

1 ST. AUGUSTINE - ST. JOHNS COUNTY AIRPORT AUTHORITY

2 Workshop Meeting

3 held at 4796 U.S. 1 North

4 St. Augustine, Florida

5 on Thursday, May 27, 2004

6 from 4:06 p.m. to 8:06 p.m.

7 * * * * *

8 BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

- 9 WAYNE "BUZZ" GEORGE, Secretary-Treasurer/
Acting Chairman
- 10 JOSEPH CIRIELLO
- 11 JOHN "JACK" GORMAN

12 BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:

- 12 SUZANNE GREEN, CHAIRMAN
- 13 BOB COX

14 * * * * *

15 ALSO PRESENT:

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

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

19 BRYAN COOPER, Assistant Airport Director.

20 * * * * *

21

22

23 St. Augustine Court Reporters
1510 N. Ponce de Leon Blvd., Suite A
St. Augustine, FL 32084
24 (904) 825-0570

1	I N D E X	
2	PAGE	
3	2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	3
4	3. MASTER PLAN UPDATE - THE LPA GROUP	3
5	4. NEXT REGULAR BOARD MEETING - June 14, 2004	
6	5. ADJOURNMENT	234
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Let's call the meeting to
3 order. I'll first apologize for my being late.
4 Second, let's do the Pledge of Allegiance to the
5 flag.

6 (Pledge of Allegiance.)

7 3. - MASTER PLAN UPDATE -- THE LPA GROUP

8 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. This is a workshop
9 for the purpose of getting a Master Plan update
10 and then get public opinion and Authority opinion
11 on the -- what their recommendations are. So,
12 I'll turn it over to Ed.

13 MR. WUELLNER: Okay. Just a reminder, this
14 is a workshop, which means it's typically a little
15 lighter forum and not as rigid. And I'll also
16 remind you that by virtue of being a workshop, no
17 action can be taken. You're free to discuss, get
18 input, do that kind of stuff, even make
19 recommendations for things you want to see on
20 future agendas, but just a reminder there is --
21 there can be no specific action.

22 Also, topic-wise, it needs to be generally
23 related to the Airport Master Plan. You have only
24 advertised for that topic. So, as long as you

25 stay on track, it will be fine.

4

1 And I believe the presentation side, Phil's

2 going to kind of -- or somebody.

3 MR. JUFKO: Yes, it will be a combination.

4 MR. WUELLNER: You guys will walk through

5 that thing. And then I guess that would probably

6 open up any -- any level of discussion and public

7 input and --

8 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

9 MR. WUELLNER: Idea is to keep it kind of

10 informal, I would think.

11 MR. JUFKO: And perfect timing. Usually we

12 have to wait for the computer, so...

13 I'm Phil Jufko from The LPA Group. I'm here

14 with Gloria Loungeway, and we also have Mariben

15 Andersen, one of our -- our environmental

16 scientists with us today, and Dave Goode.

17 I -- I agree with everything that Ed just

18 mentioned to you. And as we move forward into

19 this process, we're going to give sort of a, I

20 guess a presentation, a formal presentation. But

21 I'd like to treat it in a way that if you have

22 some questions, the Authority members as we move

23 through it, particularly towards one of the slides

24 or one of the alternatives that we're discussing,

25 you're more than welcome to either ask us a

5

1 question there at that time or you -- we could
2 save them for a discussion afterwards. It is your
3 workshop.

4 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I think that it's --
5 sometimes for us to save public comment and board
6 comment until we get through with the subject, we
7 miss something that we were going to say. So, if
8 no one -- the other board members object, I'd like
9 to, as we go through it, if we have a subject we
10 want to talk about, go ahead and talk about it at
11 that time. Okay?

12 MR. JUFKO: Give you that -- that
13 flexibility.

14 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Right.

15 MR. JUFKO: I think the more flexible this
16 could be, the better for all of us.

17 I'm going to give you a little background as
18 we move forward here. We've been before the
19 Authority here in the past, and -- and we've
20 talked about things from here's your airport,
21 here's the forecast of future activity over our
22 20-year planning period. And as a result, we've
23 come up with a number of requirements that we need
24 here at the airport over the 20-year planning

25 period to meet that forecast. And we've also

6

1 looked at capacity issues that we have here at
2 St. Augustine.

3 In -- as a result, now we're at a phase
4 that's very important, as we said. We'd like to
5 address some alternatives in -- in the form of GA
6 facilities, support facilities, as well as
7 airfield and the, you can see, commercial terminal
8 there. And that's what we're here to discuss
9 today at -- at some -- some length.

10 We do the best we can, as we move through
11 this process, as -- as the consultant, using our
12 areas of expertise to come up with ways of
13 addressing these needs and requirements, while
14 enforcing some of the FAA and DOT-type standards
15 that are out there.

16 But, there is some flexibility in this
17 process, and that's why we have this workshop,
18 because -- and -- and prior to the workshop, we
19 had a Technical Advisory Committee meeting. What
20 that's done for us is it's given us some input
21 into a series of preliminary alternatives that
22 we've developed. And now we're like another layer
23 of that input, and we're going to present some of
24 those to you today.

25 I'm here to answer and provide clarification.

7

1 There's one guarantee: That we're going to walk
2 out of here today and we're all going to be better
3 informed. And this goes not only for the
4 Authority and the public that's here, but for
5 ourselves here as the consultant team.

6 We don't have a crystal ball that kind of
7 tells us what this body's desires are for the
8 future of this airport, and this is an opportunity
9 that we felt very strongly was a great opportunity
10 for us to sit down and have a frank discussion
11 about what you think might work and what might not
12 work and can we do it.

13 And -- and more importantly, when you see
14 these alternatives, have we really looked at all
15 the options that are available to us? And I'm
16 going to try to make sure we clearly communicate
17 that to you this afternoon.

18 We've had some requirements that -- that came
19 out. This is just to kind of bring us back to
20 where we were, you know, a month or so ago. And
21 we showed that this airfield in its current
22 configuration is projected to be at 80 percent of
23 its theoretical capacity, at airfield capacity, by
24 the end of the planning period.

1 these numbers, 60 and 80. And we're -- we're
2 already at the 60 percent of theoretical capacity,
3 our operations compared to the capacity of the
4 airport.

5 This is the time we should be planning for
6 some sort of capacity relief, projects that bring
7 that relief to the airport. By the end of the
8 planning period, at the 80 percent level, we
9 should be considering or have already initiated
10 construction of such projects.

11 We've also come up with other requirements.
12 We've discussed ad nauseam that 8,000 feet is what
13 we're looking for here at the airport to help
14 support the type of fleet mix that we anticipate
15 for the future, and currently have, as a matter of
16 fact.

17 The other component of this is looking at
18 crosswind coverage and -- and looking at the
19 crosswind runway lengths. And if we go to follow
20 the FAA standards and guidelines, we -- we show
21 that for aircraft in the small aircraft category
22 of 12,500 pounds and below, that it's recommended
23 that a runway length of about 3,100 feet or 30 --
24 3,060 feet, would be recommended, and that's right

25 there before you and, of course, provide that

9

1 optimum crosswind coverage.

2 Crosswind coverage is for our small aircraft
3 that can't land -- can't land on the other runway
4 during strong wind conditions. We have to have
5 that -- the optimum orientation to -- to help --
6 help them land and take off.

7 Then we've also looked at other various
8 general aviation needs, aprons, hangars, FBO
9 terminal space, support facilities that go along
10 with the airport. We've looked at all those
11 issues, or are about to look at them as we refine
12 our alternatives. And then we also address any
13 future commercial terminal needs that -- at least
14 plan for the potential of that.

15 Now, what I'd like to -- to bring up is
16 we've -- we've run these alternatives in front of
17 the Technical Advisory Committee, and we received
18 a significant amount of comments of which we'd
19 hoped to address prior to this meeting. Many of
20 them, we have. And as we go through, we'll
21 address, you know -- you know, what we have and
22 haven't and the reasons why, and maybe what
23 another next step might be, depending on which
24 issue we're talking about.

25 But as -- as we move through these general

10

1 aviation alternatives, I'm going to turn it over
2 to Gloria. And I'll probably interject as we go,
3 to provide a little clarification, but Gloria's
4 going to discuss the meat of our general aviation
5 alternatives.

6 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Thanks, Phil. What we have
7 here is the first alternative for the north
8 general aviation area, which is north of the
9 Northrop Grumman complex near the -- near runway
10 13 end (indicating). This option shows how can we
11 get a large amount of corporate hangars in the
12 area, kind of replicating what you have, kind of
13 started with that one taxi lane that has four
14 existing hangars along it.

15 This option shows 24 corporate hangars and
16 relocating Hawkeye View Lane into the Gun Club
17 property. It would require dealing with the point
18 of the channel that comes in off of the river
19 and --

20 MR. WUELLNER: Some land acquisition, too.

21 MS. LOUNGEWAY: -- and some land acquisition.

22 The second alternative for this area shows
23 how can we minimize the land acquisition, the road
24 relocation, and it shows approximately 12

25 corporate hangars, kind of finishing out the taxi

11

1 lane that you started, and then continuing along

2 Alpha with corporate hangar development

3 (indicating).

4 Those are the two alternatives that we've

5 done for kind of this north area. I don't know if

6 we want any comments now on -- on these two before

7 we -- we go on to other -- to the south GA area.

8 MR. JUFKO: Yes, Mr. Ciriello?

9 MR. CIRIELLO: Could you put that other

10 picture on?

11 MR. JUFKO: I'm going to try.

12 MR. CIRIELLO: It says here, "preserves

13 existing retention pond." Where is that at?

14 MR. WUELLNER: Those are reversed.

15 MS. LOUNGEWAY: The pictures are reversed.

16 MR. CIRIELLO: Huh?

17 MS. LOUNGEWAY: I'm sorry.

18 MR. WUELLNER: That one does not. The other

19 one does.

20 MS. LOUNGEWAY: The other one does.

21 MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah, okay. But --

22 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Right. Right.

23 MR. CIRIELLO: These white hangars down here,

24 Ed, are those the ones we just recently built, 5,

1 MR. WUELLNER: The ones on the upper left.

2 That's 5 you're seeing right there (indicating).

3 6 and 7 are still out of the --

4 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Picture.

5 MR. CIRIELLO: Oh, okay. Well, this area --

6 this space here (indicating), is that open over

7 there right now? I thought when we was over there

8 between those hangars and the new ones we put in,

9 there wasn't anything -- any space there.

10 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Retention pond.

11 MR. WUELLNER: You're a little bit -- this

12 is -- picks up where -- basically where the

13 National Guard hangar is and comes down toward

14 Grumman. This is space that currently has nothing

15 on it, other than that roadway snaking through

16 there.

17 MR. CIRIELLO: Is it buildable without any

18 problems? In other words, are we going to get

19 into the environment and then get into an

20 environmental hassle with anybody?

21 MR. WUELLNER: We'll have more of an

22 environmental issue with this configuration than

23 the 12 unit.

24 MR. CIRIELLO: But either -- even with --

25 MR. WUELLNER: That is --

13

1 MR. CIRIELLO: That's a retention pond there.

2 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Correct.

3 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. The -- who's got the --

4 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Pointer?

5 MR. WUELLNER: -- ditty?

6 MR. JUFKO: I'm sorry.

7 MR. WUELLNER: The --

8 MR. CIRIELLO: But even with this --

9 MR. WUELLNER: This area right here -- Joe?

10 MR. CIRIELLO: Huh?

11 MR. WUELLNER: This area right here is

12 actually freshwater wetland (indicating).

13 However, our experience with the Water Management

14 District is we can mitigate this area, allowing it

15 to be developed by expanding that conservation

16 area west of U.S. 1 --

17 MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah, I remember that.

18 MR. WUELLNER: -- the industrial park. But

19 that -- that could be done and allow it to be

20 buildable, also. Or, you could preserve it. I

21 mean, that's -- it's all on the table. But you

22 could -- you can get past that.

23 The other side of the street will be more

24 difficult. And the reason it will be more

25 difficult is that water snaking through there

14

1 could be potentially argued by all as -- as

2 saltwater --

3 MR. CIRIELLO: All right. Let me ask you

4 another question.

5 MR. WUELLNER: -- as it does go out to the --

6 MR. CIRIELLO: This expansion here right

7 now --

8 MR. WUELLNER: That's shown here.

9 MR. CIRIELLO: Would -- would it be safe to

10 say that it is currently within the boundaries of

11 the airport? The present boundaries of our

12 airport that would be fenced in, is that within

13 our fenced area, or is that outside of it?

14 MR. WUELLNER: It --

15 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Out.

16 MR. WUELLNER: The parking as it's shown

17 there and -- and perhaps a part of two of the

18 hangars there look to -- that probably comes

19 across the property line a smidge to -- into

20 the -- what's currently owned by the Gun Club.

21 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: How much of the Gun Club

22 property do you think you're going to have to

23 acquire?

24 MR. WUELLNER: This is probably an acre or

1 MR. JUFKO: Uh-huh.

2 MR. WUELLNER: -- to clean up the corner.

3 MR. JUFKO: Uh-huh.

4 MR. MARTINELLI: Could I ask a question?

5 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Alternative 1, though?

6 MR. WUELLNER: Alternative 1 is much --

7 that's much more significant in terms of property.

8 You want to back -- I've got the thing.

9 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Phil, can you tell us a

10 little bit about the -- what your forecast is, as

11 what do you feel the increased demand is going to

12 be for corporate hangars?

13 MR. JUFKO: Well, it appears that this is one

14 of the few airports that I've seen in the state

15 that actually had a waiting list for corporate

16 hangars. I believe that we would be able to --

17 to -- to fill these -- these corporate hangars, as

18 supported by the forecast.

19 As we get into somewhere like the southern GA

20 area in Araquay Park, that area is being shown as

21 a concept for what a complete buildout of that

22 area could look like. Knowingly, we -- we know

23 that that exceeds what the 20-year planning

24 horizon is for -- and requirements over that

25 period. But we would still want to show what that

16

1 development would look like, because it deals with
2 much different type of development.

3 In -- in discussions with the airport and --
4 and the Technical Advisory Committee, it was best
5 felt that if we could separate and keep a lot of
6 the corporate-type hangars up at this end of the
7 airport and keep some of the smaller hangars and
8 tie-down areas down the south end, T-hangars, that
9 that would be a better use of the area.

10 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. Do you --

11 MR. MARTINELLI: Can I ask a question? I
12 don't know who's moderating. Are you moderating?

13 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I'm moderating it, yes. Go
14 ahead, Vic. State your name. We are recording.

15 MR. MARTINELLI: Okay. You know who I am.

16 I'm Vic Martinelli. Anyway, just ask a question,

17 Ed. I -- I seem to recall that the Airport

18 Authority owns some property on the north side of

19 Gun Club Road out toward U.S. 1; is that correct?

20 MR. WUELLNER: North side of Gun Club Road.

21 MR. MARTINELLI: Yeah. In other words, as

22 you go into Gun Club Road from --

23 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: There's two parcels we own

24 up there.

25 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, two or three parcels.

17

1 MR. MARTINELLI: Okay. Were they considered
2 in this expansion as a possible --

3 MR. WUELLNER: They're not contiguous with --
4 they're not contiguous with the --

5 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Airfield.

6 MR. WUELLNER: -- with the airfield.

7 MR. MARTINELLI: When you say they're not
8 contiguous, is there something separating? Is a
9 road separating them? Is that --

10 MR. WUELLNER: Gun Club, as well as other --
11 other ownership.

12 MR. MARTINELLI: Okay.

13 MR. WUELLNER: The parcels we have are -- I
14 think amount to about -- you're beating my memory
15 up here, but I want to -- I want to say there's
16 about -- somewhere between 10 and 15 total acres
17 that we have in two parcels, one being about
18 double the size of the other.

19 MR. MARTINELLI: Okay. Is -- is there any
20 future planned use for that property, or maybe it
21 should be sold or --

22 MR. WUELLNER: I think, actually, Vic, to be
23 perfectly honest, I think when these -- when --
24 when they're walking through the airfield

25 development alternatives, which is, I don't know

18

1 whether it's next or within a couple of these
2 layouts, I think a part of that does get looked
3 at.

4 MR. MARTINELLI: Okay. That's -- that was
5 all my questions.

6 MR. WUELLNER: But not in the context of the
7 GA area. Going to pass it to the others.

8 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. Henry?

9 MR. WARNER: My name is Henry Warner, and I'm
10 a member of the Pilots Association. And I guess
11 one of the questions on everything that deals with
12 the airport is what -- what does it add in terms
13 of either making the airport self-supportive or in
14 the use of the airport and as a commercial or a
15 venture or whatever? But unless you know the
16 figures and you're assured that you're going to --
17 it's going to be a profitable activity, that's one
18 question.

19 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Well, let me try -- let me
20 try to answer that question. One of the questions
21 I just gave Phil is, what is the demand, you know,
22 for the 20 years?

23 MR. WARNER: I understand.

24 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: And he's saying that the

25 demand that they've come up with for corporate

19

1 hangars will fill -- that these two plans -- or
2 the 24 planned will fill the -- the forecast they
3 have for corporate hangars. I think that's
4 basically your question.

5 MR. WARNER: And second --

6 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Rather than talking about
7 building them --

8 MR. WARNER: -- is it profitable?

9 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah.

10 MR. JUFKO: We'll talk about that.

11 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Well, if -- if we're
12 building our -- our recent philosophy has been if
13 we build something, we're going to get at least a
14 10 percent return on our money. And you're
15 talking about a long-term lease. So, if it's not
16 profitable, we don't -- this Authority wouldn't
17 build it. Now, the one coming down the road might
18 for some other reason. But, no, it's got to be
19 profitable.

20 MR. WARNER: Good.

21 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Joe, I'm sorry.

22 MR. CIRIELLO: Mr. Chair. Ed, the property
23 that Vic was referring to, is this the same
24 property that you and I discussed one time when I

25 said I'd like to see us either build or deal with

20

1 some motel company, just leasing the land and let
2 them build a -- some motel units that is -- is
3 that the property facing U.S. 1 that's right on
4 U.S. 1?

5 MR. WUELLNER: No. This -- this is out next
6 to the North 40 --

7 MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah.

8 MR. WUELLNER: -- complex at Grumman. It
9 doesn't face -- this is -- well --

10 MR. CIRIELLO: But we do have some property
11 there, don't we, right on U.S. 1?

12 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. The -- can you see the
13 aerial right behind us? The property we're
14 talking about is right where here where I've got
15 (indicating) --

16 MR. CIRIELLO: Okay. Off the end of the
17 runway on this side of Gun Club Road --

18 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, down here.

19 MR. CIRIELLO: -- we have some property
20 there, don't we?

21 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. We have a few pieces
22 here. That's what Vic was asking about, right
23 about there (indicating). And then we have
24 significant pieces up in here (indicating).

25 MR. CIRIELLO: And that's where I was wanting

21

1 to build a hotel for these corporate planes that
2 come in and pilots stay overnight, instead of
3 sending them down the road. And then during the
4 year, when you have like the Gator Bowl and
5 Georgia University and Bike Week, and there's
6 always an overflow from Jacksonville down here for
7 motel rooms. But I thought that if we had some
8 motel units that belong to the airport, whether we
9 just lease it out or build it, it would bring in
10 some money.

11 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Well, Joe, can we handle
12 different alternatives for that piece of property
13 when we get to the overview? Because I think what
14 he's trying to do now is just cover the
15 corporate --

16 MR. CIRIELLO: Okay. I thought that was in
17 the same area. All right.

18 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Jack?

19 MR. JUFKO: Thank you.

20 MR. GORMAN: Can I suggest, in any future
21 discussions of any development on this airport,
22 that we have a master overlay showing what we own,
23 showing what we own --

24 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Good idea.

25 MR. GORMAN: -- completely, in a separate

22

1 issue, on a separate billboard, whatever it is, so

2 we continually refer to it?

3 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: That's a great idea.

4 MR. GORMAN: This should be, you know --

5 MR. WUELLNER: That's a good idea.

6 MR. GORMAN: All right. Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Do you have that on one --

8 on a slide that you could interject in here or --

9 MS. LOUNGEWAY: I might.

10 MR. JUFKO: There were some areas down south.

11 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: But when you get to the

12 overall airfield, I'm sure you're going to have

13 one there.

14 MS. LOUNGEWAY: The airfields do -- it does

15 show all the property.

16 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, it does, you're right.

17 MS. LOUNGEWAY: The -- the airfield ones show

18 the property lines.

19 MR. WUELLNER: The larger ones do.

20 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Right.

21 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. Do you -- is it

22 convenient for you to, as we talk about it, to be

23 able to jump from your presentation right to that?

24 MR. JUFKO: We can do that. It's only a few

25 slides.

23

1 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. Because I think
2 you've got a good point there. We keep talking
3 back and forth.

4 MR. WUELLNER: In terms of -- just for what
5 it's worth, but in terms of reference, the -- the
6 airport's border right now runs roughly what I'm
7 tracing here (indicating). Everything on the
8 inside of that or the bottom of your screen
9 belongs to the airport. It follows -- it
10 basically follows the existing road line, if you
11 can kind of follow that through here (indicating).

12 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

13 MR. WUELLNER: The road line, that's -- the
14 side I'm on right now belongs to the Gun Club.
15 The road and this belongs to the airport and
16 everything else inside (indicating).

17 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

18 MR. WUELLNER: It's a great suggestion,
19 Mr. Gorman, about showing the --

20 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Any other comments on the
21 corporate hangars then?

22 MS. ANDERSEN: Yes, sir. I wanted to add
23 that our preliminary data, according to land
24 use -- my name is Mariben Andersen. I'm the

25 environmental scientist for LPA Group, your

24

1 consultant.

2 The area that he was referring to is actually
3 a freshwater marsh, and the area next to that is
4 also considered a freshwater wetland, but that one
5 is forested; it's trees. And the reason why it is
6 more challenging to permit forested wetlands is
7 because the mitigation ratios are higher.

8 Your options for mitigations are several.
9 You can go to a preserve or buy mitigation credits
10 at the same time, because that channel discharges
11 into a saltwater wetland. He's right; it can be
12 claimed as a saltwater marsh, and that means more
13 agencies to get permits from, in a very simple way
14 of stating things. I wanted to support his
15 statement.

16 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

17 MR. CIRIELLO: Well, with -- with this line
18 of thinking, I know this -- this Authority hasn't
19 been -- been blasted in the papers recently, but
20 if you read the papers daily or weekly, there's
21 some -- these environmental people complaining
22 about building and losing a little bit of, you
23 know, ecology here and there. And we're going to
24 be infringing in some of that.

25 And just because we can doesn't necessarily

25

1 make it right. And if we're going to be taking
2 some precious land away just to build some hangars
3 and make a few bucks, I'm not going to -- I'm not
4 going to be too -- too much in favor of that.

5 That's -- that's what it sounds like. Just -- she
6 said that --

7 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

8 MR. CIRIELLO: -- permitting might be a
9 problem, but it will be done. But like I say,
10 just because we can, doesn't mean we should.

11 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Absolutely.

12 MS. ANDERSEN: May I please respond to your
13 comment?

14 MR. MARTINELLI: Go to the mic.

15 MR. WUELLNER: If you don't mind. Thank you.

16 MS. ANDERSEN: You have different types of
17 environmental people, okay? My role with you is
18 to make sure that the project you are proposing is
19 permissible. There are rules in the State of
20 Florida and throughout the United States to
21 protect wetlands and uplands and species that are
22 what we call endangered or dwindling in numbers,
23 and they're important to us.

