needs of the county.

20 MR. HICKOX: Wayne Hickox, 881 Queen Road.
21 Just based on the comments of the last two minutes
22 from Mr. Wuellner and from yourself, and also from

23 the previous speaker, one of the things that's
24 developed this afternoon in my mind, if I just may
25 take a moment with this, it might help.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

103

1 Being involved, obviously, in the relaying of
2 information to the public, I think maybe we're
3 operating under a perception that doesn't reflect
4 the fact that this airport is changing. I don't
5 know what's involved, for example, in changing
6 your designation from a general aviation to a
7 commercial airport. But a great deal of what is
8 pushing you and what is pushing the growth of the
9 airport are commercial needs.

10 You know, this is not the case of all of us.
11 Of course, I can't fly anymore because of vision,
12 but -- and it's not a case of us putting down on
13 some grassy strip somewhere. This is a very, very
14 sophisticated airport, and to your credit. I
15 don't mean that as a bad thing.

16 And I'm wondering if it might help with some
17 of the public objections and some of the public
18 concerns that we've heard voiced here, if the
19 airport looked into the method of changing its
20 designation, because this is really what you folks
21 are -- are doing. Not incorrectly. Don't get me
22 wrong. I'm not knocking anything you're
23 suggesting here. That's for somebody else to do.

24 I'm just saying that maybe the resistance
25 you're getting publicly would be better understood

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

104

1 if the nature of the airport were better explained
2 and also more reflective of what's really
3 happening.

4 MR. GEORGE: That's a good point. Any other
5 comments? Phil?

6 MR. JUFKO: I guess it's me, huh?

7 MR. GEORGE: Uh-huh.

8 MR. JUFKO: Following our submittal to the

9 FAA and to DOT, we would wait the -- the time and
10 see what kind of comments come out from both those
11 agencies. And then we would address those
12 comments as necessary. Sometimes they'll make
13 comments that are just -- just to make a
14 statement, and then sometimes they have an actual
15 issue that they want you to -- to correct.

16 After that, we'll come back here and then it
17 will be -- once those changes are made, we'll be
18 ready to finalize the actual document and ask for
19 this group to adopt that Master Plan.

20 And also, somewhere in that time frame, there
21 are probably a series of presentations locally
22 that we are talking about, to County, City, that
23 kind of thing, just about how this plan now fits
24 into the local planning scheme comp plan, that
25 kind of thing.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

105

1 So, that's generally what the next steps are.

2 Just to comment on the last -- the comment. If it
3 were ever a decision to change the designation of
4 the airport, that also gets done through that
5 process, the system planning process. So, it's
6 quite likely that could occur -- if you go those
7 next steps that Mr. Gorman has suggested, it could
8 also be considered at that time as well.

9 MR. GEORGE: Yeah.

10 MR. WUELLNER: Well, effective -- did it
11 again. Effectively, you already have the system
12 plan notation as a potential commercial service
13 airport.

14 MR. JUFKO: That's true.

15 MR. WUELLNER: That exists in its, quote,
16 unquote, notation. You can't just determine
17 yourself to be a commercial service. And by rule,
18 if you will, or by definition, you're commercial
19 service when you have commercial service and not a
20 minute before.

21 You have met the requirements from a planning
22 nature and you've -- also have taken steps to

23 prepare yourself to be commercial service, and you
24 have -- you maintain an operating certificate with
25 FAA for the -- the ability to handle such things

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

106

1 as charters and -- and the like, which is kind of
2 the precursor to established scheduled commercial
3 service, which that would have to be established
4 before you could formally grab the title, if you
5 will, of commercial service airport and fall into
6 all of the different considerations that -- that
7 happen at funding. There are different funding
8 sources open to you, different -- different things
9 that are out there as a, quote, unquote,
10 commercial service airport. But that's, again, a
11 function of actual use, not perceived use in the
12 future.

13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, I think that's what
14 Mr. Hickox was talking about, that -- I mean, we
15 have a notation, I know.

16 MR. WUELLNER: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We made a point to put that

18 in there, not that that's going to be something we

19 do -- who knows? Not in the immediate future.

20 But we asked them to put a notation in there. And

21 I think what Mr. Hickox is saying is we need to

22 disseminate that information to the public so that

23 they know we have not discarded that thought.

24 MR. HICKOX: There's a major

25 misunderstanding --

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

107

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Right.

2 MR. HICKOX: -- of what you're trying to do

3 and why you -- why you have to do this.

4 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Does that mean you're asking

5 me to write another letter to the editor?

6 MR. HICKOX: No, I haven't.

7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: No. We, the board, did.

8 MR. GEORGE: Suzanne -- we had Suzanne write

9 one, yeah.

10 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We, the board, did. And I
11 think that's a good point, that, you know, it's
12 there but it's just not being perceived.

13 MR. GEORGE: I would like to suggest you go
14 on his talk show and --

15 MR. HICKOX: If my talk show were on. You
16 should go on Carrie's (phonetic) program on WFOY.

17 MR. GEORGE: Thanks. Okay.

18 MR. WUELLNER: There's also two distinct --
19 just for clarification, what the Chairman's
20 referring to is the Master Plan's determination
21 that somewhere out at 13 years or whatever, you
22 know, the forecast suggests there'll be commercial
23 service. But arrived at totally independently is
24 the system plan designation that the airport,
25 because of population trends and independent

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

108

1 analysis, has made the determination that

2 commercial service is feasible from another angle.