24 Now, we wouldn't recommend to you an

25 alternative that would not follow those rules. We

26

1 impact wetlands because we can and we have to and
2 because there is a balance between social,
3 economic, the need for public interest and public
4 need, and environmental concerns.

5 If you do impact that wetland, I can assure
6 you that somewhere else in this county, another
7 wetland will replace that. That's how the rule
8 works, and that's how the law in the State of
9 Florida works.

10 So, I just don't want you to think that the
11 airport is going to expand the airport for the
12 sake of expanding. My role, as part of your
13 consultant, is to make sure that we would show the
14 need for it, and at the same time, we would
15 minimize environmental impacts, if we can. But
16 that is all limited by a whole bunch of factors.

17 MR. CIRIELLO: Let me ask you a question.

18 MS. ANDERSEN: Yes, sir.

19 MR. CIRIELLO: Do you feel that maybe there's
20 a time when expansion isn't -- I don't want to say
21 necessary, but it isn't prudent? I'm not one of
22 these guys that thinks -- sits here and just
23 thinks, well, we -- the business is coming; we've
24 got to go out, we've got to go out, we've got to

25 go out and build, build, build, build.

27

1 I feel that once the airport gets saturated
2 within its own boundaries, that's it; you either
3 make another airport somewhere or you live with
4 what you've got. So, I don't -- I don't much take
5 to the words that "need, public need, public need,
6 public need." Because there's other needs besides
7 just the public.

8 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I think that this --
9 this --

10 MR. CIRIELLO: And so, I -- I don't -- you
11 know, these -- I'm not much in favor --

12 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Mr. Ciriello, I think that
13 this workshop is to go over the -- what the
14 consultants are telling us the need that they have
15 seen. Whether we all get together at some other
16 meeting and say we're not going to do that, you
17 know, we're not going to exceed the boundaries of
18 the airport, then that's something we do at
19 another meeting. Yes, Jack.

20 MR. GORMAN: Just to put this to bed really
21 quickly. In other words, is it true that
22 Alternative 2 would be far more easily permitted
23 than alternative -- than the larger alternative,
24 because of the lack of intrusion into this

25 forested wetland?

28

1 MR. WUELLNER: It appears --

2 MR. GORMAN: We're not --

3 MS. ANDERSEN: It's not just the lack of
4 intrusion of wetland. It's also the amount of the
5 area you're intruding into. The less there is --

6 MR. GORMAN: In other words, just in simple
7 terms, this is easily permitted --

8 MS. ANDERSEN: Yes, sir.

9 MR. GORMAN: And the other alternative, which
10 is much larger, is much harder.

11 MS. ANDERSEN: Yes, sir.

12 MR. GORMAN: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. All right. Any
14 other questions? Carry on, Phil.

15 MS. LOUNGEWAY: The other area of general
16 aviation development is in the current Araquay
17 Park area south of the existing T-hangars. What
18 we've shown here is within the boundaries of -- of
19 going along the property acquisition that the
20 airport has -- has been undertaking over the past
21 ten-plus years (indicating). It shows a
22 development of the full area. It does exceed what
23 is currently forecasted in the Master Plan, as far
24 as the number of facilities.

25 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: You say it does?

29

1 MS. LOUNGEWAY: It does exceed.

2 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

3 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Some of the major -- let's
4 see if this is better. Some of the major aspects
5 of this are keeping landside access to U.S. 1 for
6 vehicles coming to the hangars, and this would be
7 along Araquay and a new southern route going along
8 the full development. We have airfield access by
9 a taxi lane coming kind of between the tower and
10 the proposed extension to Taxiway Bravo.

11 We show a potential for a second FBO or the
12 current FBO to expand to have staff and services
13 to meet the need of transient and the based
14 aircraft in this area (indicating).

15 We keep -- we show the current maintenance
16 facility (indicating). We show quite a few
17 T-hangars. In fact, it's 165. Forty new box
18 hangars, five kind of corporate hangars
19 (indicating) that would -- some of these could be
20 in support of the FBO and maintenance activities,
21 or it could be some -- some small corporate
22 development.

23 Yes, Mr. Gorman?

24 MR. GORMAN: I just passed out to the other

25 board members just a thought I had about -- and

30

1 the title of it was "Let's keep the park in

2 Araquay Park."

3 I notice in this drafting that everything is

4 quite linear. And it -- has any thought in this

5 particular layout been made to maximize or make

6 issue with keeping the whole development as

7 environmentally friendly as -- as -- and esoteric

8 possible, a park-like setting; in other words, so

9 it's attractive, rather than being just linear,

10 rather than just using a straight slide rule?

11 In other words, I had asked the previous man,

12 Mr. DiCarlo, about telemetry from aerial views,

13 about the most useful hardwood stands, could they

14 be kept, in other words, and then could a logical

15 sequence of planning been able to be done so

16 you're still using the land, but so you've still

17 got a very attractive, in other words, setting,

18 rather than something that's just linear that's

19 just mall-like?

20 MS. LOUNGEWAY: This alternative maximized

21 the development. It was: How much could we get

22 in there?

23 MR. GORMAN: Right.

24 MS. LOUNGEWAY: The next alternative does

25 kind of leave a -- a kind of more open feel, which

31

1 does -- and this is a trade-off. In getting that

2 park-like feel, you cannot get --

3 MR. WUELLNER: The density.

4 MS. LOUNGEWAY: -- the same number of -- of

5 hangars and development which could bring in money

6 for the airport.

7 MR. GORMAN: Certainly there's a compromise.

8 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Right. And so, there's a

9 compromise. And -- and so if -- if there is a

10 hardwood stand, say in the middle of the apron,

11 that -- that could potentially, because of

12 object-free areas, impact a large area of -- of

13 development. So, it's a trade-off between the

14 two.

15 MR. GORMAN: Certainly, I know. I understand

16 there would be compromises. I'm just looking for

17 possible out-of-the-box thinking as far as design

18 goes, you know, throwing away the slot -- throwing

19 away the linear rule for just a moment and seeing

20 what possibly could be done as alternatives.

21 MR. WUELLNER: You also need to just step

22 back just for a second. There's -- there's a

23 difference between the level of detail like you're

24 mentioning in -- in the planning effort than what

25 you'd actually do when you got to engineering. I

32

1 mean, I think when you get to engineering,
2 there -- that opens a whole bag of -- of options
3 available to creating, you know, much more
4 friendly, aesthetically-pleasing design --

5 MR. GORMAN: Certainly.

6 MR. WUELLNER: -- than -- than is drawn here.

7 They're not, at this point, probably not
8 considering some of those issues, such as, you
9 know, if there's a specific set -- stand of trees
10 or --

11 MR. GORMAN: Right.

12 MR. WUELLNER: -- you know. They -- you
13 would definitely look at that when you got to
14 engineering, in trying to implement a plan.

15 MR. GORMAN: Just trying to make the point --

16 MR. WUELLNER: No, it's --

17 MR. GORMAN: -- of -- you know, so we started
18 with that possible.

19 MR. WUELLNER: Sure.

20 MR. GORMAN: Thanks.

21 MR. WUELLNER: And if they -- if they were
22 aware of it -- and I'm not sure whether they've
23 done that but, you know, if there are -- if there
24 are places in -- within the Araquay Park or

25 anywhere else on the airport for that matter, that

33

1 lend itself to -- to preservation and -- and a
2 layout that works wonderfully, then, you know,
3 it's a perfect opportunity to get it done in the
4 planning part of it, even pre-engineered, so that
5 it's always considered.

6 MS. LOUNGEWAY: And one of the options that,
7 as far as like trees and keeping a natural kind of
8 barrier, it would be kind of important along the
9 southern edge of this road (indicating), because
10 this is a residential area, to kind of keep what
11 natural barrier is there, and even possibly
12 improve it as needed to -- to deal with the
13 adjacent land uses.

14 MR. WUELLNER: And it doesn't necessarily
15 take big heavy stands of trees to create the
16 environment you're talking about.

17 MS. LOUNGEWAY: The second alternative is
18 similar to the first in that it keeps the F -- the
19 FBO expansion, the maintenance, the apron kind of
20 on the eastern side of -- of the GA development
21 area.

22 What is a little different is the T-hangar
23 units are broken down into smaller kind of chunks.
24 And there is another access point that -- that

25 goes in, which kind of gives it a -- somewhat of a

34

1 more open feel.

2 It does limit -- it does take the number of
3 T-hangers down by about 40 to 50, depending on --
4 I mean, there are a few other differences in the
5 layout.

6 MR. WUELLNER: And those are new units,
7 correct?

8 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Those are new units.

9 MR. WUELLNER: Which, just -- just for frame
10 of reference, would be approximately double what
11 you have out there now in total units.

12 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: And the total units we have
13 now is?

14 MR. WUELLNER: I'd say 128?

15 MS. LOUNGEWAY: A hundred and twenty-eight, I
16 think?

17 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: So, this is going to
18 double --

19 MR. WUELLNER: It's approximately doubling
20 that.

21 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: And our waiting list is?

22 MR. WUELLNER: A little over a hundred.

23 MS. OCHKIE: A hundred and eight.

24 MR. WUELLNER: A hundred and eight. That's

25 assuming they all showed up.

35

1 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I understand.

2 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Another facility that's shown
3 on here is the potential for a community
4 development center, which would maybe contain an
5 office for like the Pilots Association, for the
6 Civil Air Patrol, that kind of thing, have a
7 meeting room and have kind of an observation deck
8 to -- to see -- for the public to come and watch
9 airfield operations.

10 In this alternative, it is placed near the
11 tower and FBO (indicating), which would give you
12 some economies of scale with parking and -- and
13 some of the utility runs and that kind of -- kind
14 of development needs.

15 The third alternative takes a different look
16 and proposes changing, bringing all of your access
17 to the area along this southern route
18 (indicating). To get to the T-hangars and tower,
19 you would come down around and come through the
20 middle here (indicating). This gives two airfield
21 access points, this one in between the tower
22 (indicating) and Bravo, and then one off of Delta.

23 It's proposed to put an FBO in this location
24 (indicating) with sort of a smaller ramp than you

25 would need just for tie-downs, but it would be

36

1 large enough to -- for pilots to drop off
2 passengers, run in for quick things, and then go
3 with a larger apron out here for general storage.

4 This gives 133 T-hangars. We do show some
5 box hangars and a few corporate hangars, although
6 any of these areas that show corporate hangars
7 could be switched out for box hangars or T-hangars
8 as the need dictates.

9 MR. JUFKO: I'd like to bring up a point.
10 During our TAC meeting, there was some
11 recommendations to perhaps take Alternative 3 and
12 maybe provide a fresh look to this area. There
13 are similarities, as we've moved through at least
14 the first two alternatives, one giving you a full
15 buildout, get as much as you can within the area.

16 Another one, let's open it up a little bit.
17 Of course, that presents us with some
18 opportunities, at least on the entrance roads and
19 so on, to address Mr. Gorman's comment a little
20 more, and to give us that feel, that aesthetic
21 feel that we're looking for here at the airport.

22 In here, we had -- we're going to look at a
23 different -- a fresh look at this, but one of the
24 options that we were looking at and -- and on

25 our -- on our fault here, we had moved the

37

1 maintenance facility, and that was a given; it had
2 to stay in place. So, basically, the one that we
3 had worked up to show as an additional alternative
4 wouldn't be prudent to show at this time.

5 So, be assured there's going to be another
6 alternative that provides an out-of-the-box kind
7 of look, taking into consideration -- you know, we
8 try to maximize facilities that are already
9 existing. And what we propose with this other
10 look is to take a fresh look at it. You know,
11 granted, the maintenance facility would stay in
12 place, but really, try to see what can we do, even
13 if it means taking some of those hangars that are
14 already existing out there, out -- out of the
15 play, and especially the older ones, and what
16 would be a best way to -- to organize this area.

17 So, I apologize for that. We thought we were
18 on top of things, but I -- I missed that one
19 there. And the next time we get together, we'll
20 pass that out to you.

21 MR. MARTINELLI: Can I ask a question? Where
22 is this centroid of this airport?

23 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Where is the what? That
24 was Vic.

25 MR. MARTINELLI: Our -- our previous

38

1 consultants, going way, way back, made a strong
2 argument that the centroid -- and it's your kind
3 of talk --

4 MR. JUFKO: Okay.

5 MR. MARTINELLI: -- so you understand what it
6 is -- was where the present FBO is. And I would
7 just like to know, in your studies, where the
8 centroid of this field is.

9 MR. JUFKO: Well, I would say -- go ahead.
10 I'm sorry.

11 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Will you define "centroid"
12 again so that I and other people understand?

13 MR. MARTINELLI: Well, I'll give you the
14 Reynolds, Smith & Hills definition --

15 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: That's fine.

16 MR. MARTINELLI: -- which is the point where
17 access to runways and services is most accessible.

18 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

19 MR. MARTINELLI: Okay. Most accessible
20 distance-wise, et cetera. I always had a problem
21 with that, simply because our main runway is
22 13/31, and you couldn't get much further away from
23 13/31 --

24 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: With this alternative.

25 MR. MARTINELLI: Forget the alternative.

39

1 With their definition of where the centroid was.
2 So, I'm asking you where the centroid is, because
3 at least according to Reynolds, Smith & Hills,
4 that was a very important factor to factor into
5 any of this kind of stuff, where you locate an FBO
6 and services, et cetera.

7 MR. JUFKO: Well, one way I would look at
8 that and -- and attempt to address you here is
9 that now that this area is open for consideration,
10 I would dare say that that centroid really could
11 find itself right here where we're looking at,
12 because of its location.

13 MR. MARTINELLI: Okay. But not where it's
14 going to find itself; where did you guys find it
15 in your study?

16 MR. JUFKO: Well, because if I look at what
17 is existing out there, and this does -- a great
18 part of this does not exist, okay --

19 MR. MARTINELLI: Okay.

20 MR. JUFKO: -- the centroid would be where
21 it's at, because that is where a lot of the
22 facilities are, and that's where we have the room
23 for some of the -- the development and the storage
24 capabilities here at the airport, and does have

25 access to the airfield.

40

1 This area is by far better access to the --
2 to the airfield. It's very clear. We're here
3 near an intersection of -- of two runways that are
4 used quite often.

5 So -- and to answer your question, I would
6 say that the -- this Master Plan -- and I wouldn't
7 necessarily point that out, but to answer your
8 question, this would be the centroid, this area.

9 MR. MARTINELLI: Can you give it by the
10 laser?

11 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yeah, point it. You're
12 talking about right where the new FBO and the end
13 of 6 and 2 is?

14 MR. JUFKO: Whoops. I just can't get this
15 right, can I?

16 MS. LOUNGEWAY: It's the button underneath.

17 MR. JUFKO: Oh, is that why? Okay. When
18 they -- just to be clear, when they said the
19 centroid, they were just talking generally in this
20 area (indicating), weren't they? They didn't
21 specifically --

22 MR. MARTINELLI: No, they where talking about
23 where we should make our future investments.

24 MR. JUFKO: Okay. And I'm telling you

25 that --

41

1 MR. MARTINELLI: Bear in mind that the
2 terminal was not there.

3 MR. JUFKO: -- your future investments should
4 be made in this area.

5 MR. MARTINELLI: Because you're saying --
6 well, that's a big area for a centroid. That
7 looks like a --

8 MR. JUFKO: It is --

9 MR. MARTINELLI: -- not a centroid.

10 MR. JUFKO: -- but you have a waiting list.
11 You have a -- you have a huge waiting list at this
12 airport that could support this development now.

13 MR. MARTINELLI: Okay. Well, you must have a
14 different definition of centroid than Reynolds
15 Smith & Hills has.

16 MR. COOPER: That's a term they made up.

17 MR. JUFKO: Centroid --

18 MR. COOPER: I never heard it before.

19 MR. JUFKO: Centroid is used -- is a widely
20 used term in planning, not just in airports. And
21 I -- I sense they kind of took it out of context
22 from straight urban planning and tried to apply it
23 to this. And it would still apply.

24 You -- you need to know that your population,

25 if I want to kind of tie it to the planning side,

42

1 the population, the airport population is where
2 our hangars and our based aircraft are at. If we
3 say in the future that we want to see them in this
4 area because this is the best area to develop in
5 the future (indicating), and they provide the best
6 access to the airfield as we know it, which is
7 there's some access to -- to two runways that are
8 used, then I would still stick to my -- to my guns
9 here. This area is -- is where that centroid
10 would be.

11 MR. MARTINELLI: Okay.

12 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yes, Henry?

13 MR. WARNER: I've got just some observations.

14 And I flew into a number of airports like Hernando
15 County, Thomasville, and Williston, and they all
16 have shade hangars, which is a cheaper approach to
17 providing small aviation some kind of protection
18 from the hot sun and some other inclement weather.
19 They're not as expensive and -- to build or
20 maintain, yet they are very useful for private
21 pilots, either in transit or either as a place to
22 keep your aircraft as an alternative to a fully
23 developed hangar.

24 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Well, Henry --

25 MR. WARNER: I wonder if the planning group

43

1 has considered such a thing. Not everybody can
2 afford \$200 a month for a rental hangar. And some
3 people have aircraft they would still like to
4 protect, but don't have any alternatives.

5 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I think at this point, what
6 they've done is they've taken need and based it
7 into T-hangars, corporate and commercial, and said
8 where's the property that we have to fill that
9 need? Whether we make one of those rows shade
10 hangars as opposed to T-hangars, that's a decision
11 this board can make, you know, five years from
12 now, three years from now.

13 There is one thing that I'd like to point out
14 that -- that the whole idea here is a 20-year
15 plan. And we've defined the need. And what Phil
16 and his -- his group are doing is they're telling
17 us, here are some alternatives for planning for
18 that 20 years, you know, down the road. How we
19 get there is not, you know, go borrow money and go
20 in there tomorrow.

21 I personally kind of like this over the other
22 ones, because if I come in here to satisfy the
23 next five-year demand, I can leave these property
24 owners right here alone (indicating). And I can

25 have my activity coming in and have my buffer here

44

1 and not have to bother these property owners for
2 another five years or seven years. When the next
3 FBO comes in, then I can see what the demand is
4 and pop in there. So, I kind of like this as an
5 overall plan, because it -- it gives us a little
6 breathing room with our present expansion into
7 Araquay Park.

8 If you look back at Alternative 1 and 2, they
9 show this whole -- whole area as ramp
10 (indicating). And you guys know when you're done
11 trying to get money through Uncle Sam, you try to
12 get it, you know, all you can at one time to get
13 the ramp. So, Alternative 1 and 2 would basically
14 require us having to have all of this property
15 right now, in my opinion.

16 MR. WUELLNER: You -- you would, in that
17 scenario, too.

18 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Huh?

19 MR. WUELLNER: You'd have to have it in this
20 scenario, also. The taxiway is literally running
21 right down the middle of Indian Bend.

22 MR. JUFKO: Right.

23 MR. WUELLNER: The road as it's depicted
24 there is new construction, not existing.

25 MR. JUFKO: Plus, for -- for anything like

45

1 what you're saying to happen, you'd have to have

2 buffer --

3 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: The taxiway couldn't come

4 here (indicating). It would go down through here,

5 and we start off with duplicating, you know, these

6 four buildings for another 48 (indicating).

7 MR. WUELLNER: Well, there -- there are

8 other -- other takeoffs.

9 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: That's another alternative?

10 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah.

11 MR. JUFKO: Now, what -- what Ed was saying,

12 there are other takeoffs that could be kind of

13 carved out of any of the three that you see

14 here --

15 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yeah.

16 MR. JUFKO: -- because there's infinite --

17 you know, sometimes I feel there are infinite

18 possibilities, and we're trying to give you at

19 least three or four different looks at something

20 just to kind of give you a good feel for what

21 other possibilities are out there.

22 Typically, when we go to refine alternatives,

23 it's rare that we even take one of the

24 alternatives that we put before you in the

25 preliminary. And, Mr. George, you may like one

46

1 aspect of it, and Mr. Gorman may like another
2 aspect, Mr. Ciriello may like another aspect, and
3 we may come back to this group in refinement and
4 say, you know what? We've come up with this
5 alternative that meets some of -- of the needs
6 here --

7 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yeah.

8 MR. JUFKO: -- and the requests.

9 MR. GORMAN: I have one great big issue
10 and -- and here we go; I'm going to drop a bit of
11 a bomb. We have immediate planning and design
12 issues, and all of these planning and design
13 issues are based on land ownership, and they're
14 assuming land ownership. And that's a problem.

15 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yeah, but over the 20-year
16 time period, is what he's saying.

17 MR. GORMAN: Okay.

18 MR. JUFKO: If you look at this -- this
19 alternative here -- and I'm not promoting one over
20 the other, but it's -- it's a good example --
21 there is currently a need for additional ramp
22 space now. So, when we say -- and this happens to
23 show the ramp on this side of the airport -- this
24 side of the area (indicating).

25 But to show -- one of the -- one of the

47

1 questions I think that came out at one of the last
2 meetings is, how would we phase this? I think --
3 I can't remember which one of you mentioned this.
4 But if we wanted to start building now, would we
5 be able to start building? And the answer is,
6 some of the needs that we've addressed in these
7 areas here would allow you to start building in
8 this area --

9 MR. GORMAN: Even though this is --

10 MR. JUFKO: -- ideally.

11 MR. GORMAN: Even though this is a 20-year
12 plan, we do -- like I said, we have immediate
13 needs. And I really wish we had an overlay right
14 now that showed what we owned right now so that we
15 could actually intelligently discuss actually
16 doing what we've already funded and -- and
17 borrowed \$5 million to do.

18 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Mary?

19 MS. WILLIS: The three plans, the three
20 alternatives show the entire taking of Araquay
21 Park, which you all know I'm opposed to. But back
22 in December, I believe it was, you airport
23 planners told this board that the list of more
24 than 100 people on the waiting list right now

25 would be filled by approximately 35 to 45 percent

48

1 five years from now or whenever this is -- comes
2 to fruition because of the various things that
3 happen; people rent elsewhere, they die, they move
4 away, they get divorced, they stop flying, et
5 cetera, which negates the need for 114 T-hangars.

6 But I realize y'all are just trying to do
7 your job. I in turn am trying to do my job of
8 preserving my home. It is possible to phase it
9 in, is it not? Which you are not taking into
10 consideration here.

11 MR. JUFKO: During late -- once we do have an
12 alternative that is agreeable, both between the
13 consultant team and -- and -- and the airport,
14 later phases of this do deal with the issues of
15 phasing construction of the program, and that is
16 primarily based on what the needs are, you know,
17 ties back to the needs, and also ties back to the
18 ability to fund those projects, as well as the
19 financial feasibility of the projects. And I
20 don't see any problem with that, but I just wanted
21 to give you the considerations.

22 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. So -- so, what
23 you're saying is the -- the next iteration is
24 where you'll break it down based on the needs over

25 the next five years, over ten years?

49

1 MR. JUFKO: No, it's much later. The

2 question --

3 MR. WUELLNER: You would -- you would only

4 normally do that with your preferred development

5 alternative. You're not going to do that for each

6 alternative.

7 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

8 MR. WUELLNER: Once you ultimately decide on

9 what you want it to look like or expect it to look

10 like in 20 years or more, then they're going to

11 pick that apart into a sequence of -- that's

12 generally made up of logic and constructability

13 and -- and -- and need, and -- and propose that --

14 that -- this would -- this would come together in

15 pieces, obviously.

16 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. Joe?

17 MR. CIRIELLO: Yes. On this list, I'd like

18 to hear some more about the community education

19 center. I have some questions there. I'd like

20 for you to expound just exactly what you mean by

21 that community center.

22 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Well, we were asked to

23 consider that.

24 MR. WUELLNER: I was going to say, it -- it's

25 a -- it came out of a series of discussions that

50

1 we've had with Pilots Association, Civil Air
2 Patrol, members of the community just interested
3 in -- in being able to view the activity on the
4 airport or -- it just so happens our airport's got
5 a very difficult layout to allow the general
6 public to -- to have a real good view of what goes
7 on.

8 The concept or just the idea of including
9 some place on the airport where the community
10 could better interface with the airport as a
11 whole, that's not terminal space, it's not, you
12 know, propriety space or space that's leased out
13 to -- to private companies, but a place where
14 meetings can be held, where -- where the tour
15 groups can come, where -- and I don't mean -- I
16 mean, groups looking for a tour of the airport,
17 where they can -- you can have those meetings and
18 seminars and discussions and -- and have place for
19 other arguably public meeting places.

20 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: With possibly a park, you
21 know, like a -- swings and watching airplanes?

22 MR. WUELLNER: Exactly.

23 MR. CIRIELLO: And here's the point, what I'm
24 getting to: Is this community center going to --

25 center going to be outside of our perimeter on a

51

1 stand-alone part?

2 MR. WUELLNER: It can be. It can be in
3 integrated in there.

4 MR. CIRIELLO: Here's what I'm getting at.
5 Here I am a board member, and I can't get on this
6 airport unless I go over to the flight school and
7 rent an airplane, and then I can walk out on the
8 ramp and go to an airplane. So, how is this
9 community center going to be available to the
10 general public?

11 Now, I'm not talking about Pilots Association
12 and stuff like that. It -- it's not groups who
13 want to come in and learn; I understand all that.
14 But just some citizen driving by and says, oh,
15 they have a community center; I think I'll just go
16 in there and sit a while, how are they going to
17 get into it if it's not stand-alone?

18 MR. WUELLNER: Okay. We're not -- we're
19 not -- the property itself would be available/open
20 to the public. Now, the building itself is --
21 obviously the access to that's got to be
22 controlled in some manner, you know, and that --
23 and that would be discussed and I'm sure --

24 MR. CIRIELLO: Then it's not truly available

25 to the public.

52

1 MR. WUELLNER: The balance -- the exterior of
2 that property would be accessible for you to drive
3 up, you know, go look at an -- go look at
4 airplanes, you know, have -- you know, we
5 envision, you know, a gazebo or two, for lack of
6 better term, but a picnic shelter kind of set up
7 where you -- you kind of pull some aspects of
8 public park into the -- the environs of the
9 airport.

10 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Joe, this road right here
11 which we presently have gates to get into the
12 facility (indicating), leave that road as it is
13 all the way out to here. Maybe there's a
14 secondary fence area so that we can control people
15 getting to the community center. But once they
16 get into the community center, there's a gate to
17 keep them from wandering out where airplanes are,
18 you know --

19 MR. CIRIELLO: Well, when you say available
20 to general public, you're not talking that they
21 can just go through all of the --

22 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Correct.

23 MR. CIRIELLO: -- security and get anywhere
24 they want.

25 MR. WUELLNER: Correct.

53

1 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Right.

2 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: No, this is not a public
3 park like downtown where you --

4 MR. CIRIELLO: Okay. That's what I was
5 getting at.

6 Now, on the -- the note that everybody says
7 this airport's going to be self-sufficient some
8 day and we're going to make money and this and
9 that, thinking that way, how is this thing going
10 to make us any money strictly to try to get off
11 the tax rolls?

12 I'm thinking about making money now; I'm not
13 thinking about getting the service to the public,
14 you know, which is -- people should do, government
15 should do is give the public access. Thinking
16 strictly with all of the words being thrown out,
17 we're going to get off the tax rolls, how is this
18 thing going to help us make any money?

19 MR. WUELLNER: I suspect it's not to be a
20 revenue -- you know, a large revenue producer.
21 What we envisioned was some small-type leases that
22 basically cover the operating cost of the
23 building, not the capitalization of it.
24 Otherwise, it's more characterized as park public

25 property versus revenue-producing.

54

1 MR. CIRIELLO: I just wanted -- wanted it
2 understood that it's not going to be a
3 revenue-making thing --

4 MR. WUELLNER: It's not.

5 MR. CIRIELLO: -- that will get us off the
6 tax rolls.

7 MR. WUELLNER: It is not.

8 MR. CIRIELLO: Okay. I'm done.

9 MR. WUELLNER: You know, the alternative you
10 had after this, Alternative 3? And I understand
11 your -- your comments, Mr. George, but I -- I
12 think from a phasing perspective -- and my first
13 blush when I look at these things really has to do
14 with operational. You know, does -- does it
15 function well? Does it -- you know, does it work
16 well from an aviation standpoint? And then
17 secondarily, when you go to actually build it,
18 does the phasing work? You know, does it make any
19 sense, based on what you own or how -- how it's
20 logically likely to develop? And, you know, I see
21 some things I like in this one, too.

22 The -- the area that gives me the most
23 heartburn is in the development of the second FBO
24 area. With those three existing T-hangars sitting

25 there, A, B, and C building, you're effectively

55

1 creating a pinch point for public access to ramp.

2 And -- and I think if you were, you know,

3 seriously considering a layout, something similar

4 to this, you'd want to open up that end, replace

5 those units somewhere else.

6 The other thing that gives me concern is just

7 expense-wise, because it seems a little excessive

8 in numbers, is -- is taking this area here -- I

9 guess you'd call it here (indicating), and -- and

10 reversing the aviation access. Just put the

11 aviation access on this side, providing vehicle

12 access and parking on this side of it.

13 You cut down the total linear feet of taxiway

14 dramatically. And I think you could even extend

15 taxi -- those -- some of those buildings a little

16 bit further and gain some more yield in terms of

17 revenue-producing.

18 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: From a phase-in standpoint,

19 does that give us the ability of not having to

20 acquire the property that's on the water at the

21 present time?

22 MR. WUELLNER: That's the single biggest

23 negative of this layout, is that if -- if the --

24 if we're moving toward at any pace -- the second

25 FBO, you've actually kind of flip-flopped to some

56

1 degree the priority you've had on acquiring in
2 Araquay Park. Because now you're looking at the
3 stuff that's west of Casa Cola being much more
4 priority in this kind of a layout than the extreme
5 east end of Casa Cola. I say Casa Cola --

6 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Well, I would --

7 MR. WUELLNER: -- the east end of the
8 development.

9 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yeah.

10 MR. MARTINELLI: Isn't Alternative 2 more
11 along the lines you're talking about?

12 MR. WUELLNER: I -- I think it is.

13 MR. MARTINELLI: Yeah.

14 MR. WUELLNER: I think it has the -- what I
15 understand to be the priorities, if you will,
16 that -- that we've heard come out in bits and
17 pieces over the last year, it -- it fits it a
18 little bit better.

19 MR. MARTINELLI: I think it also --

20 MR. WUELLNER: You could change those
21 priorities anytime you want.

22 MR. MARTINELLI: I think it also defines, if
23 I can use this term, centroid, a little more
24 specifically, you know, as being close to the

25 tower in that area.

57

1 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Did you, Phil, look at any
2 other land that was adjacent to the airport that
3 would give us the option of stopping the
4 penetration into Araquay Park from where we are
5 now? I know the decision to go to Araquay Park
6 was a 1985 decision based on a master plan at that
7 time. And all I'm saying is that we need to
8 reassess every option that we have --

9 MR. GORMAN: Based on reality.

10 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Right. Exactly, yeah.

11 MR. GORMAN: Based on the reality of what we
12 own, too, and what we can really do to really
13 start getting off the tax rolls now.

14 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yeah. Yeah.

15 MR. GORMAN: Yes.

16 MR. JUFKO: For the short, intermediate, and
17 even long-term development and more towards the
18 short, intermediate, the only areas that we looked
19 at were these -- this area (indicating) and -- and
20 the north end --

21 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

22 MR. JUFKO: -- as the only available areas
23 for this type of development, given the leases
24 that you have in -- in effect right now.

25 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: The property that is

58

1 presently the Gun Club, how well -- is that -- is
2 that a lot of wetlands that are in there? Does
3 that -- because, see, that is a bulk -- that is a
4 chunk of land, you know, that's in there.

5 MR. JUFKO: Sure. Could do a lot of
6 interesting things up there if I were to ignore
7 the fact that the wetlands were there.

8 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. So, that's -- that's
9 the main thing that -- that keeps us from looking
10 at that as a -- as a major --

11 MR. JUFKO: Did I step on your -- did I rain
12 on your parade?

13 MS. ANDERSEN: No. I'm just saying I have a
14 reference map so I can --

15 MR. JUFKO: Whenever I talk environmental,
16 she gets all excited.

17 MS. ANDERSEN: If you give me five minutes, I
18 can tell you.

19 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

20 MR. WUELLNER: It's actually more of the same
21 as we were looking at the 24-unit development up
22 there --

23 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Right.

24 MR. WUELLNER: -- in the previous development

25 area. It's -- it's more of that kind of impact on

59

1 the -- what we could argue may or may not end up
2 being determined to be saltwater. It's -- it's --
3 it's a nice piece of property, but we've even
4 looked at it a couple of times in -- in the
5 context of purchasing. It's been offered to the
6 airport a couple of times. But the net on it
7 is -- is very poor without having to mitigate it.

8 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

9 MR. WUELLNER: So, if you want to leave the
10 wetlands intact, that -- that works, but you're
11 only looking at about 50 percent use.

12 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

13 MR. GORMAN: Here's my problem with this
14 whole thing: In other words, you can look at 20-
15 and you can look at 10-year plans, but then if you
16 look at the reality of what you own and then you
17 look at the contentious issues we have now and you
18 look at what you could actually do, so in reality,
19 what we can do in the next one year, and the
20 reality what we can do in the next two years,
21 doesn't that have to kind of move the plan, the
22 10-year plan around?

23 In other words, you take what you can really
24 do right now and you isolate those areas. And you

25 say, well, this is area we could really use. This

60

1 area we could really use right now without a
2 tremendous number of contentious issues. Now go
3 on from there and build your 10-, your possible
4 20-year plan from that, rather than assuming all
5 of these issues are just going to go away.

6 You plan for all these issues with that
7 assumption they're going to go away and then we're
8 moving on, I don't -- I see that whole thing as
9 clogging our actual progress towards actually
10 getting the realistic, you know, entities that are
11 rentable. I mean --

12 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I understand what you're
13 saying.

14 MR. GORMAN: -- real progress, real progress,
15 right.

16 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yeah. Do you start from
17 satisfying today, then tomorrow, and then all of a
18 sudden 20 years, you know, how does it all go
19 together? They elected to do the whole one and
20 let's let everybody take potshots at it, and then
21 maybe come up with an alternative --

22 MR. GORMAN: I don't really want to take
23 potshots; I'd like to just kind of, in reality,
24 map out what we really could develop right now and

25 what we're really not sure we can develop right

61

1 now, and then move along with a plan along that
2 basis so that we've actually got something that
3 can move ahead rapidly.

4 MR. WUELLNER: I -- I think that's a
5 significant item.

6 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I think tying it with need
7 is right on the line, you know.

8 MR. WUELLNER: It's a -- it's a very
9 significant comment in that -- when you're really
10 looking at the phasing of the ultimate development
11 plan. And I think that's exact -- you're exactly
12 on the money, is that when you -- we can pick --
13 pick any one of them. I really don't care at
14 the -- for the purpose of illustration.

15 But when you get down to how -- how can you
16 develop it, how can you phase it for development
17 and -- and meet the existing needs, as well as the
18 short-term needs that -- that we've already
19 identified. So, you've -- you've largely got a --
20 that's going to be a significant evaluation factor
21 in determining which alternative you want to move
22 forward on --

23 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yeah.

24 MR. WUELLNER: -- because there's -- there's

25 an extreme logic to what you're saying. But, you

62

1 know, it's perfect -- it makes perfect sense.

2 MR. GORMAN: Part of the logic goes to these
3 contentious issues we've got. We've got eminent
4 domain issues. I hate to say the word, but we do.
5 And those are pieces of the puzzle that are not in
6 place. And to pursue the goal of airport
7 self-sustenance, the eminent domain issue has
8 become red hot.

9 So, we've got to -- don't we actually go into
10 reality? In other words, this is an issue that --
11 this is what we could do if the eminent domain
12 issues are met. This is what we could do if the
13 eminent issues -- domain issues are not met, as
14 far as our purchase.

15 MR. WUELLNER: You could make it that basic,
16 sure, you could.

17 MR. GORMAN: You've got -- seems we've got to
18 have Alternative 1, Alternative 2, and Alternative
19 3 to really making progress. I just don't want
20 this to mire in litigation. It's the truth.

21 MR. WUELLNER: I don't -- I don't see it
22 miring in litigation either way, but -- but --

23 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Phil, is it easy for you --

24 MR. WUELLNER: -- there is a process you have

25 to follow, though.

63

1 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Phil, is it easy for you
2 at -- at -- at this point for you to give us a
3 quick recap at what you see the demand for the
4 various pieces are, say at the five years from now
5 and at ten years from now? That might help us all
6 to visualize, okay, well, ten years from now, that
7 can, you know, do that. I'll give you a
8 three-minute break. And then I'm going to ask you
9 to do the alternative needs.

10 MR. JUFKO: I'm going to wag this. I'm going
11 to take --

12 MR. WUELLNER: Hold this. We're going to do
13 a tape --

14 (Short pause.)

15 MR. WUELLNER: We're good.

16 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Wait a minute. Let me --
17 are you ready?

18 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah.

19 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. Phil, go. Henry,
20 you're up.

21 MR. WARNER: So far, what I've used, really a
22 physical plan, rather than looking at a program.
23 What do you want it to be in terms of a program?
24 You've got a physical plan of various alternatives

25 of what facilities are going to be where. And I

64

1 don't know much about master planning of an

2 airport, but usually you start with the program.

3 What are you trying to achieve --

4 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Well, Henry, that's been

5 doing that for nine months.

6 MR. WARNER: Yeah. Well --

7 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: And I invite you to go back

8 to some of those, you know, meetings and go

9 through it. But that's what they've been doing,

10 is trying to define what program do we need to

11 meet the needs of this county and the growth of

12 aviation.

13 MR. WARNER: Well, that's fine, but let's put

14 it in the context of what the facilities are.

15 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: That's what he's doing.

16 MR. WARNER: Well, I didn't see anything

17 about what the Master Plan was in terms of its

18 goal. What do you want to be, a general aviation

19 airport? That's what I understand it's to be.

20 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Right.

21 MR. WARNER: Okay. That -- that sets one

22 aspect of it off. How do you want to relate to

23 the community? What is the financial plan that

24 goes along with this? You can't get anywhere

25 unless you have a financial plan.

65

1 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Henry, I can't have a
2 financial plan if I don't know what I'm going to
3 build.

4 MR. WARNER: Well, your goal --

5 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: But what we're trying
6 now --

7 MR. WARNER: You set your goal, then you can
8 have a plan.

9 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Well, we have the goal. We
10 have the -- the forecast of the need, and we have
11 challenged the forecast of the need, and based on
12 that challenge, we have an alternative to that.

13 MR. WARNER: Well --

14 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I urge you to read that,
15 because now we are into coming up with, if we go
16 with that need, here's where you can be with the
17 land that is available for you 20 years down the
18 road. So, to do what you're saying would be to go
19 back four months, you know, and come forward.

20 MR. WARNER: No. I'm saying that they work
21 together, the plan, the -- whatever facilities or
22 alternatives you do and whatever financial plan
23 you have to implement it, they're all part of one
24 piece of -- of the overall structure of what you

25 intend to do.

66

1 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I don't know who got my big
2 book out of the way here.

3 MR. JUFKO: We stole it.

4 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Sorry.

5 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. There's the --
6 there's the need thing, if you want to run through
7 it. Phil, can we go back to what Jack was asking?

8 MR. JUFKO: Actually, can -- can I make a
9 real quick comment to --

10 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yeah.

11 MR. JUFKO: You're actually hitting on some
12 points that are forthcoming in this process. And
13 as we said before, we do follow a process. It's
14 a -- it's a rather regimented process, and there
15 is some due diligence as part of this. But you
16 decide your needs, you come up with what we feel
17 the best options are for addressing those needs on
18 the airport -- or perhaps even off the airport;
19 that's something we haven't even discussed yet --
20 and then we set forth and refine that and come up
21 with a plan. And that plan then gets turned into
22 dollars and cents, phasing, how do we afford it
23 over this period of time. All very good
24 questions, but that -- we're right now looking at

25 the options.

67

1 MR. WARNER: Okay.

2 MR. JUFKO: Very easy question you asked me.

3 Remember that any of these alternatives, all three
4 of them, it doesn't matter which one we look at,
5 exceeds the required -- depending on -- we mix and
6 match. You know, some of the alternatives have
7 more apron than the others. Some have more
8 T-hangars, more box hangars. There's -- there's a
9 mix, because what we're trying to do is get some
10 input from this group.

11 You can go over the -- to kind of summarize
12 it, if I were to look over the 20-year period, in
13 the first five or ten years, we're looking at
14 roughly, from what I can tell here, just T-hangars
15 alone, if I read this right, another what, 30 or
16 so T-hangars just in the 10-year window? But we
17 know that these are based off of kind of running
18 off the forecast.

19 We have two things going here. We've got the
20 process that we follow. We follow the forecast,
21 we come up with some requirements, and we say,
22 okay, meet these requirements. Then we have sort
23 of a dose reality, which can just come up right --
24 and just catch you from behind.

25 We've got a waiting list out there that we --

68

1 we try to work into the forecasting process as
2 much as we can. But remember, waiting list is
3 kind of nebulous out there. You know, it's good
4 right now, but as -- as you had mentioned before,
5 what's it going to be down the road? Maybe that
6 waiting list might be 30, 40, 50 percent. You
7 know, that -- that's the crystal ball nature of
8 this.

9 If you're looking -- I think what you're
10 trying to do is kind of phase into this. What are
11 we going to need in near term as compared to later
12 on, the 20 years?

13 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I think that's what Jack
14 and -- and Joe was in essence implying.

15 MR. JUFKO: In the -- in the phasing -- if I
16 could step back a second, the reason we look at
17 these big pictures and we look at this is because
18 we -- we want to see something that's
19 unconstrained. That's our first take on it.

20 We want to look at something that -- other
21 than some physical land features that are really
22 going to set us off. If we can kind of look at an
23 unconstrained view of -- of developing a
24 particular area, it allows us to fully develop it

25 in an efficient manner. And that's what we're

69

1 trying to do with these three alternatives and as
2 you'll see with some of the other alternatives on
3 the airside.

4 It doesn't mean we're going to build it all.
5 In fact, even if this sits on your airport layout
6 plan this time around, it's there because what
7 you're doing is -- if it's there, you're -- you're
8 stating as an Authority, we would like to reserve
9 this area for this type of development.

10 Whether your needs -- your needs are always
11 going to drive when you build things. Even --
12 even if I were to give you a capital improvement
13 program that phased the development, like we said
14 we would do, things happen. Changes occur. And
15 that means that -- that either the demand happens
16 sooner than we anticipated or it doesn't happen as
17 anticipated. Therefore, you may choose or not
18 choose to develop in a -- in a manner that's
19 either, you know, quickly, or you may want to hold
20 off.

21 So, my point is, we start big picture to
22 identify the best use of an area, like we did
23 these two areas. And now, if we do pick an area
24 or an alternative concept, we still have the

25 challenge of trying to phase those projects in --

70

1 in the design phase to meet a lot of these

2 important needs in terms of property.

3 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Phil, I think that what

4 Mr. Gorman has asked for is -- is appropriate in

5 that when we get to reality, you know, to put the

6 whole plan together, it could make a difference of

7 alternative 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 for us to take

8 into consideration what the immediate needs and

9 the immediate future, because it might be that we

10 give something up 20 years from now because we

11 have a need right now that we want to satisfy, you

12 know, and -- and pick a different alternative to

13 ease into it better. Does that make sense?

14 MR. JUFKO: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: That's why he was asking

16 for, can you tell me, even if you want to take a

17 break, you know, tell me what the need was, you

18 know, in the forecast, you know, for these. For

19 instance, we have 133 T-hangars. You just said 30

20 T-hangars over 10 years. I find that mighty hard

21 to believe with --

22 MR. JUFKO: I agree.

23 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: -- with a hundred on the

24 waiting list. And --

25 MR. JUFKO: But there's -- the other portion

71

1 is out there, because there are certain
2 assumptions made during the forecasts and the
3 requirements phase that assume, okay, if they're
4 not in T-hangars, they're in some other hangar.
5 Might be conventional hangar. Might be tie-downs.
6 That all went into coming up with these -- some of
7 these requirements.

8 We went into this area in -- in looking at
9 ways to best -- well, one of them had to do with
10 maximizing the area, and the other one had to do
11 with just show how would we utilize it.

12 MR. GORMAN: And, again, I think this
13 discussion needs to include an overlay on what we
14 actually own in reality right now without any, you
15 know, further --

16 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yeah. Joe?

17 MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah. What you people are in
18 effect doing right now is coming up with the plan,
19 the needs that we're going to need when, whatever,
20 but you're not saying how.

21 Let me give you an example. Say right now if
22 you show us a need that we need to take runway 6
23 and 24 and it needs to be lengthened 2-, 3-, 4-,
24 5-, 600, a thousand feet or whatever, and

25 everybody says, yeah, I agree with you; we could

72

1 use that runway longer, but you're not saying how.

2 And so the board would sit around maybe and vote

3 and say, yeah, okay, they agree with you.

4 But then, later on, when you come in to say

5 how, and then you come in and say, well, now how

6 we can do that is because of this road and

7 everything out here, we're going to go out into

8 the marsh and we're going to extend the runway a

9 thousand feet out there and ruin all that ecology,

10 then I'm going to say, if I'm here, no, no, no,

11 no, no, no. So, I want to know how before I agree

12 with we need, because I may not agree with how

13 you're going to do something even if we need it.

14 MR. JUFKO: I understand.

15 MR. CIRIELLO: So, I think maybe, is this

16 what you're trying to say, too, Jack, that you'd

17 like to know how we're going to do something

18 before we say we need it? Because that's what I'm

19 saying.

20 I want to know how you're going to do these

21 things and what effect they're going to have on,

22 you know, the Araquay Park, the ecology, the bank

23 roll and everything else before I say, yeah, we're

24 going to need to do this. I want both answers. I

25 want to know what we need and how.

73

1 MR. JUFKO: Well, as we refine alternatives,
2 any of them, not just this area, we have to look
3 at areas that incorporate the operational aspects
4 of it. We need to look at the environmental
5 aspects of it, the financial feasibility and costs
6 associated with it.

7 If there happens to be any socioeconomic or
8 political ramifications by -- for some reason,
9 usually on big projects -- well, this too. Those
10 are all aspects that go into the thought process.

11 Now, not necessarily in the layout -- well,
12 in this case, it would. All of those would apply
13 to some degree or another. And in many of our
14 alternatives, they all apply to one degree or
15 another. And no alternative's perfect. It's
16 going to have trade-offs, as we've dealt with all
17 along. And you wanted to ask me a question.