3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Uh-huh.

4 MR. WUELLNER: So everything -- it's
5 beginning to point that direction at some point in
6 the future.

7 MR. GORMAN: One more thing, and I don't want
8 to go on forever about it. But, the retention of
9 this land is all based on overcapacity issues.

10 What if you tell the FAA we do not have an
11 overcapacity issue that we feel feasible? We have
12 no way to deal with overcapacity at this time.
13 Now what happens?

14 MR. WUELLNER: That you have no way of
15 developing?

16 MR. GORMAN: Yes. And we don't --

17 MR. WUELLNER: That's fine, too.

18 MR. GORMAN: And we don't --

19 MR. WUELLNER: I don't think FAA's in a
20 position to come in and force you to build a new
21 airport or to --

22 MR. GORMAN: And so, our funding is cut off
23 for projects that we need on the existing airport

24 we have.

25 MR. WUELLNER: They'll allow you to continue

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

109

1 to develop. In fact, that would be the normal

2 course of development, anyways.

3 MR. COX: Chicago O'Hare, LaGuardia.

4 MR. WUELLNER: You would virtually maximize,

5 you know, your existing facility before they're

6 even going to consider funding on that.

7 MR. GORMAN: So, it is not essential for us

8 to retain that land in order to continue to fund

9 what we have now --

10 MR. WUELLNER: In terms of --

11 MR. GORMAN: -- our operations now.

12 MR. WUELLNER: That is correct. I mean, in

13 terms of retention of property -- physical

14 retention of property -- it's my opinion; we

15 differ on this collectively -- but I mean, in

16 terms of retaining the maximum flexibility into

17 the future, it -- I'm not -- I'm not sure
18 disposing of it would make any sense in and of
19 itself.

20 You've got an overlay district that -- that
21 covers a future land use to allow the development,
22 but you effectively at some point in the future
23 end up buying the property twice.

24 MR. GORMAN: My point, then I'll put it to
25 bed. My point is that I don't see it effectively

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

110

1 being used as an overcapacity airport because of
2 just the nature of its division. And two, I would
3 patently oppose its development as an industrial
4 park or anything else, because I, even though
5 there may be some loophole in the charter, I don't
6 feel that building industrial parks with our tax
7 dollars is the right thing to do.

8 So, I don't really see its retention for
9 overcapacity. But if it's something we have to do

10 for the time being...

11 MR. GEORGE: Well, there's no --

12 MR. GORMAN: That's my point.

13 MR. GEORGE: -- decision it's going to be

14 made jointly by the board, you know, on that right

15 now.

16 MR. GORMAN: And I agree.

17 MR. GEORGE: But what we're doing here is to

18 review the Master Plan as it now stands, better

19 understand what you are presenting, and the ground

20 rules under which you are -- and voicing concerns.

21 MR. GORMAN: That's fine.

22 MR. GEORGE: I appreciate all the effort your

23 company's gone through. There's lots of -- lots

24 of manhours of work in here.

25 Before I adjourn, I'd like each one of the

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

111

1 board members, if they have any final comments to

2 make on this whole planning cycle. Mr. Gorman,

3 no.

4 MR. BRUNSON: The only comment I have, I -- I
5 appreciate the planning process to incorporate
6 that each project has a goal of being
7 self-sufficient in --

8 MR. JUFKO: A goal.

9 MR. BRUNSON: -- as best you can.

10 MR. JUFKO: That's right.

11 MR. BRUNSON: So, I -- I hope you continue to
12 put emphasis on that. And I'm very pleased that
13 that's in the Master Plan. I think you've done a
14 good job.

15 MR. GEORGE: I think that that's going to be
16 our emphasis as we start implementing the needs,
17 you know, as they dovetail into the plan or they
18 change from the plan. Mr. Cox?

19 MR. COX: No.

20 MR. GEORGE: Suzanne?

21 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I just want to thank you for
22 all of the workshops that allow the public to come
23 in. I think that's been important so we have

24 enough public input to find out what the needs

25 are. I've been addressed individually, but this

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

112

1 is important to publicize and allow the public to

2 come here. It's been helpful for the board.

3 MR. BRUNSON: And the few --

4 CHAIRMAN GREEN: And I think it's been

5 helpful for you guys.

6 MR. JUFKO: Oh, absolutely, yeah.

7 MR. BRUNSON: And if you allow me, I had that

8 on my notes, too, that I really appreciate the

9 public comments.

10 MR. GEORGE: Okay. Then the workshop is now

11 adjourned.

12 (Whereupon, the workshop adjourned.)

13

14

15

16

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005

113

1 REPORTER'S COURT CERTIFICATE

2

3 STATE OF FLORIDA)

4 COUNTY OF ST. JOHNS)

5

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

7 that I was authorized to and did stenographically

8 report the foregoing proceedings and that the

9 transcript is a true record of my stenographic

10 notes.

11

12 Dated this 10th day of February, 2005.

13

14

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

15

Notary Public - State of Florida

16

My Commission No.: DD102224

17

Expires: April 30, 2006

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

AIRPORT AUTHORITY WORKSHOP - JANUARY 19, 2005