18 MR. GORMAN: No. My point's just -- is the
19 same one.

20 MR. JUFKO: Okay.

21 MR. GORMAN: In other words, we've really got
22 to deal with the reality of a two-year plan to go
23 to a five-year plan and then keep building from
24 that, because we need to make progress.

1 MR. MARTINELLI: Yeah. My interpretation of
2 this type of planning, having been involved in the
3 previous one that was a laughingstock because it
4 was -- it took it too far one way or the other.

5 This plan, in order to be a good, viable, credible
6 plan has to have one foot in reality and the other
7 foot in the future. And if you get it skewed more
8 one way or the other, you'll have a failure.

9 So, to have a plan, which we had at one time
10 that said we were going to move U.S. 1, we were
11 going to move the railroad, we were going to put a
12 parallel runway to 13/31 on the west side of where
13 U.S. 1 is now, we're going to put a bridge over
14 God knows where, was ridiculous. Okay. Why?
15 Because it didn't have a foot in reality.

16 On the other hand, if you have too much in
17 reality, you grow like topsy, because you're
18 always satisfying an immediate need and you're not
19 looking to the future to satisfy future needs.

20 So, you've got to blend the two. And where
21 you blend the two and how you blend the two is the
22 task of the consultant, and he's got to take the
23 slings, arrows, and harpoons of all of you to
24 defend what he does. But that kind of puts in

25 perspective, at least my view, of what this

75

1 long-range plan's got to be.

2 MR. JUFKO: I appreciate that.

3 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. Phil, in knowing
4 what the 20-year plan -- excuse me. Knowing what
5 the 20-year needs are, you've come up with three
6 alternatives. Which one is your company
7 recommending that we use as a basis?

8 MR. JUFKO: We are not recommending any at
9 this point. The purpose of this meeting and the
10 TAC committee is to get some feedback in what your
11 feedback is in particular to these alternatives,
12 because they've all been designed with different
13 characteristics.

14 I have purposely -- well, not on purpose. It
15 just happens to work out the way that no one
16 alternative has everything that you're looking
17 for. There are some benefits to each one. And
18 because of the nature of that, we need to get a
19 feel from this group as to where -- I mean, you
20 had some comments here before on a couple of these
21 alternatives. That's good information for us to
22 take back and go back and refine these
23 alternatives so that we can make a recommendation.

24 See, there's one step that comes after this.

25 The reason we don't want to start running off and

76

1 going to the next step without getting input from
2 you folks is because it's rather intensive, labor
3 intensive, and it involves looking at things like
4 the environment and the -- we've looked at some of
5 the operational characteristics, looking at some
6 preliminary order-of-magnitude costs associated
7 with those, looking at the -- we've already
8 started addressing some potential impacts in terms
9 of to the community and so on.

10 These are the things that we have to take
11 into consideration in this next step in the
12 refinement. This is why we have this meeting
13 today.

14 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. Let's continue with
15 your presentation.

16 MR. JUFKO: Okay.

17 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: And we have not solved
18 anything as far as us -- we're still giving him
19 input. Let's get the overall picture; then we'll
20 go back, and not attack, make a recommendation.

21 MR. JUFKO: That's all right. And -- and I
22 promise not to --

23 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: We're going to -- Ed,
24 you're going to try to bring us that --

25 MR. JUFKO: I promise not to be defensive.

77

1 MR. WUELLNER: It will be just a minute.

2 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

3 MR. JUFKO: Do you want me to hold off or --

4 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: No. Go ahead.

5 MR. JUFKO: Okay. You aren't going to like
6 this part.

7 MR. RODERICK: We didn't like it at the TAC,
8 either.

9 MS. ANDERSEN: It should be you are going to
10 like this part.

11 MR. JUFKO: Thank you, Mariben. There.
12 There it is. We -- I'm going to stand up for
13 this, I think. I've been sitting for a while.

14 There's four alternatives that we pulled
15 together, A, B, C, D. And we've made some changes
16 to these alternatives, to some of them, to reflect
17 some of the comments that were received during the
18 TAC meeting. We felt it important to leave some
19 of it in place for this meeting, because I want
20 you to get a feel for what types of issues we have
21 to deal with as we look at alternatives and as
22 they relate to the runway.

23 As I mentioned earlier on briefly, one of the
24 things that drives the runway alternatives in --

25 in our mind was to address our capacity issue in

78

1 the -- in the long range. We -- we showed that on
2 that first slide. And one of the things that we
3 have to look at is, how do we get the capacity
4 that we really need? And if we can't, we can't.

5 That means, Mr. Ciriello, that we might have
6 to look, at least at this stage of the game, off
7 airport. And that's okay at this stage of the
8 game. Decisions that get made after this point,
9 that decision might mean stay on the airport,
10 don't develop out here, develop here, we like this
11 concept. But right now, we don't want to shut
12 down the analysis because there's a lot of good
13 ideas flowing through this process, and we want to
14 capitalize on some of the good ideas out of the
15 process.

16 So, here is Alternative A. And what this
17 does for us is it doesn't meet our long-term
18 capacity. But there are some -- a number of
19 things that we could do to the airport as it
20 exists today to meet some of these needs. One of
21 the things needs is, if you'll look at 13/31, was
22 to -- can we get that 8,000 feet back that we've
23 been talking about? We've talked about NATO
24 certification, Grumman being able to utilize the

25 full capability of the runway.

79

1 The only way that we can get that, both
2 landing and takeoff, is to correct the runway
3 safety area issue. And what that means, and you
4 see it sort of here with the red coloring
5 (indicating), is to make sure that we get our
6 safety area, which goes into U.S. 1 area, and we
7 come back out and erect -- remedy the safety area
8 issue here (indicating).

9 The benefit down here is that we also,
10 although we're going to look at getting safety
11 area here, we could pave that area and be able to
12 use it for takeoff purposes only (indicating).
13 So, there's a benefit of doing that.

14 This runway here, 6/24 (indicating), we
15 looked at the potential of bringing that --
16 Gloria, can you refresh my memory on the length
17 there?

18 MR. WUELLNER: Just under 3,100.

19 MR. JUFKO: Just under 31- on that one?

20 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Just under, yeah.

21 MR. JUFKO: And that goes with that 3,060
22 requirement. And here's how we meet at least some
23 of our needs. Now, we're fully aware of this
24 (indicating). And if you had been at the TAC

25 meeting, you probably would have had a totally

80

1 different reaction. But we -- we've come up with
2 ways to keep the design speed of the rail, keep it
3 a very subtle change.

4 Here is a way to handle this (indicating).
5 Is it -- is it something that we want to
6 venture -- a road we want to venture down? Don't
7 know. Does it meet our long-term need, if this
8 that is the general directives that we're trying
9 to -- to accomplish here? No, it does not.

10 But it does give us some -- some relief over
11 the 20-year period. It meets those runway length
12 issues. And we would be able to continue
13 operating, but it doesn't -- if I'm correct,
14 Gloria, these two options do not give us capacity
15 relief.

16 MS. LOUNGEWAY: They do not, because --

17 MR. JUFKO: They do not.

18 MS. LOUNGEWAY: -- they do not address the
19 intersection. It's still --

20 MR. JUFKO: That's right.

21 MS. LOUNGEWAY: According to the model.

22 MR. JUFKO: There's only a couple of ways
23 that we can -- at this airport we can -- I'd like
24 to backtrack -- get the capacity relief that we're

25 looking at. One, we do get a little bit of minor

81

1 capacity relief because we've looked at the
2 interaction of taxiway access. We do get to
3 improve upon that. That's something that we would
4 do in all alternatives.

5 The other thing is this intersection right
6 here (indicating). If I were to be able to
7 separate that intersection using the theoretical
8 models that we have that the FAA provides, we
9 would technically be able to increase the amount
10 of capacity here at the airport. But, in and of
11 itself, I would not necessarily say this is the
12 way we're going to solve our long-term capacity.

13 The only other way we can is to come up with
14 a configuration that gives us great capacity
15 relief. And that configuration is going to be a
16 parallel runway system. It's the only way. So,
17 those are your choices: Get cap -- don't provide
18 capacity relief. Provide some capacity relief by
19 removing the intersection. Or, go to a parallel
20 runway configuration. Those are your choices.
21 That's --

22 MR. CIRIELLO: Where you going to put this
23 parallel runway?

24 MR. JUFKO: Well, we're not there yet. But I

25 just want to break it out into basics, because

82

1 that's where we start. So now -- now you kind of
2 get a feel for where we're coming from when we
3 say, how would I dress this -- address this
4 situation?

5 This here allows us to -- it's much -- it's
6 similar to the other alternative in the way -- in
7 terms of capacity (indicating). But what -- what
8 this does for us is gives us additional runway
9 length out to 4,000. And that 4,000 isn't any
10 magic number, but what it does is it allowed us to
11 maximize use of this area. You know, how much
12 could we theoretically get if we were to extend
13 that runway out in that direction?

14 One of the benefits and the differences
15 between Alternative A and B is we -- we're getting
16 similar benefit at -- and we're not necessarily
17 relocating parts of the U.S. 1, rail corridor.

18 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Where is the optimum wind
19 direction for -- for a second runway? It's not 6
20 and it's not 2. What is it? If we only had one,
21 what's --

22 MR. WUELLNER: It splits them.

23 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Huh?

24 MR. WUELLNER: It splits them.

25 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: It does?

83

1 MR. JUFKO: It splits it.

2 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

3 MR. GORMAN: What did you say before, Ed, was

4 40 --

5 MR. WUELLNER: It's right between 4 and 5.

6 MS. LOUNGEWAY: And 5, yeah.

7 MR. GORMAN: Okay. All right.

8 MR. JUFKO: And as we get into a couple of

9 different -- the last alternative, you'll see kind

10 of where we're coming from.

11 MR. RODERICK: Phil?

12 MR. JUFKO: Yes, sir.

13 MR. RODERICK: Alternative B does not move

14 the rail line or the highway; is that correct?

15 MR. JUFKO: Actually, it -- it does. Am I

16 missing that? And the reason --

17 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Then go back to B.

18 MR. COOPER: On the north end, there's a

19 slight realignment --

20 MR. JUFKO: There is a slight --

21 MR. COOPER: -- just on the north end.

22 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Yeah. Show them with the --

23 MR. JUFKO: It would be -- is it on that one

24 graphic, or am I -- or is this just a layer

25 missing? Just B.

84

1 MS. LOUNGEWAY: I think one layer is missing.

2 MR. COOPER: Oh, I could point it out on the
3 screen.

4 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Yeah, a layer's missing.

5 MR. JUFKO: Okay. It would -- it would mean
6 the re -- a minor relocation of the road in this
7 area here (indicating).

8 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Around the safety area of
9 runway 13/31. And what that does is it allows you
10 to use the full pavement in both directions for
11 landings and takeoffs.

12 MR. MARTINELLI: Can I ask a question?

13 MR. JUFKO: Yes.

14 MR. MARTINELLI: You are extending 13/31 to
15 the south, okay? Can you extend it a little bit
16 farther to the south and not have to move U.S. 1
17 or encroach on U.S. 1?

18 MS. LOUNGEWAY: You could.

19 MR. MARTINELLI: Since you're moving it there
20 anyway.

21 MS. LOUNGEWAY: You could. It's a balance
22 between --

23 MR. CIRIELLO: Getting into the --

24 MS. LOUNGEWAY: -- paying to move the road

25 and rail or paying to mitigate going into a salt

85

1 marsh in class 2 waters, so...

2 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Which one is more
3 realistic?

4 MR. RODERICK: That's the real question.

5 MR. GORMAN: Yeah.

6 MR. JUFKO: And the reason we show and we're
7 pointing out some of these different features is
8 because this body may have a preference, based on
9 the input, whatever input we receive, to go that
10 direction, versus impacting the road. And if
11 that -- if that's the case, we would refine this
12 to reflect that and then do the comparison based
13 on that.

14 MR. WUELLNER: Well, if you were to leave the
15 north end alone --

16 MR. JUFKO: Right.

17 MR. WUELLNER: -- you've still got a really
18 pretty good alternative there. I mean, you -- you
19 eliminate the absolute requirement for that last
20 section of parallel to the north. Leave the
21 safety area where it is, which, you know, you've
22 got your displacement, it's going to be there.

23 Solve your 8,000 issue by --

24 MR. JUFKO: Well, part of the 8,000.

25 MR. WUELLNER: -- the southern extension.

86

1 MR. JUFKO: We only solve part of the 8,000.

2 You don't get the --

3 MS. LOUNGEWAY: The LDA. It would still only
4 be between thresholds.

5 MR. JUFKO: You're not getting 8,000 both
6 ways.

7 MS. LOUNGEWAY: You'll only be at 7-.

8 MR. RODERICK: Is it enough to get a waiver
9 from the government?

10 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, but if I extend the
11 southern end the thousand feet --

12 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Another thousand beyond that?

13 MR. WUELLNER: -- with this thousand feet
14 you're showing there gives me 8,000 to land.

15 MR. JUFKO: Gives you takeoff.

16 MR. WUELLNER: No, but I have a 9,000
17 departure. I've got 8- physical pavement now.

18 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Right.

19 MR. WUELLNER: If I extend a thousand feet to
20 the south or the equivalent of, I now have 8,000
21 to land either direction and 9,000 --

22 MR. JUFKO: Are we -- are you making the
23 assumption -- okay. We're extending the runway a
24 thousand --

25 MR. WUELLNER: On the south.

87

1 MR. MARTINELLI: That's what you're showing.

2 MR. JUFKO: Plus, an additional thousand for
3 the RSA? Is that what you're getting at? I'm
4 lost there.

5 MR. WUELLNER: No. It -- it's exactly the
6 scenario we've got today --

7 MS. ANDERSEN: But he's saying extending --

8 MR. WUELLNER: -- with 1,000 more feet in the
9 mix. Just -- just add a thousand feet to what
10 we've got today. I've got 7,000 to arrive today,
11 either direction, and I've got 8,000 to depart.
12 If I add a thousand physical pavement on the south
13 end of this airport, I now have 8,000 to arrive
14 and 9,000 to depart. So, we've met our 8,000
15 without doing anything on the north end.

16 MR. MARTINELLI: Right. Right.

17 MR. WUELLNER: With this simple 8 -- 900
18 foot -- thousand foot total extension down here.

19 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Joe --

20 MR. WUELLNER: Am I right, Bryan?

21 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: -- you had a comment to
22 make on this?

23 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Eight hundred -- you get 800
24 back on this one. You get 800.

25 MR. COOPER: Well, no. You're missing one

88

1 part of it, Ed.

2 MS. LOUNGEWAY: You get 800, the 200 feet.

3 MR. COOPER: If you go a thousand -- you

4 have -- first of all, look at 13. You approach

5 13, you have a displaced threshold of 1,000 feet,

6 which you had to have. That leaves 7,000 feet of

7 pavement with only 200 feet off the end of it.

8 Coming in from the other end, we displaced it 800

9 feet, and that leaves remaining 7,200 feet of --

10 of pavement, but there's no safety area at the end

11 of it. None.

12 So, it depends -- you have to have the safety

13 area. If you go one thousand feet of pavement on

14 the south end, absolutely, you're going to have

15 8,000 feet on 13. You still don't have what the

16 FAA is going to say -- well, yeah, you will.

17 You'll have -- actually have 8,200 feet.

18 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah.

19 MR. COOPER: One thousand feet --

20 MR. WUELLNER: It solves it both directions.

21 MR. COOPER: -- safety area. Yeah, you're

22 right.

23 MR. WUELLNER: Rough numbers, I got 9,000 to

24 depart from either end, and I've got 8,000 to

25 arrive either end. Rough numbers.

89

1 MR. COOPER: A thousand feet of pavement,
2 though.

3 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Because arrivals -- arrivals
4 to 13, there's still a thousand.

5 MR. MARTINELLI: And if you have to -- if you
6 have to adjust that by 500 feet or whatever,
7 there's an old saying that my father used to tell
8 me, "You may as well be hung for a sheep as a
9 billy goat." And by that, I'm saying if you're
10 going to extend a thousand feet, you can extend
11 1,500 feet. The permitting process that you have
12 to go through is going to be the same.

13 MS. ANDERSEN: Yes, it is.

14 MR. RODERICK: But it costs more.

15 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: So, if you extend it a
16 thousand, you still wind up with the nonpavement
17 overrun --

18 MR. COOPER: You end up --

19 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: -- at the end of 31?

20 MR. COOPER: You end up with -- part of your
21 safety area is actually paved --

22 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yeah, exactly.

23 MR. COOPER: -- in one direction. Usable
24 pavement --

25 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. Right.

90

1 MR. WUELLNER: Just like the other. The only
2 thing that's kind of a -- that's beginning to look
3 dumber was extending just the safety area to the
4 south, is not paving it.

5 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Right. Okay.

6 MR. WUELLNER: It's the same environmental
7 exercise to pave it or not pave it.

8 MR. JUFKO: That's right.

9 MR. MARTINELLI: That's the hump --

10 MR. WUELLNER: But you get no utility value
11 out of just being safety area.

12 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: But Joe had something --

13 MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah. Before you got on this
14 runway length, you mentioned parallel runway, and
15 you was talking about ways of doing that. What
16 gave you the conclusion of -- is it your -- where
17 you might get so much traffic here that we're
18 going to need a parallel runway?

19 What I had in mind -- I've talked with Ed
20 before, and every time I give him ideas, he shoots
21 me down, the FAA, this and that. And I know
22 they're a bunch of hardheads. But I can imagine,
23 once in a blue moon, having enough traffic where
24 you could use a parallel runway. And so, I was

25 wondering why we couldn't approach the FAA, get

91

1 some kind of a understanding that on those few
2 occasions that we might need it for specific
3 aircraft, say just from singles or some light twin
4 that doesn't need much width, that we couldn't use
5 that long taxiway as a runway.

6 I know you don't have the distance between
7 that they want between -- but this is what I'm
8 saying: To get a variance that just on certain
9 occasions when you're going to be heavy on
10 traffic, say like, you know, when these people
11 come in by the hundreds for parties and stuff,
12 that on occasion, you can go ahead and use that
13 taxiway as a runway.

14 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Because it doesn't have the
15 lateral separation --

16 MR. CIRIELLO: Well, this is what I'm saying
17 you've got to go to the FAA and get exceptions
18 for.

19 MR. JUFKO: Well, until somebody -- somebody
20 crashes.

21 MS. LOUNGEWAY: And it's probably not going
22 to -- yeah, it would -- probably would not be
23 approved.

24 MR. MARTINELLI: Can I ask another question

25 here?

92

1 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yes.

2 MR. MARTINELLI: The parallel Taxiway Bravo
3 on there --

4 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Bravo?

5 MR. MARTINELLI: -- in all of these
6 iterations, I don't see any high-speed turnoffs
7 from an active runway to that taxiway. And one of
8 the ways that you increase your capacity -- and
9 David, if I'm wrong, stop me -- is to have a
10 high-speed turnoff off that active runway to the
11 taxiway.

12 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yeah. Is that --

13 MR. MARTINELLI: And so, that's an
14 alternative for increasing capacity that I don't
15 see there.

16 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yeah. Wait a minute.

17 MS. LOUNGEWAY: The -- the problem with that
18 is that the -- the taxiway and runway are at 400
19 feet, and they have high speeds based on a D-4
20 classification system, which is what that runway's
21 been designed for and is anticipated to be used
22 for in the future. You have to have 600 feet
23 between the taxiway and runway to put -- to get
24 the geometry correct to have your high-speed

1 MR. MARTINELLI: Why -- why did we just build
2 a taxiway so close when we knew that this was an
3 alternative that we had to keep --

4 MR. GORMAN: I asked that question before,
5 Vic.

6 MR. MARTINELLI: You did.

7 MR. GORMAN: I asked that question before
8 about high-speed turnoffs. But she's given us the
9 answer, is at the separation.

10 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I think what Vic is
11 saying --

12 MR. GORMAN: I agree with you. I mean, I was
13 thinking the way you were.

14 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Well, you would need to put
15 the whole taxiway at 600 feet, which impacts all
16 of the -- the northern portion of the Northrop
17 Grumman property along U.S. 1, the -- the apron,
18 the -- I mean, there's a lot --

19 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: You're saying it's --
20 you're saying it's 400 feet now?

21 MS. LOUNGEWAY: It's 400 feet now.

22 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. So, we'd have to
23 take the northern end of it and move it 200 feet,
24 and that would cut right into Grumman's fence line

25 in there.

94

1 MR. MARTINELLI: Right.

2 MR. CIRIELLO: Okay. With all these plans --

3 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Let's go back to what Joe

4 was saying. Is there any way we can squeeze a

5 3100-foot parallel runway on the west side of

6 Bravo taxiway to relieve your capacity? I mean,

7 is that --

8 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Not with the predominant --

9 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Is that an alternative?

10 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Well, you could, but it would

11 not be with the predominating wind. And

12 Alternatives C and D give you two parallel

13 options, which we'll get to you.

14 But what we would recommend, if you're going

15 to set up a parallel system, is that you set up

16 the parallel system with the predominating wind,

17 because the majority of users are general

18 aviation, more single engine than jets, which --

19 which it would allow for a better utilization if

20 your parallels were with the predominating wind.

21 So, you could do a -- a short G -- short,

22 small parallel to 13/31. You would impact your

23 hangars, the tower. I mean, so it -- I mean, you

24 could do it, but there's a trade-off, and that

25 trade-off is you lose some of your existing

95

1 facilities to do that.

2 MR. CIRIELLO: Well, if you people, whenever
3 you're figuring out these alternatives, put dollar
4 signs with it -- now, you know, it -- to take and
5 extend that runway a thousand foot at the end of
6 this 13/31, out into all that marsh and everything
7 like that, that's a bad idea as far as I'm
8 concerned, and I'd say no.

9 So, the cost of doing that, the cost all of
10 these other things, if that was all -- do you have
11 all that, Ed, about what it would be, to compare
12 with just going down the road, like I've suggested
13 different times, and just buying enough land to
14 put in a small 5,000-foot single, general aviation
15 airport?

16 I'm pretty sure that a lot of guys up here
17 with little singles and that, with all the hassles
18 and everything up here, even though they think
19 it's nice with all the things we have, wouldn't
20 mind just going down the road another 20 minutes.
21 And that'd almost be like their own little private
22 airport, you know.

23 I mean, here, you've -- you're talking about
24 commercial people intruding. You've got the Army

25 coming in here, you know, the helicopters. You've

96

1 got all kinds of mixed traffic here. If I had a
2 plane and everything, I'd rather be simple with a
3 5,000-foot runway where I didn't have to worry
4 about all these things up here.

5 So, I would like to know the approximate cost
6 of building another airport, which we would own
7 and control, in another location down by south of
8 206 as compared with doing all of this stuff.

9 You're even talking about in this Master Plan, and
10 the bad idea of the other one, of moving U.S. 1
11 and the railroad, even though it's a little bit.

12 And I don't even know if the railroad would give
13 you approval to do something like that. You know,
14 They're -- they're really tough when it comes to
15 dealing with. They -- they'd never let you do
16 that.

17 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: What Phil is trying to do
18 is to get the 80 percent of the forecasted need in
19 the year 2023. And what Joe is saying is, did you
20 consider, to get that 80 percent, another piece of
21 property somewhere for a 3,100-foot general
22 aviation and move some of our T-hangars --

23 MR. JUFKO: For another runway, period.

24 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yeah.

25 MR. JUFKO: And that's where we're going --

97

1 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: And that would lower
2 your -- your usage here and therefore give you the
3 capacity number.

4 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Well, I mean, you're talking
5 about a whole new airport site, right?

6 MR. JUFKO: Well, in this case, he is, yes.

7 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Right.

8 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: And Joe is saying, does
9 that economically make more sense than coming in
10 and asking them to move U.S. 1 or to go through
11 all the fight to extend runway 6 out into the --
12 well, even if you extend runway 6 out more into
13 the marsh, it still does not meet your 80 percent.

14 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Well, in a way, if you -- if
15 you were to do that, you could -- I mean, that is
16 an alternative that you could consider.

17 Selecting a site and all that is beyond the
18 scope of -- of this plan. But with starting a new
19 airport somewhere comes all the issues you have
20 currently at this airport, the environmental, the
21 public. And I would say it's even more so -- I
22 mean, the public opposition to a new airport is
23 probably as bad, if not worse, than to an existing
24 airport.

25 So -- so, it doesn't necessarily solve all

98

1 the problems. I mean, any new runway will
2 increase your capacity, but again, it's a balance
3 between all those issues.

4 MR. CIRIELLO: Well, I'd say a lot of these
5 things we think about wanting to do and everything
6 could be simplified if the board, other
7 politicians or somebody could get together and go
8 bump heads with the FAA.

9 And, you know, when they make a rule, they
10 make it for one rule covers everything. They're
11 talking about L.A. and Chicago and everybody.
12 Those rules that they make shouldn't even apply to
13 this little airport, but they do, and it hurts us.

14 And -- and you need to go and fight with them and
15 buck heads with them and say, hey, these rules you
16 have up here don't apply down here, and get them
17 to --

18 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I think what Gloria is
19 saying --

20 MR. CIRIELLO: -- give us some leeway.

21 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I think what Gloria is
22 saying is that, you know, not necessarily FAA;
23 it's, you know, the residents of St. Johns County,
24 you know, the problems that you have there.

25 MR. CIRIELLO: I don't mean -- I'm not

99

1 talking about what she's talking about.

2 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. All right.

3 MR. CIRIELLO: I'm talking about, like you
4 say, sometimes, whenever the need is there, which
5 isn't going to be a hundred percent of the time,
6 to land extra traffic. Take Oshkosh, for crying
7 out loud. When they get -- when they have that
8 airshow up there, they break -- they don't break
9 rules, but they get all kind of exceptions to get
10 planes in and out of there, because they come in
11 by the thousands.

12 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yeah. Well, he's trying to
13 plan for, you know, continuous, not for a Super
14 Bowl, you know, or something like that.

15 MR. JUFKO: Semiannual basis.

16 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: What if we -- could we get
17 you guys to put something in -- in black and white
18 that says if you did another airport, here's what
19 you're going to pay for concrete, you know, for
20 runways and --

21 MR. JUFKO: You want just a rough cost of
22 construction?

23 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I just want a rough cost,
24 and then all of those factors that you brought

25 in -- and maybe the cost of land down at 206 or

100

1 the land to the west of U.S. 1, you know, out
2 there, which as you can tell, has not been
3 developed, but...

4 MR. JUFKO: The alternatives that we're going
5 to look at, of course there'll be that kind of
6 analysis in terms of costs of -- associated with
7 an alternative. But -- and in terms of
8 comparison, you know, especially when we go into a
9 report and we start discussing why maybe we're
10 even looking at an alternative on this side of the
11 road, there could be discussion, say, well,
12 because, generally speaking, that the rough costs
13 associated with constructing a new airport and
14 these other types of issues that are associated in
15 this climate would prohibit pretty much
16 construction of a new airport.

17 Now, here's another thing that builds into
18 this I'm not sure you're aware of. The state
19 depart -- Department of Transportation is
20 responsible for preparing a system plan. It's a
21 continuous process that we have here in the state.
22 And that ties into the federal plan of integrated
23 airport system, the NPIAS. And what it does, it
24 helps us identify areas of the state that are in

25 need of new airport facilities.

101

1 It would look at things like -- and this
2 airport would -- would plug into that. If we are
3 deficient in terms of capacity and us in -- and
4 plugged into the system, the regional airport
5 system and the state system, they're able to
6 determine that this area is in need of a new
7 airport because there are no other ways to expand
8 those existing airports, they would actually come
9 out with a recommendation in the system plan for a
10 new facility. In addition to that, they would
11 also put the money forward to recommend and try to
12 find a site to accommodate that facility. So,
13 there is a mechanism in place. And -- and to my
14 knowledge, they aren't recommending a new airport
15 in this area.

16 MR. GORMAN: Also, don't -- and
17 Mr. Martinelli has had his hand up for a while, so
18 I -- I just wanted to make a point. Don't we, as
19 a board here, need to keep with that focus of
20 getting off the tax rolls and almost discuss -- I
21 don't mean to be harping on it, but almost discuss
22 anything that makes the money versus things that
23 don't make the money?

24 I don't know if an extra parallel runway

25 would make any more money. I mean, I -- if it

102

1 would, then someone needs to advise me of that,

2 but...

3 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. The logic that I go

4 on as far as whether to make an investment in or

5 not --

6 MR. GORMAN: Right.

7 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: -- is if the interest rates

8 are at 5, 6 percent, and somebody wants -- comes

9 in and defines a need, then we better be making 10

10 to 12 percent. If we make 10 to 12 percent, if

11 we're off the tax rolls, we go to the bank and

12 borrow the money, you know. As long as we get a

13 10-year commitment -- or 10 years at 10 percent

14 pays the bank off. So 10 -- 11 years, 12 years

15 pays the bank plus the interest. And then after

16 that, you know, it's a -- it's an income that we

17 can take for the next investment that we go down

18 the road.

19 So, when I look at, you know, stuff like

20 that -- now, I agree, doing an airport, that's --

21 you're not renting that to anybody, so -- but I'm

22 looking at facilities. It's the other way.

23 MR. GORMAN: He wants to be recognized back

24 there, but...

25 MR. MARTINELLI: I want to go back to Joe's

103

1 suggestion of using Taxiway B as an alternative

2 runway, or jointly with 13/31 at peak periods.

3 And, Gloria, you said 600 feet. It's now 400

4 feet, okay, separation.

5 MS. LOUNGEWAY: For high-speed taxiway.

6 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: For high-speed taxiway, not

7 for a parallel runway.

8 MR. MARTINELLI: Okay. Well, what's the --

9 what's the requirement for a parallel runway?

10 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Your visual conditions?

11 MR. SLINGLUFF: It depends on the category.

12 MR. WUELLNER: It depends on the category.

13 MS. LOUNGEWAY: It depends on the category

14 with --

15 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Ed's thinking about it; I

16 can tell.

17 MR. JUFKO: At some airports, you can get

18 away with 700 feet.

19 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Between runways?

20 MR. MARTINELLI: I just -- Joe, Mr. Ciriello

21 had mentioned Oshkosh, and I've flown into

22 Lakeland Sun 'n Fun many times, where I've come on

23 9/27 taxiway at the same time somebody was coming

24 in at 9/27 major runway, and the separation there

25 between the taxiway and the runway is 400 feet.

104

1 Now, they must have gotten a waiver or something
2 with the requirements. The requirements may be
3 some -- some ground assistance where you have
4 people directing, et cetera.

5 But if you have a peak period for Super Bowl
6 or something like that, and you can get that
7 waiver and you can provide the necessary
8 requirements to satisfy the FAA, wouldn't Joe's
9 suggestion be a viable one?

10 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: For a peak performance, I
11 would say yes, it would. But I think that his 80
12 percent demand is just looking for a -- for a
13 number of airplanes coming in.

14 MR. MARTINELLI: Well, I'm -- I'm not saying
15 that that would take care of the long run, but I
16 think it would give you an opportunity. I think
17 David's having a fit.

18 MR. JUFKO: Dave is saying go ahead. Let's
19 do it.

20 MR. KNIGHT: Let's look outside the box just
21 for a moment, okay? If you're using the big
22 runway, maximizing it with aircraft, where are
23 they going after they land? They've got to go
24 down the taxiway, and you can't be landing

25 aircraft on the taxiway. So, that -- that doesn't

105

1 work too well.

2 MR. MARTINELLI: Well, except you have

3 Taxiway A over there.

4 MR. KNIGHT: Marginally.

5 MR. MARTINELLI: And Taxiway B becoming a

6 runway, you can turn off where we turn off now.

7 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I don't think that we would

8 want that as a --

9 MR. MARTINELLI: I'm going to make you

10 like --

11 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yeah. Okay. That's a good

12 alternative to take a look at, yeah.

13 MR. JUFKO: One thing I wanted to bring up

14 while we move into these next -- and actually,

15 this -- these two alternatives, well, these are

16 designed for long-term development. Doesn't

17 necessarily mean it's going to happen right away.

18 If you look at these alternatives, I think

19 you would agree; there's aspects of these, even if

20 they were to occur, can't happen right away. And

21 any time we're looking at extending runways and

22 things like that, there's a period of time -- and,

23 although constructible building-wise, we could do

24 it in a period of time, a rather short period,

25 because of the permitting, because of the public

106

1 hearings, and the environmental and -- and all of
2 the hoops that we have to go through on some of
3 these, it's much longer. I've seen new runway
4 construction go from 10 years on out from the time
5 they started it. So, it's -- this is something
6 that is long term. Got to keep that in mind. And
7 we look at these because when we get to the point
8 that we need to be looking and trying to address
9 the situation, you would want to phase the studies
10 and the development.

11 Remember, we're planning this now, but just
12 because we say, oh, we like this configuration, we
13 want to plan for a parallel runway, there are
14 follow-on studies that could still negate the
15 development of that runway. This is the first
16 look at that. And -- and I think you need to kind
17 of realize that.

18 Look at Alternative C, which is actually the
19 Master Plan concept from the previous Master Plan,
20 as part of this scope of services for this study,
21 we agreed to look at this alternative again. And
22 that -- that's good sound judgment to -- to go
23 back and look at history and what has been
24 accomplished and -- and kind of what some of the

25 problems were at the time and then look at that

107

1 again and say here's some of the issues we see
2 with this today in our current climate, or as we
3 see it in the near term.

4 So, we need to look at that. And it -- it
5 hasn't changed. And -- and there's that nice road
6 relocation that y'all like, and -- tongue in
7 cheek, folks. We definitely have to look at this
8 and compare to the other alternatives as well.

9 MR. GORMAN: Can I ask an acidic question?
10 Can we even contemplate the removal of the
11 railroad that far? Even contemplate? Even start
12 to contemplate? Even bother contemplating it? I
13 mean, we're talking about a tremendous cost to
14 move a railroad. So, I mean -- I don't mean to be
15 acidic, but I mean -- you know, and I know that
16 this is --

17 MR. JUFKO: Look at the way this is set up
18 (indicating). That's -- that -- I apologize
19 there. Look at the way it's set up. Those are --
20 those are parallel runways (indicating). Those
21 are long runways.

22 MR. GORMAN: Right.

23 MR. JUFKO: You're setting yourself up here
24 under this concept for something much bigger than

25 what you are now, okay?

108

1 MR. GORMAN: Exactly.

2 MR. JUFKO: And, you know, there's pros and
3 cons associated with that. And the cost alone,
4 even though cost isn't the only thing we look at,
5 but the cost associated with the relocation,
6 specifically the rail, not so much the road, is
7 humongous. And they're going to come back looking
8 here for -- they're going to be looking for money.

9 MR. CIRIELLO: Have you ever talked to the
10 railroad to see if they would go --

11 MR. JUFKO: They're tough. Yeah. They're --
12 they're tough.

13 MR. CIRIELLO: Back when Victor was on the
14 board and they went with the Master Plan, I was at
15 a couple of meetings and they was talking about
16 moving, like he said, the road and the highway --
17 or the railroad. And the newspaper printed --
18 they estimated -- this is what, seven, eight,
19 nine, ten years ago, maybe longer. They estimated
20 to move the road and the railroad, if they would
21 be allowed to do so, was something like \$258
22 million then. Now you talk about --

23 MR. JUFKO: I would say that's cheap.

24 MR. CIRIELLO: -- today. Well, okay. Cheap.

25 But now, cost-wise, getting off the tax rolls, how

109

1 in the heck are we going to make up that kind of
2 money to even consider something like that? We
3 shouldn't even -- you know, if --

4 MS. ANDERSEN: Sir?

5 MR. RICH: I've got to go. I just wanted to
6 make a comment before I went. Ben Rich, 136 Moses
7 Creek Boulevard. When I'm watching all of this, I
8 just wanted to let you know how it's analogous to
9 me trying to get into my 1971 sailor suit. You
10 know, it just almost seems as if you've overgrown
11 your capacity to do anything here with this. And
12 it worries me because of the taxing situation of
13 this group. I'd like to see you concentrate and
14 focus on how you're going to get out of my pocket
15 with the ad valorem tax.

16 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Ben, that's not the purpose
17 of this meeting. This is a work group to discuss
18 what the Master Plan has done to come up with
19 alternatives. If you'd like to come to the next
20 regular meeting, that is a topic of discussion
21 that's already there. But I think that would be
22 inappropriate to hear.

23 MR. RICH: I was commenting actually on the
24 expansion of this. But --

25 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I'm sorry. I thought you

110

1 were asking us to look --

2 MR. RICH: -- it also works into the spending
3 of -- of a lot of money. I'm hearing a lot of
4 things that are kind of scary when it comes to the
5 spending of the money by this group. And I --
6 I'm -- I would like to see the group focus on not
7 spending my money and giving me some of it back.
8 That's all.

9 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. All right. Thanks
10 for your comments.

11 MS. ANDERSEN: Sir?

12 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yes, ma'am? Maryann (sic),
13 right?

14 MS. ANDERSEN: I wanted to support Phil,
15 okay?

16 First of all, I wanted to let you know that
17 the exploration of alternatives, no matter how
18 many there are, is necessary. It's necessary
19 because when you decide -- you put together your
20 alternative and you decide that this is your
21 Master Plan, this is where you want to go, we have
22 to go to the permitting agency and say -- and if
23 they ask the question, "Well, how come you're
24 filling the wetlands? Well, how about the

25 uplands?" So, we're going to say, "We looked at

111

1 that and this is how much it's going to cost us
2 and this is how long it's going to take. In the
3 meantime, we have this need and we have to fill it
4 now." All right?

5 "Well, how about going this way or that way
6 or that way?" And we're going to say, in your
7 report, that goes with your permit application,
8 that we looked at that. We looked at that and we
9 looked at this and we looked at that. And we
10 decided, after looking up all of the different
11 aspects, your social, your public, your financial,
12 your environmental, your hydrology, et cetera, all
13 of the existing conditions that constrict the
14 airport, because it's there and you can't move it,
15 that this is the best way reaching your goal, your
16 proposed improvements. Okay?

17 So, I just wanted to let you know that Phil
18 is not putting this together. We're not putting
19 it together for the sake of putting it together.
20 It's a necessary process. Like I said, we have to
21 give you something that you can build, and this is
22 part of the process.

23 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Right.

24 MS. ANDERSEN: Yes, sir.

25 MR. GORMAN: I've got a question to ask.

112

1 Seems like a dumb question. So, which entity are
2 you -- are you talking to in the fact that you are
3 actually -- have reviewed the proposals with a
4 board? In other words, what -- what actual
5 governmental entity are we talking about?

6 MS. ANDERSEN: We're talking about all of the
7 permitting regulatory agencies.

8 MR. GORMAN: And that they will be asking the
9 questions whether that you have gone into these
10 discussions.

11 MS. ANDERSEN: Yes, sir. As part of your
12 permit. If you were to fill in any type of
13 wetland --

14 MR. GORMAN: Right.

15 MS. ANDERSEN: -- federal or state. Part of
16 it is what we call a narrative of avoidance and
17 minimization. Avoidance and minimization would be
18 avoidance of environmental impact. If we have to
19 impact wetlands, we have to justify why.

20 MR. GORMAN: And so, you're saying to meet
21 those narrative needs --

22 MS. ANDERSEN: Yes. Yes, sir.

23 MR. GORMAN: -- then we must go through
24 this -- these evolutions.

25 MS. ANDERSEN: Yes, sir.

113

1 MR. GORMAN: I see.

2 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Joe?

3 MR. CIRIELLO: Go back to what -- one
4 statement the young lady made. You said about the
5 airport, you can't move it, so these other
6 alternatives, you know, is what you come up with.

7 MS. ANDERSEN: Sir, I didn't say that you
8 cannot move the airport. I said you cannot move
9 the existing conditions surrounding your
10 environment. In other words, the wetlands are
11 there. The trees are there. The river is there.

12 MR. CIRIELLO: Oh, okay. Okay. So, I mis --
13 misunderstood that part. But my thought is still
14 the same. We have the airport confined within its
15 own boundaries. There's nothing that says we have
16 to move into those areas and -- and do anything
17 with them, like you're saying. We -- we could
18 just leave them alone, leave the airport the way
19 it is, and live -- learn to live with it. It --
20 you know, if it has to be bigger and we can't make
21 it bigger, tough. Build another one or live with
22 what we have.

23 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yeah. Let's let Phil --

24 MR. CIRIELLO: There's no way I can go with

25 that line of thinking.

114

1 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Let's let Phil go through
2 his -- I think he's got one or two slides. And
3 then we'll take a 10- or 15-minute break, because
4 I have a funny feeling we really want to dive back
5 into the -- narrowing down the alternatives and
6 phasing things in.

7 MR. JUFKO: I guess this -- this alternative
8 needs some -- some discussion, because it reflects
9 some ideas here that I wanted to -- to discuss at
10 the meeting. I don't suggest necessarily that
11 this ultimately look like this.

12 There's a -- there's a couple of
13 considerations. One, we took care of -- of the
14 capacity issue. There's a runway down there
15 that -- that you see. I mean, this is definitely
16 "out of the box" kind of thinking, just so we can
17 narrow down the field.

18 One of the things that we were asked to look
19 at at one time, and so we investigated to see,
20 well, if I were to connect the two sides of the
21 airfield, how would I do it? And here is one way
22 (indicating).

23 This runway is designed at -- as a larger --
24 to handle larger aircraft. It could easily be

25 designed to handle the smaller aircraft, to

115

1 alleviate that. That actuality is where the
2 capacity considerations kind of exist with some of
3 the smaller aircraft than have your GA. What it
4 would do in turn is it would enable us to move
5 this whole piece closer towards the airport to
6 some degree and give us a little bit of -- of
7 relief there (indicating).

8 There -- there's some other issues. We -- we
9 have a -- the ability to cross over from this side
10 of the airport (indicating). In the event let's
11 say that we didn't utilize this crossover, here's
12 an optional way to cross over to the -- the
13 airport across the road and over to this area
14 (indicating). And that's kind of what you would
15 have to go to get to that point.

16 We threw this runway in like this because
17 technically, to get the relief, you actually have
18 to have parallel runways. And this is in a 5/23
19 orientation (indicating), which is pretty much
20 maximized, and we said we would throw one out
21 there that maximized the wind conditions.

22 You'll notice that, you know, the existing
23 runway still has a lot of the same type of
24 improvements that we had shown before. But what

25 this also does is it gives us a lot of area for

116

1 more development, and same, of course, over on
2 this side (indicating) for the -- for the long
3 term.

4 Does it mean you build it in the next 20
5 years? Of course not. But it means that we
6 thought through this, and -- and there's some ways
7 to address some of the issues that we currently
8 face.

9 And to keep this on the -- to keep any of
10 these futuristic-type alternatives on the books
11 and in the Master Plan is not a bad thing. What
12 it does is it -- it helps you to -- to look at
13 what the issues are, much like Mariben was saying,
14 but also, it gives you the flexibility to reserve
15 certain areas for future development. You know,
16 down the road you may determine that the total
17 outlook for this airport might be different.
18 Maybe a different group might feel differently.

19 We show the worst-case scenario here because
20 I wanted you to see the magnitude. Obviously, I
21 could bring -- as I'm telling you now, I could
22 bring this in a bit. I could shorten the runway
23 length. I could do certain things to clear things
24 like the State Road 312 road that's proposed to go

25 through there.

117

1 There are things that could be done to
2 totally eliminate this road and -- and rail
3 relocation. You could actually operate this --
4 when we were talking about a new airport,
5 there's -- there's no reason why we can't look at
6 this as a separate airport facility over here,
7 runway, with different access and different
8 facilities to support it.

9 If you have that kind of demand here, there's
10 no reason why it couldn't operate in that fashion.
11 There's no reason why we have to connect the
12 airfield. But I wanted to show you that we looked
13 at those options, because here's what happens if
14 you have to connect to the other airfield. It's
15 kind of crazy. Mr. Ciriello?

16 MR. CIRIELLO: How much -- that -- that
17 runway you're showing has two -- two taxiways,
18 right?

19 MR. JUFKO: Yes, sir.

20 MR. CIRIELLO: Okay. And, of course, this is
21 a real expensive proposition. So, spend a few
22 more dollars. The taxiway to the north, why
23 couldn't you spread that out a little further from
24 the main runway, make that a parallel runway --

25 MR. JUFKO: This one here (indicating)?

118

1 MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah. Put it out that way and
2 make it a parallel runway with one taxiway and
3 eliminate -- since it's the same direction as 6
4 and 24, eliminate that and use the space that
5 runway takes now for parking or hangars or
6 whatever.

7 MR. JUFKO: Well, you could -- you could
8 certainly do that, you know.

9 MR. CIRIELLO: I mean, you know, it would
10 only cost a few more dollars to make it wide
11 enough for a parallel runway, and then you could
12 eliminate 6 and 24 and utilize that some other
13 way, if we ever got that way.

14 MR. JUFKO: If you ever got this far --

15 MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah.

16 MR. JUFKO: -- down it. Yeah. If we ever
17 got this far, and you went to the cost -- and
18 that's why the previous alternative has some
19 merit. If you ever went that far and had to go to
20 the expense of doing that, you're looking at a
21 different type of airport. And when you start
22 looking at a different type of airport, you're
23 looking at different types of revenue streams as
24 well and -- because we're concerned about how do

25 you afford something like this? How do you pay

119

1 for it? You know, even with grants and -- and
2 things like that. You know, you've got to take a
3 number.

4 So, what I wanted to get out of this, for
5 discussion purposes, is to show you, here are the
6 types of -- the orientation that we would get if
7 we tried to favor the winds. If connectivity to
8 the existing airport was an issue, here's how we
9 could do it. About the only way we could do it.

10 And also, since we were thinking of -- since this
11 required a certain amount of distance that we had
12 to travel because of design issues for taxiways,
13 you have to keep certain grade requirement, so
14 that means that that taxiway has to be a certain
15 length before you put a turn in it.

16 It also allowed us to actually get some of
17 this area back that we've been trying to get back
18 on the other alternatives. So...

19 MR. CIRIELLO: Well, we're playing a "what
20 if" game here. So, what if --

21 MR. JUFKO: Absolutely.

22 MR. CIRIELLO: -- we went to this scenario
23 and did what I said, and you eliminated the 6 and
24 24 right now? What can you as a planner envision

25 that could go in there in place of that runway

120

1 that would be revenue-making? A number of hangars
2 or a big parking area?

3 MR. JUFKO: This whole area would be --

4 MR. CIRIELLO: No, no, over here

5 (indicating).

6 MR. JUFKO: Over here (indicating)?

7 MR. CIRIELLO: No.

8 MR. JUFKO: I'm sorry.

9 MS. LOUNGEWAY: No. Over the existing 6/24?

10 MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah, right in there, to
11 eliminate that runway when this one was put in,
12 what do you envision that could go in there where
13 that runway is now that would be revenue-making?

14 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Second FBO. More parking
15 ramp.

16 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Or hangars. One of the
17 issues is, is that if you put both runways on the
18 west side of U.S. 1, you would certainly want some
19 sort of bridge to your existing facilities. So --
20 so, part of what 6/24 and Taxiway Delta could
21 become is part of that bridge, which could be done
22 in that case without moving the road. It would --

23 MR. GORMAN: A bridge --

24 MS. LOUNGEWAY: You could do it that way.

25 MR. GORMAN: A bridge that's -- that is a

121

1 taxiway?

2 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Yeah.

3 MR. GORMAN: Just like Hartsfield?

4 MR. JUFKO: And other airports.

5 MS. LOUNGEWAY: And other airports, Orlando,

6 et cetera, yeah.

7 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Orlando?

8 MR. GORMAN: Well, that's true.

9 MR. WUELLNER: Tampa.

10 MR. JUFKO: Yeah.

11 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: What about -- what about

12 this as an alternative? We're looking at spending

13 some money and some time for permitting to

14 possibly extend 31 a thousand feet, 800 feet,

15 whatever; that's got to cost money and time.

16 We're looking at finishing up the acquisition of

17 Araquay and putting 6,500 square feet of tarmac

18 down there on the road.

19 We know we have a problem 15 years out, 16

20 years out, 20 years out. Why not build another

21 run -- another set of runways to the west of U.S.

22 1? Leave U.S. 1 and the train track alone. Two

23 separate facilities, that if you want to get your

24 airplane to the other side, fly it over there.

25 The new hangars, go ahead -- and the new

122

1 corporate hangars, we don't have to mess with the
2 other corporate and the wetlands up there. We
3 start that over on the new side.

4 MR. CIRIELLO: Well, you're almost talking
5 like I say about building a second airport --

6 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Absolutely.

7 MR. CIRIELLO: -- to alleviate. But instead
8 of putting it down at 206, between there and
9 Flagler, you're wanting to put it right over here.

10 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Right. And -- and if I put
11 it down at Flagler and 206, I've got to go through
12 FAA and get justification for a new airport. I
13 don't have to get justification for a new airport.

14 MR. JUFKO: It would be considered the same
15 airport.

16 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: This is the same airport.
17 It's just we're not connecting the two runways.
18 We're letting U.S. 1 and -- and the railroad go
19 between it. Grumman has a nice facility for any
20 kind of testing they want. And at some point in
21 time, we pick up our T-hangars, if you want to,
22 that we just built, and move them over. That's 20
23 years down the road. Then you wind up with --

24 MR. CIRIELLO: By that time, they'll be

25 rusted.

123

1 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: -- no capacity problems.

2 MR. JUFKO: Yeah --

3 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: You don't wind up with a

4 silly bridge for airplanes to go over U.S. 1, and

5 we take the money that we're looking at spending

6 now and we dump it in over there.

7 MR. CIRIELLO: Well, it's worth a look.

8 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Mary?

9 MS. WILLIS: And your cost of land here is a

10 heck of a lot less than at 206 --

11 MR. CIRIELLO: It is?

12 MS. WILLIS: -- when you're looking at

13 \$50,000 an acre down there. Yeah.

14 MR. CIRIELLO: Well, I thought it was

15 expensive anywhere in St. Johns County.

16 MS. WILLIS: Well, it's expensive, but not

17 like it would be on 206.

18 MR. JUFKO: The opportunity to get at the

19 land is -- is here before us --

20 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Ed?

21 MR. JUFKO: -- as we look at it.

22 MR. WUELLNER: Huh?

23 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: What do you think about

24 that?

25 MR. WUELLNER: I don't see any reason you

124

1 couldn't operate it separately.

2 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: And have the same tower
3 take care of both.

4 MR. COOPER: I doubt that.

5 MR. WUELLNER: You'd actually have to
6 relocate the tower.

7 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

8 MR. GORMAN: And again --

9 MR. WUELLNER: But that would be a minor,
10 compared to the cost involved.

11 MR. GORMAN: And again, if we have these
12 discussions again, could we please get an overlay
13 to see what we do own now? I hate to be a harper,
14 but...

15 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Ed's been waiting for you
16 to ask that question. Do you guys want to a
17 five-minute break, ten-minute break? Let's take a
18 ten-minute break, and we'll come back -- I've got
19 6:13. We'll come back at 6:25, okay?

20 (Whereupon, a recess was had.)

21 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. We were discussing
22 alternatives for the entire park, and it was
23 brought up again that we would like to see what we
24 actually own and what we don't own. So, Ed?

25 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. On the screen, is

125

1 the -- the graphic we've been using for a while,
2 but it kind of shows you the Araquay Park
3 subdivision and also picks up that piece of
4 St. Augustine -- or the unplatted piece of Jackson
5 Park over there in the lower right-hand corner.

6 The gray area up there depicts --

7 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I don't know where that is
8 when you say it picked it up.

9 MR. WUELLNER: I say it's across --

10 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Oh, okay.

11 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Here's the pointer.

12 MR. WUELLNER: There's a graphic showing it.
13 Yeah, that area (indicating).

14 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

15 MR. WUELLNER: I keep forgetting we have this
16 little pointer device, so it -- I'm not smart
17 enough to remember it long enough, I guess.

18 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. So, that's the
19 property we own down there.

20 MR. WUELLNER: You own that piece, yes. But
21 if it's in gray up there, you currently own it.

22 That -- the graphic's current relative to the
23 Araquay Park subdivision.

24 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

1 you I think in April, or whenever it was, and got
2 authorization to go do appraisals in advance of
3 looking at eminent domain. So, the red ones are
4 out currently being appraised, just to give you an
5 idea.

6 MR. GORMAN: And the white ones?

7 MR. WUELLNER: The white ones to the left are
8 where there's no current sales activity going on.
9 They're not owned by the Airport Authority.
10 They're ones you would have to either acquire by
11 eminent domain, or maybe some voluntary sales
12 would still come -- come about over the period of
13 time. But you can see the focus, per your
14 direction, has been east of Casa Cola, which is
15 the right side, right side of the drawing up
16 there.

17 I also handed out a copy -- and I'm sorry we
18 don't have a -- I don't have an easy way to get
19 you this. A little more lead time, we could have
20 probably done a lot better job. But you've got a
21 copy of what is a large version of the airport and
22 its surrounding environs.

23 The dark lines represent different plats that
24 were out there. The big heavy dark lines are not

25 necessarily boundaries relative to the airport.

127

1 The shaded-in areas, which is what's kind of hard
2 to really pick out in some of the smaller pieces,
3 but if it's -- looks like it's shaded or hazed or
4 in any way grayed, is property you own. Okay.
5 So, it kind of gives you an expanded view of
6 surrounding properties, too.

7 We've had discussion earlier, Mr. Martinelli
8 pointed out -- I've got a color version I'll pass
9 around if it helps you pick it out. But the
10 blocks that were up on the -- the north end of
11 U.S. 1, north of Gun Club Road, east of U.S. 1,
12 you can see those blocks are colored in up there,
13 and you get a feel for what the couple of pieces
14 we were talking about, what does the airport own.
15 That's -- that's the extent of our knowledge north
16 of Gun Club Road, are three parcels there.

17 You can see the industrial park property,
18 which is the west side of U.S. 1 along the north
19 end of the airport, is -- you know, has a
20 relatively high percentage of ownership by the
21 Airport Authority. And a small portion of that
22 was put in a conservation easement with the Water
23 Management District to mitigate all of those
24 issues on the east side of -- of the airfield,

25 wrapped up some of the -- including the new

128

1 northeast area. It has a small piece of that in
2 there. Plus, all of those relatively meaningless
3 slivers of wetlands that were in conservation
4 areas are all now in one larger, hopefully more
5 meaningful piece.

6 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: The blackened-in area, that
7 is everything west of U.S. 1.

8 MR. WUELLNER: Uh-huh.

9 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Is that where our airport
10 boundary has been set in the past?

11 MR. WUELLNER: No.

12 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: What is that?

13 MR. WUELLNER: As I was mentioning earlier,
14 the dark heavy line there, really is -- all it's
15 doing is depicting the various plats involved, the
16 limits of plats.

17 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. I gotcha. All
18 right.

19 MR. WUELLNER: I -- I have nothing in a
20 graphic that -- that is of any meaning right now
21 that shows the future airport boundary as it was
22 called out in the previous Master Plan study.

23 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

24 MR. WUELLNER: With some lead time, I can get

25 you that. I mean, I can get it in the format to

129

1 do that.

2 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. But the County has
3 basically already approved --

4 MR. WUELLNER: Yes.

5 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: -- those boundaries as --

6 MR. WUELLNER: Correct. That in fact is what
7 we know as the Airport Development District
8 Overlay.

9 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

10 MR. WUELLNER: That's the overlay district,
11 is the future airport boundary.

12 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: How much to the west of
13 these darkened-in lines does that -- would you
14 estimate that that goes?

15 MR. WUELLNER: It -- it would incorporate
16 everything you see west of that black line
17 that's -- currently looks like a map on your
18 drawing.

19 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

20 MR. WUELLNER: It's a --

21 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: And then go past that?

22 MR. WUELLNER: It's a fairly significant
23 area, because it -- keep in mind, it depicted a
24 parallel to 13/31 that laid west of U.S. 1.

25 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

130

1 MR. WUELLNER: So, it's a -- it showed a
2 fairly significant --

3 MS. LOUNGEWAY: On -- on the airfield
4 alternatives that we handed out, if you look at
5 the proposed State Road 312, that is probably
6 where the edge of the airport district went to
7 from the last Master Plan.

8 MR. GORMAN: Which is Alternative A?

9 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Just to give you an idea.
10 Well, just any of them show the state road --

11 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yeah, look at A.

12 MS. LOUNGEWAY: -- just to give you an idea
13 of --

14 MR. WUELLNER: How far it goes.

15 MS. LOUNGEWAY: -- of how far over it goes.

16 MR. WUELLNER: I don't know if any of the
17 color helps them on that.

18 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: And that 312 being on the
19 MPO, that 312 is a -- is a hot topic, you know, to
20 get something going on that, so... So, you're
21 thinking that the airport property basically goes
22 up to that.

23 MS. LOUNGEWAY: I would think so, based on
24 the -- is this -- I mean, based on where the --

25 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Of where we are?

131

1 MS. LOUNGEWAY: -- the last alternatives. I

2 mean, this was --

3 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Jack, look at A, the form,

4 the top. See that blue line from up in the --

5 that's it. Yeah, that's 312.

6 MS. LOUNGEWAY: And that's where the airport

7 district goes to, right?

8 MR. WUELLNER: Sort of. Where is the

9 pointer?

10 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Here you go.

11 MR. WUELLNER: This is the -- an airport

12 aerial. I can get you pretty darn close if you

13 want to try to follow me along here.

14 Starting at this point, which is the -- kind

15 of the Grumman area (indicating). Following this

16 around, we follow this road (indicating). It's

17 now -- this is the intersection of Gun Club Road

18 and Hawkeye View. Coming out to U.S. 1, we go up

19 north. We have a couple of blocks of property in

20 this area (indicating).

21 Going west, we follow this line here

22 (indicating), which is the north piece of the old

23 St. Johns Industrial Park. Follow down, we

24 include this block of property out here

25 (indicating). There's a couple more blocks out

132

1 here toward the racetrack that's out there, the
2 old speedway, out in that way (indicating).

3 We come in here (indicating), pick up a
4 myriad of parcels within the old Oak Grove
5 subdivision. Nestled up into this area
6 (indicating) is the -- what's called the
7 St. Augustine North subdivision. We have quite a
8 bit of property ownership in there close in,
9 especially in this general area (indicating).

10 Following that line down -- keep in mind that
11 parallel runway layout brought the property line
12 out kind of like this (indicating), or the future
13 property lines out -- way out in this area
14 (indicating).

15 And coming around, picking up the Araquay
16 Park or Araquay Creek, which kind of meanders
17 through here (indicating), something like this
18 (indicating), and then come back out. It was
19 to -- the long-term interest put us abutting what
20 is now the Madeira property line, the old Ponce
21 golf course line --

22 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yeah.

23 MR. WUELLNER: -- which is right about there
24 (indicating), and then brought it back around. I

25 think our line comes in, comes down to about right

133

1 here (indicating), goes up all the way out to the
2 Intracoastal, comes across, bisects this island
3 (indicating) something like this, and then comes
4 back up and includes this whole point (indicating)
5 and then picks us back to about where we started.

6 MR. GORMAN: Not to harp on it, Ed, do you
7 think you can work on -- on a graphic for that?

8 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, I'll -- I'll get one.

9 MR. GORMAN: Yeah. Okay.

10 MR. WUELLNER: If I realized you -- you
11 wanted --

12 MR. GORMAN: Sure.

13 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Even --

14 MR. WUELLNER: -- quite like that, we would
15 have got that.

16 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Even if it's a big
17 blueprint that just somebody obtained --

18 MR. GORMAN: Exactly. Exactly.

19 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: -- that we can roll out
20 when we need it.

21 MR. WUELLNER: We actually have -- I've got
22 one. Let me -- let me walk back there. I've got
23 one on the 30 x 42 size. It's from the old Master
24 Plan.

25 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Well, is this basically

134

1 what everybody wanted, though? I mean, does

2 that -- I hate to lose Ed to this meeting.

3 MR. GORMAN: The description.

4 MR. WUELLNER: It's not going to show you all

5 of the ownership of the individual parcels,

6 though. I'll give you that now.

7 MR. GORMAN: The description he's just done

8 is -- is fine, but I mean, if we could actually

9 see it, take it home and ponder it, we could

10 certainly get a lot further.

11 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

12 MR. GORMAN: Sure.

13 MS. ANDERSEN: Gloria, you have it in your

14 alternatives.

15 MS. LOUNGEWAY: We do show what was the

16 existing property line as of I think two months

17 ago. I'm not sure if y'all have closed on any

18 property since then. It may still be current in

19 the Araquay Park. There might be a parcel or two

20 that we are missing, but it is shown --

21 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Which one are you talking

22 about?

23 MS. LOUNGEWAY: It is -- it is shown on all

24 the airfield alternatives in the kind of pink.

25 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

135

1 MS. LOUNGEWAY: You can see the parcels that
2 they own. What is not shown --

3 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I can't tell where the
4 holes are in there, though.

5 MR. BURNETT: Those little pink slivers are
6 the parcels the airport owns.

7 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Yeah. It's kind of -- kind
8 of hard --

9 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yeah. A little hole right
10 there?

11 MS. LOUNGEWAY: -- at that scale, but --

12 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Little hole right there?
13 Yeah.

14 MR. JUFKO: The pink line.

15 MS. LOUNGEWAY: The pink line.

16 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Phil, what are you talking
17 about lead time-wise to get, you know, a 5,000
18 foot runway built over? Let's say we had the --
19 well, if you get the land acquisition -- let's say
20 that you're going to start the planning at the
21 same time that we started land acquisition.

22 MR. JUFKO: Yeah, in -- in round figures,
23 you're -- you're looking at a good 10-year
24 window --

25 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

136

1 MR. JUFKO: -- okay, from -- from beginning

2 to end. And that's if things go favorable.

3 The -- the key here is if you're looking --

4 and much like this area was kind of reserved from,

5 you know, the comprehensive development planning

6 process and so on, it's important that this be --

7 this concept -- and it gets kind of out there to

8 reserve that area, because there are other

9 entities obviously that interact --

10 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Right.

11 MR. JUFKO: -- with the airport.

12 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Exactly, yeah.

13 MR. JUFKO: And there's other decisions being

14 made outside. We can't do all of this in a box.

15 MR. GORMAN: Can I ask a question? I'm going

16 to ask it of Dave Knight, if I can get his

17 attention.

18 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Dave, got a question for

19 you.

20 MR. GORMAN: I've got a question for you,

21 Dave. Just while we're talking about the

22 possibility of making another runway on the other

23 side, on the west side of U.S. 1, the simple

24 question is, from an ATC standpoint, is that going

25 to be encompassed by a single tower? And I think

137

1 the answer is no. In other words, you -- you've
2 got a separate airline traffic control entity if
3 you move the runway that far over? While we're
4 talking about runways on the west side of U.S. 1,
5 we need to talk about you.

6 MR. KNIGHT: I would say that that distance
7 is probably too far away for a single facility.
8 It's based off of the height of the facility.

9 MR. GORMAN: Okay.

10 MR. KNIGHT: You get tall enough, I've seen
11 places where they've done parallel runways that
12 far apart with a single tower, and we have
13 different local controllers and different ground
14 controllers, basically your staff. Separate
15 entities.

16 MR. GORMAN: Two separate viewing towers
17 then. You've just -- yeah, that would -- makes
18 common sense to me, too. I understand. Thank
19 you. Okay.

20 MR. KNIGHT: I've never seen anything in
21 writing in terms of what the distance criteria is.

22 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Go ahead.

23 MR. JUFKO: One thing I was saying, though,
24 is that we -- we do this exercise because if this

25 is the direction that the airport wants to go in

138

1 the future, we're going to come up with a way to
2 allow you to go that direction, okay, number one.
3 And it gives you an -- an opportunity to start
4 protecting those areas and at least planning
5 around those areas.

6 It doesn't mean -- obviously much like the
7 exercise where you're going to purchase property
8 falls in there, and -- and that takes time, but
9 it's just doing the normal day-to-day,
10 year-to-year planning. You want to be able to
11 protect the airspace in that area. You want to
12 protect the approaches. You want to do all of
13 those things.

14 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Well, this is not a meeting
15 where we vote on anything and make any decisions.
16 It's really an exchange of ideas. So, if you took
17 the ideas that the three of us came up with, and
18 the public, and put it into another alternative,
19 you've still got to go through a regular board and
20 go through it all, you know, with all five board
21 members, you know, to go through it.

22 I have a problem with using a consulting
23 firm, any consulting firm, you know, at -- at how
24 far does that consulting firm go as far as making

25 recommendations? In other words, you know our

139

1 reality of our situation we have now. You know
2 how much it costs to construct things and how
3 difficult it is to get FAA funding. You would be
4 the ideal person, in my opinion, to come back and
5 say, of six alternatives that you've come up with,
6 I think that alternative number 4 best fits all of
7 these environments now.

8 MR. JUFKO: That would be the direction --

9 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: It sounds like that you
10 would not --

11 MR. JUFKO: No. No, that's not true. That
12 would be the direction that you would go down as
13 we move through this process.

14 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

15 MR. JUFKO: There would be a -- either a
16 ranking or -- there's a number of ways that it can
17 be done. It -- sometimes it's done with, here are
18 your pros and cons. Sometimes there's a numerical
19 ranking, which has some drawbacks to it. We -- we
20 look at all of those issues.

21 Now, the reason that we've held off from
22 going in and really doing the detailed analysis,
23 as -- as we were talking about --

24 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Right.

25 MR. JUFKO: -- all of those various issues is

140

1 we want to be able to get down to three or four
2 alternatives so that this isn't some monumental
3 task for us.

4 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I understand.

5 MR. JUFKO: And, of course, we can only go so
6 far. We're scoped out in -- in work, as you can
7 understand.

8 So, yes, that -- that is the next logical
9 step. But it would be -- we -- we felt it's
10 important to get the input from this board, not
11 just the Technical Advisory Committee, and to --
12 to get a well-rounded look at this as we go into
13 the -- finalizing some of these alternatives.

14 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. I think I better
15 understand how we're going through this process
16 and everything now.

17 MR. JUFKO: At -- at this point, we can, you
18 know, go back to any one of the alternatives that
19 we had discussed, and if there are aspects that --
20 that you'd like to at least point out that these
21 are things that we'd like, these are things that
22 really don't -- that don't work --

23 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Well, I think Mr. Ciriello,
24 you know, put it well for -- for the board. I

25 don't know if Mr. Gorman agrees with him. But

141

1 the -- you know, to look at moving the railroad
2 and to moving the, you know, the road is just
3 totally out in left field. And so, we need to be
4 more responsible and come up with some
5 alternatives that -- you know, that are doable.

6 And -- and maybe this duplicating our
7 facilities on the other side is the best way for
8 us to take the first step for a long-range
9 solution of the past 20 years, past, you know, 40,
10 50 years. Because we're constrained on three
11 sides, you know? And that's -- can't go any
12 further.

13 MR. GORMAN: That's what I was saying, why
14 should we even contemplate moving the railroad?

15 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yeah.

16 MR. GORMAN: We almost have to put that to
17 bed. The railroad won't move, so move on from
18 there.

19 MR. JUFKO: And it's -- it's much easier for
20 us to go forth and say, when -- when you have an
21 issue that moving the railroad is definitely, you
22 know, bad policy for this group --

23 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yeah.

24 MR. JUFKO: -- then we look at options that

25 that's a given. Much like when we were looking at

142

1 Araquay, the given is we would like to leave the
2 maintenance building in place. We can work around
3 and within those constraints.

4 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yeah.

5 MR. JUFKO: Makes it much easier for us.

6 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Well, let me ask the two
7 board members that are here for -- for your
8 comments on the airfield alternatives plus the one
9 that we came up with. Which -- which directions
10 are you more inclined to support, you know, for a
11 long-range objective? Jack?

12 MR. GORMAN: To me, common sense dictates
13 that you could probably extend the runway to the
14 south, that you aren't really going to expand the
15 actual environs of the airport any more than to
16 the east of U.S. 1. You're not going to move
17 U.S. 1. You're not going to move the railroad.
18 So, the only way you can go out is possibly into
19 the marsh, if that is environmentally possible, to
20 extend 31 or to extend 6/24, period.

21 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Extending 31 does not get
22 past the 80 percent capacity constriction.

23 MR. GORMAN: No. I don't see an easy
24 solution to actually increasing capacity without

25 going to the other side of -- of U.S. 1, without

143

1 moving the railroad, or in an entirely

2 different --

3 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: So, could you support --

4 MR. GORMAN: -- facility.

5 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: -- an alternative -- trying

6 to send them off to do some more homework -- an

7 alternative that puts two runways to the west of

8 U.S. 1.?

9 MR. GORMAN: If you're going to do a 20-year

10 plan to increase capacity, that seems to be the

11 only common sense alternative. You've either got

12 to do that to the west of U.S. 1 or you've got to

13 do a completely different airport, period.

14 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Absolutely.

15 MR. WUELLNER: Let me ask you something.

16 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Joe, how do you -- I'm

17 sorry.

18 MR. WUELLNER: Let me ask you something.

19 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I'm sorry. Let me get

20 Joe's input first, though. Joe?

21 MR. CIRIELLO: Well, I think I've said it

22 many a times in different ways, that as far as I'm

23 concerned, the airport is the airport just where

24 it is, as is, and if you're going to talk about

25 extending that runway 31 -- at the end of 31 or

144

1 13 -- I never know which end's which; that's why I
2 don't fly -- but into the marsh another thousand
3 feet, as long as I'm around, I'll never -- never
4 agree with that. It -- I'm too environmental and
5 ecology prone to do that. I don't think it's
6 necessary. I'd rather do another airport
7 altogether.

8 I wouldn't go along with extending 6 and 24
9 out into the marsh, because you're going to do
10 some damage. So, I guess none of these ideas I
11 really care for.

12 Now, if you want to extend the end of that
13 long runway and put it on piers, like a bridge,
14 you will damage the ecology temporary. But when
15 you're done, the water and the snails and
16 everything will come in underneath where all the
17 piers are, and you'll still have the runway out
18 there. I think Boston Logan is that way, isn't
19 it?

20 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I don't know. I don't
21 know. Is it, Ed?

22 MR. CIRIELLO: Have you ever been into
23 Boston?

24 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I was just in it.

25 MR. CIRIELLO: Do they have a --

145

1 MR. GOODE: No, there are runways like that.

2 MS. ANDERSEN: Yes.

3 MR. JUFKO: There are runways like that.

4 MR. CIRIELLO: So, I don't know how much more

5 it would cost than putting a permanent extension

6 and destroying that ecology. That would be the

7 only way I would agree with anything.

8 But if you're going to go out there and dig

9 it up and put a permanent runway in out there and

10 ruin that thousand feet of snails and fish and

11 crabs and everything, no, no, no, no, I'll never

12 go with that. And the same for 6 and 24. I'd

13 much rather put another runway in somewhere else,

14 but --

15 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: So, based on what --

16 MR. CIRIELLO: -- we need to go --

17 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Based on what you know

18 right now, you -- you could support putting

19 another facility to the west of U.S. 1 as a

20 long-term --

21 MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah. But --

22 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: -- solution to our capacity

23 problem.

24 MR. CIRIELLO: But I am not much in favor of

25 doing anything to this airport physically beyond

146

1 the boundaries it is right now. And that includes

2 Araquay Park. You guys know that.

3 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. All right. Ed? Oh,

4 yes. Mariben.

5 MS. ANDERSEN: I wanted to clarify, sir, that

6 wetlands impact are through, over, above wetland.

7 If you cover wetland area, it's considered a

8 wetland impact.

9 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

10 MR. CIRIELLO: What'd she say? I didn't hear

11 her.

12 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: She said if you're

13 covering --

14 MR. COOPER: She said even if you build a

15 pier, you're still impacting the wetlands.

16 MR. JUFKO: You're still impacting the

17 wetlands.

18 MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah, but not as much as a --

19 MR. JUFKO: It would be considered the same,

20 is what she's saying.

21 MR. CIRIELLO: Well, then we don't do

22 anything there.

23 MR. GORMAN: And I have a quick question for

24 the environmental. Quick environmental question.

25 Is the environmental impact of -- of tremendous

147

1 concern, on a 20-year basis, putting in a reliever
2 runway over there as a separate facility? Is
3 that --

4 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: West of U.S. 1.

5 MR. GORMAN: West of U.S. 1. Is that a
6 difficult option?

7 MS. ANDERSEN: Actually, to answer your
8 question, it's a little complicated. You have
9 more than wetland impacts in your proposal because
10 of your location. You have protected species
11 around your area that has to be addressed if you
12 are going to extend your runway.

13 MR. GORMAN: No, no, not runway extensions.
14 We're talking about separate runways that as a
15 20-year capacity reliever to the west of U.S. 1,
16 rather than any extensions. That's a separate
17 issue.

18 MR. WUELLNER: If you were to build something
19 like that --

20 MS. ANDERSEN: Yes. You still have -- you
21 still have freshwater wetlands over there. We're
22 going to try and avoid them.

23 MR. WUELLNER: Those are a whole lot easier
24 to mitigate.

25 MR. GORMAN: All right. Thank you.

148

1 MR. WUELLNER: A whole lot.

2 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: If you put together an
3 alternative for this, would Mariben then look at,
4 you know, some of the wetland maps and stuff like
5 that?

6 MS. ANDERSEN: Oh, yeah.

7 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. Fine.

8 MR. JUFKO: She's there with me in Tampa.

9 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: John?

10 MR. JUFKO: We work together, so...

11 MR. RODERICK: Mr. George --

12 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yes, sir.

13 MR. RODERICK: Isn't it a separate issue to
14 extend that runway for economic impact to the
15 county of St. Johns so that we can get -- so that
16 Northrop Grumman can bid on all contracts from DoD
17 to repair?

18 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yes, it is.

19 MR. RODERICK: Okay. I think as a taxpayer,
20 that's a very important consideration.

21 MR. GORMAN: I think that that -- that issue
22 of extending it to -- to actually cater to the
23 needs of an existing tenant is a good one, but I
24 don't think that is -- that's a separate issue

25 than actually the capacity.

149

1 MR. RODERICK: Correct. I agree.

2 MR. GORMAN: Okay. I was just clarifying
3 that.

4 MR. RODERICK: But I just wanted to make sure
5 we didn't lose sight of that as an issue --

6 MR. GORMAN: Right. Okay.

7 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I was -- I was trying to
8 address the overall 20-year plan for where the
9 runways are, which really is a capacity --

10 MR. JUFKO: Correct.

11 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: -- you know, and really a
12 real estate, you know, from an expansion
13 standpoint also. Dave.

14 MR. KNIGHT: I'd like to just make one
15 comment in regards to capacity. And that is
16 St. Augustine Airport, like Ormond Beach, Flagler,
17 Craig Airport, and many other airports deal with
18 capacity. Craig, when they get busy, their
19 airplanes come on down here. When we get busy,
20 they head on somewhere else. There's a leveling
21 throughout the whole state.

22 I think what I see here is that you're taking
23 on a greater responsibility, perhaps.

24 MR. BURNETT: Can you speak up just a little

1 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. You're a
2 little soft-spoken.

3 MR. KNIGHT: I'm sorry.

4 MR. WUELLNER: Thank you.

5 MR. KNIGHT: I think you guys are taking
6 on -- I think you guys are taking on a greater
7 role than perhaps what you really need to. I
8 think an airport naturally has a self-leveling
9 effect because of other airports around it.

10 For example, Craig does 170,000 operations a
11 year. But when they're busy up there, their
12 airplanes come down and use our facility, et
13 cetera. As we become busier, aircraft from this
14 airport will go other locations. Other locations
15 would not come to this location because we're
16 busy.

17 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: David, are you saying that
18 that is a viable 50-year solution to the
19 constraints of St. Augustine, is to send -- send
20 them somewhere else?

21 MR. KNIGHT: No, that's not what I'm saying.
22 What I'm saying is I think there's a greater role
23 that Phil mentioned earlier, I believe, whereby
24 it's the responsibility of the state itself to

25 determine if there's certain traffic volume level

151

1 throughout a certain area, that perhaps a new
2 airport needs to be put in somewhere else, not
3 necessarily here next to St. Augustine. But it
4 may be required in the area. Do you follow with
5 what I'm saying?

6 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I'm following what you're
7 saying.

8 MR. KNIGHT: Okay.

9 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: And I'm going back to the
10 purpose of a master plan. And the purpose, as I
11 understand it, of a master plan is you need to
12 define the needs of the airport over the next 20
13 years and tell me how you are going to accomplish
14 that.

15 Now, if we define another runway series on
16 the other side of U.S. 1, and the reason we had to
17 do that is because of capacity constraints, not
18 saying that we couldn't do 120 percent of capacity
19 for a Super Bowl or something. But they're saying
20 from a -- from a planning standpoint, if the
21 guidelines are 80 percent, and you come up with
22 another planning solution, then that's what we're
23 trying to do is come up with a planning solution.

24 MR. WUELLNER: Let me -- let me repeat the

25 lecture I gave eight years ago on this --

152

1 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I wasn't here then.

2 MR. WUELLNER: -- on this. Yeah, I know. A
3 lot of what you're actually struggling with is
4 exactly the problem they were having eight years
5 ago or not -- thereabouts, when they were
6 finishing the last Master Plan.

7 When I -- when I came on board, it was
8 largely complete. I mean, it was just basically
9 to the point where they were adopting it and
10 submitting it to FAA. I had no real input in it
11 other than it was my challenge to get it passed by
12 the Airport Authority and submitted.

13 The exact same kinds of discussions were
14 going on then. They had gone through the -- the
15 whole iterative process, identified an
16 alternative which ultimately everyone hated. I
17 mean, if anything was agreeable was that everyone
18 hated it. And that involved the parallel to 13/31
19 scenario and, you know, everybody was caught up in
20 relocating the railroad and U.S. 1. And all of
21 this is in the current Master Plan.

22 And what I -- I cautioned them or -- or
23 directed their focus away from is you're not -- if
24 you still look at the forecast information that's

25 being presented, the earliest -- or about the

153

1 earliest time line where you hit your 80 percent
2 number is approximately 20 years, okay, using the
3 forecast you develop. That could vary a few years
4 here and there, but let's not get caught up in the
5 semantics of that.

6 Don't focus or worry about the actual
7 physical layout of the runway itself in 20 years.
8 You are going to go through a master planning
9 process every five to ten years that looks afresh
10 at the physical placement, will also look afresh
11 at the forecast each time, will continue to refine
12 and define the time line that another runway setup
13 or additional capacity is actually needed.

14 The 60 percent number we're talking about is
15 the theoretical number wherein we'd be -- prudent
16 people begin looking forward to how they solve
17 problems. It's not the time we go build
18 something. It's not the time we purchase
19 property, necessarily.

20 The important thing here is you -- you come
21 up with potential layouts. And I don't even
22 define it on the map. What your critical path
23 item here is to define for the future where you
24 would likely place a runway and reserve within the

25 comprehensive planning process of the county the

154

1 area in terms of land that that would likely end
2 up sited. That -- that's really all you need to
3 get caught up in.

4 Don't worry about how the taxiway route runs
5 across and how it eventually crosses U.S. 1 or
6 whether we eliminate the railroad. For all we
7 know, in 20 years, there will be no such thing as
8 railroad. Who knows?

9 You've got to -- you've got to focus on the
10 five- to ten-year window here of what's actually
11 physically feasible. Beyond that, it's --
12 you're -- you're reserving property for the most
13 part, reserving use and compatibility long term.

14 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Jack?

15 MR. GORMAN: Then to address Dave's issue and
16 to address your issue and to come into the reality
17 of the railroad, all we have to do is to put a
18 magic bullet on the 20-year plan as to say west of
19 U.S. 1 is feasible, period.

20 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. You will --

21 MR. GORMAN: Is this not true?

22 MR. WUELLNER: You'll eventually need to --
23 to trace a line in the sand, so to speak, and say
24 this is the property we see it happening on. As a

25 result, we're going to, quote, unquote, reserve

155

1 its long-term compatibility for aviation use.

2 MR. GORMAN: I just wanted to clarify --

3 MR. WUELLNER: That's effectively it.

4 MR. GORMAN: -- that that's seems to be the

5 consensus of this group, is that an area of west

6 of will be a capacity reliever and there is no

7 other great alternative to that --

8 MR. WUELLNER: I don't see other

9 alternatives. Whether you relocate one or --

10 railroad or never touch them, it -- you're looking

11 at the same splotch of land relative to placing a

12 runway.

13 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: As Marybeth said -- or

14 Mariben said, we've got to have looked at it,

15 because they're going to ask, well, did you look

16 at this and did you look at that? See?

17 I understand what you're saying, Ed. I have

18 a problem in putting a 20-year plan out with the

19 mentality that I'm only worried about five. That

20 says to me that five to -- six to twenty is not

21 any good. So, I think we're spending enough time,

22 you know, to define some alternatives down there

23 that are realistic and more acceptable financially

24 and public-wise.

1 mean to discount the process you're going through,
2 and I don't mean to discount the importance of --
3 of identifying where you would place that
4 additional capacity and how you'd -- you'd embrace
5 that moving forward. Because that ultimately
6 defines the land you're going to attempt to
7 protect long term for the airport expansion.

8 What I'm saying is the -- the details of the
9 thinking are in the zero to ten-year element of
10 the Master Plan. This is where you're programming
11 for all your grant funds, where your capital
12 development projects are almost entirely going to
13 occur within that -- that ten-year period.
14 Somewhere in that ten-year period you're going to
15 go down this road again.

16 We've literally exhausted -- part of this
17 process, we've literally exhausted the capital
18 improvement projects that were identified in the
19 previous Master Plan. We did that six or seven
20 years in advance of when it was projected. But
21 here nor there, you've taken that five- or
22 ten-year window and -- and done all you can with
23 it based on the plan.

24 Now it's time to look at the details of the

25 next 10 years, focussing on holding and not --

157

1 not, you know, undermining the utility of the
2 airport beyond the 10-year period into 20 or 30 or
3 whatever ultimately ends up being --

4 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Well, I think we have a
5 consensus of the three of us that the 20-year time
6 period down the road to relieve capacity
7 constraints that might or might not be there, that
8 all of the other alternatives about moving the
9 railroad and moving -- that's absurd.

10 MR. WUELLNER: And I'm not disagreeing with
11 you at all. I'm -- just reserve the property,
12 move along --

13 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I would like to hear any
14 other public comment that they, you know, disagree
15 with that, you know, or have any other points.
16 I'm talking about -- okay. Only that piece of it.
17 John?

18 MR. RODERICK: We -- in the TAC, that was
19 pretty much a unanimous vote when those were
20 presented, and if I'm out of line, Phil or Gloria.
21 We all said that's not going to happen.

22 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. Gloria?

23 MS. LOUNGEWAY: I just had one question,
24 though. As far as like going to the west, how --

25 it's my understanding that the 312 project is

158

1 somewhere in the planning --

2 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Is another constraint that
3 you have to deal with.

4 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Is in the planning or
5 environmental early phases right now. And so, I
6 would just say -- I would like, I guess, some
7 feedback on how set in stone is that alignment
8 right now?

9 MR. WUELLNER: I think it's virtually done.
10 And the reason I say that is that --

11 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: That's what I'm getting --

12 MR. WUELLNER: -- upwards of eight or ten
13 years ago, the environmental analysis was done,
14 the corridor selected based on the least
15 objectionable impact, you know, consistent with
16 normal like PD&E type work. So, I think your --
17 the alignment, you know, plus or minus a few feet
18 is -- is virtually set at this point.

19 MR. JUFKO: Well, we've -- as I'm reading
20 this, we would treat that area -- we would treat
21 that much like we're treating U.S. 1, then.

22 MR. WUELLNER: Yes. Exactly. That's going
23 to become the western constraint.

24 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Exactly.

25 MR. JUFKO: Okay.

159

1 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Mariben?

2 MS. ANDERSEN: Since you guys are deciding
3 where to put your proposed runways, I want to give
4 you existing environmental conditions. I'm not
5 going to use the slides.

6 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. Well, speak up.

7 MS. ANDERSEN: If you -- I'll speak up.

8 MR. WUELLNER: Give her the mic.

9 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I've got it right here. I
10 stole it. I took it away from Dave.

11 MS. ANDERSEN: I'm going to sing.

12 MR. WUELLNER: I just remembered doing it.

13 MS. ANDERSEN: I'm just joking. If you
14 decide to put improvements or infrastructure on
15 the wetlands east of the runway, you are going to
16 deal --

17 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: East of the runway...

18 MS. ANDERSEN: I'm sorry, east of U.S. 1.

19 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: West of U.S. 1.

20 MS. LOUNGEWAY: West of U.S. 1.

21 MS. ANDERSEN: Oh, that's not facing north?

22 MR. JUFKO: It is facing north.

23 MS. ANDERSEN: Facing north. So, it's east
24 this way. Yes.

1 airfield.

2 MS. ANDERSEN: Yes. If you decide to put
3 improvements into the salt marsh, that's an easier
4 way, east of U.S. 1, you're going to deal with
5 permits with the United States Army Corps of
6 Engineer, with the State, okay, with the Florida
7 Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission, and the
8 National Marine Fisheries. All right. And we can
9 probably get a waiver from St. -- from the County
10 for it. So, you have four permits. And then you
11 have to apply for submerged lands. That's five
12 permits.

13 If you decide to put it on the other side of
14 U.S. 1, where you have more uplands and you have
15 less wetlands, you're dealing with two permits,
16 two environmental permits. I just wanted you guys
17 to visualize it, because he's saying it's easier.
18 So, I want to quantify it for you.

19 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. Thank you. Some of
20 the ground -- well, whatever. You're -- you're
21 right. But I think that our consensus is that the
22 long-term, you know, plan would be don't move the
23 runway, don't move -- I mean, don't move the
24 railroad, U.S. 1, or 312, and come up with a plan

25 that puts two runways in there?

161

1 Okay. Now let's go to the present.

2 MR. JUFKO: Several of the things that we've
3 shown in these alternatives, and -- and to varying
4 degrees, because we just wanted to show the
5 different benefits and also impacts associated
6 with that, most of these changes, as we go --
7 where is that fancy thing there?

8 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Oh, the pointer.

9 MR. JUFKO: Pretty hot item here, right?
10 Okay. Now, if we're -- if we're looking at -- at
11 these Alternatives B and Alternative A -- and
12 we'll start at A, I guess.

13 Now we're back into needs, where we're
14 talking about getting the runway length issue
15 taken care of. You all have kind of weighed in on
16 how you felt about one way or another going out
17 into -- to the water. And we will probably still
18 take a look at those. I think those are viable
19 alternatives to at least look at and weigh
20 against --

21 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: 13 and 31? Yes.

22 MR. JUFKO: And we'll look at what the
23 impacts associated with that are. And in an
24 effort to get -- and in light of what was just

25 said about moving the road, that basically takes

162

1 us down to moving the runway, as we have it in B,
2 of 6/24 in order to get the length that we're
3 looking at, which is another out into the -- out
4 into the marsh onto the waterway.

5 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. What's the need
6 again for that?

7 MR. JUFKO: To get the recommended runway
8 length to go with the secondary crosswind runway
9 component.

10 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: What is 2 -- what is the
11 length of 2, runway 2?

12 MR. JUFKO: It needs to go up to, at a
13 minimum, as we were saying, just under 3,100 feet.

14 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I'm sorry. I -- I don't
15 remember. Isn't 2 --

16 MR. JUFKO: I'm sorry.

17 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: -- 20 longer than 6/24?

18 MR. WUELLNER: Yes. No, it isn't. 6/24 is
19 short -- or 6/24 is longer, slightly.

20 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Say that again?

21 MR. WUELLNER: 6/24 is slightly longer than
22 2/20.

23 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. What is the length
24 of it now?

25 MR. WUELLNER: Twenty-six something, isn't

163

1 it?

2 MR. KNIGHT: Twenty-seven.

3 MR. JUFKO: Some of the issues that we had

4 pointed out with -- with 2/20 at the time during

5 the requirements analysis was that we would be

6 limited -- we would be limited, even if we took

7 2/20 out into the water, due to the distances away

8 from existing facilities off -- and -- and

9 separations. And what we want to get, is if

10 you're going to go forth -- and the FAA is going

11 to look at it this way as well. If you're going

12 to go forth and extend the runway to get into

13 compliance with the requirement, it's not in

14 compliance, from a lateral separation aspect.

15 It's too close to the parking area and so on.

16 So, 6/24 is our best bet to extend in the

17 long term and -- and bring up to standard and --

18 and allow us to -- to handle more of the general

19 aviation fleet that it --

20 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: What is the FAA defined

21 time frame on when we have to meet that 3,100

22 feet?

23 MR. JUFKO: You already don't meet it.

24 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I'm sorry?

25 MR. JUFKO: Well, you don't meet it now,

164

1 so...

2 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I know. So -- so, we're
3 living -- you know, we're bad boys right now. So,
4 how much longer can we be bad boys?

5 MR. JUFKO: Well, here's the thing that goes
6 into it: You can suggest a project to get in --
7 get into compliance with the standard, but because
8 of the effort that we're going to have to go
9 through to get that -- now when we go -- we go
10 through a benefit cost analysis phase after this.

11 So, even though we project it here, there's
12 this little caveat that says we have to go through
13 a benefit cost analysis. And at that time, that
14 project could get shot down and not happen.

15 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. Do we have to go
16 through the benefit cost analysis before we finish
17 the Master Plan?

18 MR. JUFKO: No. It will be something that
19 would be put in your capital improvement program
20 to conduct, much like you would conduct other
21 series of analyses before you go into construction
22 and design and before they would spend the money
23 to go into design.

24 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: But your firm, knowing that

25 that's going to happen, would that be a black mark

165

1 on you guys coming up with a master plan that
2 shows that?

3 MR. JUFKO: No. No. This is a reasonable
4 alternative in terms of it can be accomplished.
5 And that's what we're looking at, can it be
6 accomplished.

7 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: If they looked at it with
8 the feasibility of doing that, could they also
9 look at the feasibility of putting runways on the
10 west of U.S. 1 in that same study? What I'm
11 getting at is, if they're looking at the cost
12 benefit analysis, that same study could say, go
13 ahead and build your runway on the other side.

14 MR. JUFKO: They would do -- when you're
15 talking about the west side of U.S. 1, they would
16 do that closer to the time frame that you're
17 looking at constructing it. This would be far too
18 much in advance to be looking at that through the
19 eyes of a benefit cost analysis. Because we're
20 saying we're protecting this area, much like Ed
21 said, we're protecting for the future.

22 We don't have the justification to stick that
23 and build it right now. That means -- but we see
24 it on the horizon, and we want to protect that

25 because we're being good stewards here.

166

1 So, back -- back to things that we can do in
2 the near term, this is one of the things that we
3 can do in terms of like 6/24, in terms of like
4 13/31. And will there be a relocation of the road
5 and rail if we decide -- I can tell you right now,
6 there would be a very minor relocation of U.S. 1
7 and the rail.

8 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Move it a foot and
9 you're --

10 MR. JUFKO: I know.

11 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: -- 250 million bucks.

12 MR. JUFKO: But the thing is if we -- if we
13 want to go and reclaim part of the north end of
14 the runway, if we decided to go that route, or
15 maybe one of the alternatives does look at that
16 and one doesn't -- maybe one says, okay, let's do
17 the whole nut; here it is. Then another one might
18 look at it and say, well, let's just go from where
19 we're at and go south.

20 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: So, for the Master Plan,
21 you have to put all of the alternatives in there
22 and then tell them the one that --

23 MR. JUFKO: Because now I have something I
24 can compare, apples and apples. I'm not out there

25 in the middle of nowhere, trying to figure out

167

1 well, which one's the best one to do? It would be
2 very difficult to compare one of these long-term
3 alternatives to something that's going to happen
4 in the near term.

5 MS. LOUNGEWAY: And the environmental process
6 will pick up those alternatives when -- when
7 you're undergoing the EIS or EA -- well, EIS in
8 this case.

9 MR. CIRIELLO: You used the word
10 "justification."

11 MR. JUFKO: I did?

12 MR. CIRIELLO: I don't see any just -- well,
13 something similar. I don't see no justification
14 to make that runway longer right now. The only
15 thing I heard anybody say was, well, Grumman can
16 bid on more jobs. Well, most of the jobs Grumman
17 bid on, they don't get anyhow. Nobody does.

18 You know, so you're talking rarities here as
19 justification for going into that marsh and -- and
20 ruining ecology and everything, when that runway
21 doesn't need to be run -- made longer.

22 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Grumman has another
23 facility in Louisiana that has a longer runway.

24 Would you in essence tell Grumman, any of those

25 projects that needs an 8,000 foot, you take that

168

1 out of the State of Florida; we don't want that

2 work? Is that what you're saying?

3 MR. CIRIELLO: I'm just saying that that one

4 issue of Grumman isn't justification enough to do

5 that runway and go into the ecology and

6 everything --

7 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

8 MR. CIRIELLO: -- and the environment and

9 everything, is all I'm saying. And if that means

10 they lose a couple of contracts -- well, I worked

11 there for six years.

12 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yeah.

13 MR. CIRIELLO: They don't get everything they

14 want. In fact, that runway's been made longer

15 since I was working there than what it is now.

16 So, they've -- they've been given a lot of

17 advantages from this Authority. I'm not saying

18 the heck with Grumman, no. I like Grumman.

19 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: They have an option coming

20 up on what to do with those 70 acres in the year

21 2007. So, that's three years out.

22 MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah, but after that -- I

23 mean, after that three years is up, they don't

24 have an option anymore, do they, Ed, that they can

25 tell us what to do with it? We take it and it's

169

1 ours.

2 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: No, but if we had a -- if
3 we had a plan on the books to extend that runway
4 when we're going through the cycle, that might
5 make them say, okay, if you do get that runway
6 extended, then we want to exercise the option and
7 build a bigger facility on those 70 acres. And
8 that means a lot of jobs.

9 MR. CIRIELLO: I don't see it.

10 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Ed.

11 MR. WUELLNER: My question is more of a
12 capacity utility issue kind of geared toward Bryan
13 and David. If the runway, if runway 2 -- excuse
14 me. If runway 6/24 were extended to the 3,100 or
15 even the 4,000, as it's kind of depicted there,
16 does that provide meaningful additions in utility
17 of the airport?

18 I -- I understand there -- there are aircraft
19 that currently cannot, because of runway length
20 and width, utilize 6/24 for those very reasons.
21 We have a -- you know, most of our light
22 single-engine GA aircraft, and even a few light
23 twins can routinely use that runway in its length
24 now. And I'm not saying it meets standard. I'm

25 not even trying to make that argument.

170

1 What I'm asking is if -- if we were to extend
2 it, does it provide -- does that length provide a
3 meaningful advantage in operating the airfield?

4 MR. KNIGHT: One percent only, maybe. The
5 reason why I say that is, if runway 13 and 31
6 needs to be taken down for work, et cetera, if you
7 had 4,000 feet of runway, then your Citations --
8 not the Lears, but your little Citations could at
9 least land and depart. But your Lears would not
10 even be able to come in here.

11 MR. WUELLNER: Unless we extended that runway
12 out to 6 --

13 MR. KNIGHT: Probably --

14 MR. WUELLNER: -- 5- to 6,000 feet range --

15 MR. KNIGHT: -- 5-, 6-, somewhere, yes.

16 MR. WUELLNER: -- you don't get meaningful
17 substantial advantages in the operating --

18 MR. KNIGHT: That's correct.

19 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Good question.

20 MR. WUELLNER: I suspected that, but...

21 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: But you're saying from the
22 Master Plan, because we are presently in
23 violation, we have to put something in there as a
24 way to handle that?

1 design standards that are used at airports
2 throughout the country, and around the world for
3 that matter --

4 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yeah.

5 MR. JUFKO: -- that there's a methodology of
6 coming up with what the length should be of -- the
7 optimum length should be to support aircraft, the
8 typical type of aircraft or critical aircraft that
9 are operating on that runway, or designed to
10 operate on that runway.

11 And to get part of the fleet, there's --
12 there's a number out there. That doesn't mean
13 that we can't operate. We can always operate on a
14 shorter runway, and -- and the way they deal with
15 that, depending on what the conditions are, what
16 the temperature is, they might lighten their load
17 in terms of fuel and so on, yes, you can operate
18 on that runway. That's how they do it now. And
19 it doesn't affect them.

20 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: My question -- my question,
21 Phil, was do we have to have an adopted
22 alternative of how to cope with the 3,100 foot for
23 the second runway in our Master Plan? Because,
24 you know, Joe's point about, you know, going into

25 ecology, and Mariben's point about, you know, how

172

1 many agencies you're going to have to go through,
2 that's a five-, six-year fighting project, and I'd
3 rather spend the five or six years fighting for
4 something that's more feasible.

5 MR. JUFKO: The way that we go about that,
6 Mr. George, is we would try to accommodate it, and
7 when we go through the alternatives and uncover
8 those aspects that would basically --

9 MR. WUELLNER: Eliminate it from contention
10 if we --

11 MR. JUFKO: -- negate doing it, then you
12 remove it from consideration. But we don't remove
13 it until we at least look at it.

14 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Fine. Okay.

15 MR. JUFKO: You see where I'm coming from?

16 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Well, by having it and
17 removing it because it wasn't an alternative, just
18 gives strength to a long-term solution somewhere
19 else.

20 MR. WUELLNER: A part of -- part of the
21 problem -- or advantage of all of this is that
22 you've got such a relatively high wind coverage
23 component to 13/31, even though it's -- primarily
24 because it's made up of such -- such a nice

25 length. But you -- you overcome -- you know,

173

1 you've got what, 90 -- 97, 96 percent, 95, -3 or
2 something?

3 MS. LOUNGEWAY: For -- for which group,
4 though?

5 MR. WUELLNER: For 13/31, just unilaterally.
6 Do you remember?

7 MR. JUFKO: By itself.

8 MS. LOUNGEWAY: At what crosswind, though?

9 MR. JUFKO: No, but you're saying by itself.

10 MS. LOUNGEWAY: By itself?

11 MR. WUELLNER: Collectively. Assuming that
12 was the only runway here, you've got 90, what, -3,
13 95 --

14 MS. LOUNGEWAY: -5, yeah.

15 MR. WUELLNER: -- percent wind coverage,
16 which means there's only 5 percent, arguably, of
17 the entire year's atmospheric conditions that
18 would prevent a significant --

19 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Use of 13/31, yeah.

20 MR. WUELLNER: Which means that you're really
21 filling a gap here. That -- that short runway,
22 you know, in all probability is going to fall
23 right out of there in terms of a viable project,
24 for environmental reasons alone.

25 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. Well, I think we --

174

1 or at least I understand, I hope you guys, do,
2 that he has to cover it in his Master Plan, and
3 then when it falls through, it's just not a viable
4 thing. So, it will show up on an alternative down
5 the road, but we shouldn't get too excited about
6 it.

7 MR. WUELLNER: Exactly.

8 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: And that -- you know,
9 because that should satisfy Joe, you, about not
10 wanting to go into the -- you know, into the marsh
11 and -- and ruin things out there.

12 MR. WUELLNER: For that runway.

13 MR. COOPER: Phil, let me ask a question.
14 If -- if you apply for an FAA grant overlay of
15 runway that is below the length that they want --
16 in other words, you're telling us they want 3,100
17 feet, approximately, and we have 2,700 feet, 4- or
18 500 feet short of what the FAA says it should be,
19 and we apply for a grant to do an overlay project
20 on it or upgrade the lighting system on it or
21 whatever, are they going to approve that, or is
22 that a disqualifier?

23 MR. JUFKO: No, they'll approve it. The
24 reason we're saying it needs to be this length is

25 because in the master planning process, we've

175

1 looked at what -- well, one, we looked at

2 existing, how that runway is utilized --

3 MR. COOPER: Right.

4 MR. JUFKO: -- and we also looked at how it

5 could be utilized in the future based on what the

6 forecast was. And if you take those into

7 consideration, this is what we're saying.

8 MR. COOPER: Right.

9 MR. JUFKO: It's not like the RSA issue where

10 when you go to overlay and you aren't in

11 compliance, they're not going to give you any more

12 money until you fix it. It's totally different.

13 MR. WUELLNER: And under the current

14 funding --

15 MR. COOPER: But then again, the RSA also

16 comes into play there. Even though we have not

17 displaced the threshold, we don't meet the RSA

18 requirements there, either.

19 MR. JUFKO: And that would become a problem.

20 MR. COOPER: Right.

21 MR. JUFKO: And that is another reason for

22 addressing the length issue, because not only did

23 you address the -- would you address the length

24 issue by guidelines, which is not like a mandatory

25 thing, if you want to compare them; but, because

176

1 you don't meet the RSA requirement, you're
2 actually killing two birds with one stone, so
3 maybe it is something that's viable.

4 MR. COOPER: So, there's another reason to
5 look at it --

6 MR. JUFKO: Absolutely.

7 MR. COOPER: -- other than those. That's one
8 of them.

9 MS. LOUNGEWAY: And if we don't -- if -- it
10 kind of sounds like we may eventually end up not
11 showing an extension there. We will still have to
12 show improvements to that RSA, but there -- it
13 would be a much smaller area impacted in order to
14 get the stabilized fill material that is needed in
15 your RSA area at that end.

16 MR. GORMAN: Then --

17 MR. WUELLNER: I go back, because that
18 argument doesn't hold -- pardon the pun almost.
19 That doesn't really hold argument, because you've
20 got the same exact scenario on the south.

21 If you're going to extend out there to
22 improve the RSA, you may as well pave it, because
23 it's the exact same environmental problem. You
24 displace it coming the other direction, but you've

25 got it available for extended runway length.

177

1 MR. JUFKO: Well, you just hit the --

2 MR. WUELLNER: If you're going to make that
3 environment impact.

4 MR. JUFKO: You just hit the magic word,
5 though. The FAA -- and now there's a new change
6 in there that we have to address this as part of
7 the Master Plan. If we don't meet the RSA, we
8 have to come up with some sort of a solution.

9 MR. GORMAN: How about one of these magic
10 EMAS bullets, in other words, for the short
11 runway, for the 6/24? I'm just throwing this out.
12 I don't know what I'm talking about, but --

13 MR. JUFKO: Right in line with what I'm
14 talking about.

15 MR. GORMAN: -- we've got that EMAS. In
16 other words, aren't they going to change the
17 guidelines for EMAS --

18 MR. WUELLNER: That may very well be the only
19 solution --

20 MR. GORMAN: -- and then you could kind of
21 stick EMAS at both ends of 6/24 and all of a
22 sudden it meets the criteria?

23 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Well, it would really only be
24 at the -- the water edge.

25 MR. JUFKO: You're right.

178

1 MR. GORMAN: Okay.

2 MR. JUFKO: Right. Because technically --
3 yeah, it's this little area. They're going to
4 make you look at either meeting it, they're going
5 to make you look at either using some sort of
6 thing like EMAS or displacing the threshold. Now,
7 you displace the threshold on that runway --

8 MS. LOUNGEWAY: And it's gone.

9 MR. JUFKO: -- it's gone.

10 MR. GORMAN: You have no runway left. Right.

11 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. Let's move back to
12 the corporate hangar and Araquay Park. Let's go
13 to Araquay Park and -- unless you want to look at
14 the two alternatives for corporate hangars with
15 the idea that -- that maybe somewhere in Araquay
16 Park, it could satisfy that, and therefore, we use
17 the least expensive route of the -- of the other
18 one. Yeah, let's look at the first two
19 alternatives for corporate.

20 MR. JUFKO: Okay.

21 MR. WUELLNER: I think you've got a question.
22 In the Araquay Park one, you know, reading your --
23 Mr. Gorman's comments from earlier, I think the
24 Authority, I get the impression, really needs to

25 provide a little direction to these guys about

179

1 this specific area, which is, do you really only
2 want to consider -- and what I'm hearing is this
3 is the direction you want to give them -- is that
4 you really only want to consider development
5 alternatives that allow you to maximize the use of
6 existing property in the short term.

7 You know, a plan can show a lot broader area
8 for 20 years; however, the initial five-year, this
9 is what we own, this is the way we get, you know,
10 our feet wet and take advantage of our own
11 property, you know, we need to develop based on
12 what we own or are likely to own.

13 MR. GORMAN: My own thought on this is, in
14 other words, the overall opinion -- this is a
15 statement, so bear with me.

16 The overwhelming -- overwhelming opinion of
17 public is to remove the airport from the tax
18 rolls. In this effort, the board has decided to
19 maximize the resources of the airport and build
20 hangars in what I hope is a tasteful
21 environmentally thoughtful way, to replace this
22 15-year legacy of losing money in the house rental
23 business, which is certainly not part of the
24 airport charter.

1 acquire pieces of the puzzle not in place. To
2 pursue this goal of airport self-sustenance, the
3 eminent domain issue has to -- has become red hot.
4 We've got 84-year-olds, 80-year-old blind people.
5 We've got self-built homes, et cetera, et cetera,
6 many more issues than originally conceived.

7 So, we cannot let history repeat itself. We
8 cannot not build hangars. And so, my own thought
9 is to -- immediately, to put some of this issue to
10 bed, come up with a plan to utilize what we have
11 right now, and yet make the overhaul plan blend in
12 so that if we do acquire these eminent domain
13 issues, they can fit in with some semblance of
14 order, period, so that we can right away implement
15 a plan to start building hangars without owning
16 these eminent domain contentious issues. So, we
17 can start -- we start next month planning, this is
18 where the hangar goes, this is where the hangar
19 goes, these trees we're saving, ad infinitum.

20 That's my own thought, because I just want to
21 move forward, because my own -- my own fear is, is
22 that the eminent domain issue will become
23 litigious, it will become contentious, which it
24 already is, and it's going to go on forever and

25 we're never going to get hangars three years down

181

1 the road, period.

2 MR. WUELLNER: It's only contentious with
3 nine people.

4 MR. GORMAN: But my own feeling is it's going
5 to get contentious to the point of nonsolution,
6 and I really don't want it to go three years, the
7 way this terminal has.

8 MR. WUELLNER: You folks control whether it
9 goes on or not.

10 MR. GORMAN: Well --

11 MR. WUELLNER: If you continue on your path,
12 you're done with this in, what, a year?

13 MR. BURNETT: If you -- if you recall when
14 Mark --

15 MR. WUELLNER: If you don't --

16 MR. GORMAN: I wish I believed that.

17 MR. WUELLNER: It's that simple.

18 MR. BURNETT: If you recall when Mark Arnold
19 was here, there's two different ways to do what's
20 called a taking. You can quick-take the property,
21 and that pretty much resolves it really quickly.
22 You have lingering litigation over how much that
23 property owner is going to be compensated for the
24 taking. Now, you can quick-take the property --

25 MR. WUELLNER: There's no issue about owner.

182

1 MR. BURNETT: -- and you have the property.

2 That -- that pretty quickly gets you the

3 ownership.

4 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I -- I think that -- I

5 think we all understand that --

6 MR. GORMAN: I wish I believed that.

7 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: -- we can make the decision

8 to accelerate that process and get these things.

9 And we have been waiting patiently for six months

10 for this meeting and the next meeting to come

11 about with what are the needs and how much of it

12 can we solve to decide how we're going to do it.

13 So, let's get back to looking at those

14 alternatives again so that we have a better feel,

15 and then we'll be better, you know, to give you,

16 you know, direction on what the alternative to

17 submit to the rest of the guys.

18 MR. GORMAN: To really go to the ballpark and

19 start hitting the ball, do we have that overlay as

20 to what property we own right now in Araquay Park,

21 and can we pop it back up there?

22 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yes. Okay.

23 MR. GORMAN: I hate to go there, but I've got

24 to.

25 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: That's all right.

183

1 MR. BURNETT: You've got the color one there,
2 too, Mr. Gorman.

3 MR. GORMAN: Yeah, but the one that actually
4 shows what we've owned -- what we do own. And
5 that's in red. You know, you can see that. It's
6 somewhere there.

7 MR. WUELLNER: I stupidly turned it off. It
8 will just take a second.

9 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. While he's doing
10 that --

11 MR. BURNETT: That color one, the second one
12 does show --

13 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: -- bring back corporate
14 hangars so I can get a better feel for what
15 solutions we're going to have there.

16 MR. BURNETT: -- that you just put away,
17 that's what the airport owns, the color.

18 MR. GORMAN: Yeah. That's -- it's -- it's
19 almost illogical, but you're right.

20 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. While he's bringing
21 that up, and before we get into Araquay Park,
22 let's look at what we were talking about doing
23 with the corporate area on the other side, the
24 options. So, alternative 1 here, we've got some

25 land to acquire from the Gun Club over there, and

184

1 we do not preserve the existing retention pond.

2 MR. GORMAN: My question is, has anybody
3 talked to the Gun Club lately about whether
4 they're going to sell that land?

5 MR. WUELLNER: It's been between one and two
6 years since the last conversation.

7 MR. GORMAN: And what was the dialogue then?

8 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Astronomical.

9 MR. GORMAN: That was my --

10 MR. WUELLNER: That's when they discovered
11 gold and oil and things like that on their
12 property.

13 MR. GORMAN: There was a gold mine right
14 underneath it. I understand that.

15 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: We have eight companies on
16 the waiting list of corporate hangars at the
17 present time; is that correct, Ed?

18 MR. WUELLNER: I'm sorry. Say that again.

19 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: How many do we have on the
20 waiting list for corporate hangars at the present
21 time? At one time --

22 MR. WUELLNER: Somewhere between 10 and 20.
23 Somewhere between 10 and 20. Some of those on
24 that list are -- are looking for 50 x 65 size, you

25 know, not -- not big, full stand-alone corporates.

185

1 You've also got a few on that list that are
2 actually on the list, awaiting direction and --
3 and all toward establishing second FBO operations.
4 You've got probably three on that list.

5 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: We're not looking at doing
6 second FBO operations over here in this
7 (indicating) --

8 MR. WUELLNER: No, no.

9 MS. LOUNGEWAY: No, there's not enough area.

10 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: My question is, what is the
11 present demand --

12 MR. WUELLNER: Well, they're showing
13 buildings -- for illustrative purposes, they could
14 be as little as 50 x 50s. They could be as large
15 as hundreds by hundreds. You know, what I'm
16 saying is you're probably looking at 10 to 15 in
17 aggregate, total units that are necessary, some of
18 which will be 50 x 50s, some of which will be a
19 hundred by a hundred.

20 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. Let me ask a
21 question.

22 MR. WUELLNER: I don't mean to be vague.
23 It's just that you've got --

24 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I'm trying to get -- this,

25 to me (indicating), is an option of land that we

186

1 basically already own. I'm trying to get an idea
2 of how much that solves of our present demand so
3 that we can say the rest of it goes with whatever
4 else we're going to acquire in Araquay.

5 MR. GORMAN: Can -- can we use the red
6 pointer and point out the area that we'd have to
7 buy, just so for --

8 MS. LOUNGEWAY: It would be --

9 MR. GORMAN: For Buzz's -- for Buzz's --

10 MR. WUELLNER: It follows the road.

11 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: It follows this area here
12 (indicating). See where it's coming in
13 (indicating)?

14 MR. WUELLNER: It follows the road.

15 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: And coming back around
16 (indicating).

17 MR. GORMAN: We've got to buy all that.

18 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: We've got to buy all that.

19 MR. GORMAN: And there's a gold mine
20 underneath it.

21 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Wait a minute.

22 MR. WUELLNER: Not only that, you've got
23 wetlands.

24 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Not only that, but you've

25 got here (indicating). We already own that.

187

1 MR. WUELLNER: Plus you've got a substantial
2 amount of saltwater marsh.

3 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: If you get rid of that
4 one -- we already own this (indicating). We get
5 rid of that one (indicating), we own that
6 (indicating).

7 MR. WUELLNER: Well, no. Some of those
8 you're pointing out -- Gloria. It's not easy to
9 pick out on this because the building's laying
10 right over the top of it. Okay. It is.

11 Right in this area here (indicating) is
12 actually a large drainage retention area. That's
13 already gone. Unless you're prepared to dig that
14 hole somewhere else and move everything that's
15 going into that hole presently somewhere --

16 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Which says I would have to
17 buy land somewhere else to dig that hole.

18 MR. WUELLNER: Well, not only that, you've
19 got to physically, from an engineering standpoint,
20 be able to get it there, which is not always easy.
21 You've got this piece, this corner (indicating),
22 if you want to call it -- there's this piece here
23 that is currently delineated -- actually, it
24 includes this (indicating) -- currently delineated

25 as wetland. All right? But it's all freshwater,

188

1 relatively, and I use the word "relatively", easy
2 to mitigate. It can be mitigated across U.S. 1
3 and north. The district's already done that for
4 us. It's -- our -- has done that on other
5 projects and will -- will do that for us. So,
6 there's a piece there that certainly could be
7 developed relatively short order.

8 But as you move this area (indicating),
9 you're looking at acquisition. You're also
10 looking at mitigation of potentially saltwater
11 marsh, which is a huge environmental undertaking,
12 beyond the constructability, beyond the ownership.

13 MR. CIRIELLO: Why is freshwater easier than
14 saltwater?

15 MR. WUELLNER: It's -- it's easier to make.
16 They don't -- you can't really reliably create
17 good saltwater marsh. And this -- that, and the
18 fact in this state, the State owns literally
19 everything that's under saltwater.

20 MR. GORMAN: So -- so, to sum this up
21 quickly, Ed, you're saying that the mitigation
22 issues on this and the retention pond issue on
23 this is -- our word, "onerous", is going to be
24 difficult.

25 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. The other one --

189

1 MR. GORMAN: Okay.

2 MR. WUELLNER: -- the 12-unit one I think is
3 entirely -- I don't know --

4 MR. GORMAN: Yeah. Let's see the other one.
5 Just -- I don't mean to be going so quickly or to
6 push it, but, you know, I'm just --

7 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: No, no. It isn't pushing.

8 MR. WUELLNER: It's the other way, wasn't it?

9 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Yeah.

10 MR. WUELLNER: Of course.

11 MR. GORMAN: There. In other words, you're
12 saying that this is just far more doable. I mean,
13 I'm just trying to sum things up.

14 MR. WUELLNER: Absolutely.

15 MR. GORMAN: Right. Well, there's our
16 answer.

17 MR. JUFKO: It doesn't mean we throw anything
18 out. It means we consider them. And I can just
19 tell you that's going to come out on top.

20 MR. WUELLNER: Now you've got a nice view of
21 the water, the drainage retention area I was
22 referring to that's under the other exhibit.

23 There's even a way there, the way she's got
24 it drawn, or whoever did it -- blame you or give

25 you the credit, one or the other -- but, I mean,

190

1 there's even a way here to extend perhaps the
2 capacity of that and -- and pick up what you need
3 for the newer buildings being constructed. So,
4 you know, you've got some -- some -- some play
5 room there to get the drainage retention
6 requirement, which is independent of the wetlands
7 issue.

8 MR. GORMAN: So, to sum it up again, we have
9 less environmental issues with this. We have a --
10 we don't have a retention pond problem and we're
11 not trying to buy a gold mine from the Gun Club.

12 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Well, a smaller portion of
13 it.

14 MR. WUELLNER: The negative is your loss is
15 12 fewer units.

16 MR. GORMAN: Well, we have --

17 MR. WUELLNER: It's half the size, so...

18 MR. GORMAN: Yeah. So, you've really got to
19 go very quickly to the fact if we buy -- if we pay
20 a lot of money to the Gun Club for the land, are
21 we going to recoup that actually in dollars along
22 with the environmental concerns? I mean,
23 that's -- we go right to Wayne George's con --
24 always going to have the same contention. It's

1 MR. WUELLNER: Part of the property they were
2 willing to sell us, which was about, my memory,
3 12, 13 acre range, which is basically draw a line
4 like this and it picked up this here (indicating).
5 It's basically this piece (indicating).

6 About 50 percent of -- it was about 12 or 13
7 total acres, half of which was wetland and
8 considered unbuildable, unless you can go secure
9 the permits, which is a huge effort. That was
10 sitting there somewhere between three-quarter and
11 a million dollars for vacant land. That's what
12 they were asking for it, and not willing to come
13 off it.

14 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: With the 70 acres and
15 Grumman not making a decision, there's --

16 MR. WUELLNER: Well, you've got a potential
17 piece there. I mean, that -- that -- you've got a
18 potential large piece of puzzle there, that while,
19 you know, all your best efforts in the Master
20 Plan, you could end up having a little more
21 developable property that doesn't require any of
22 these little, I call them nuisance mitigations,
23 for lack of better terms.

24 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Couldn't we do this --

25 MR. WUELLNER: That's not a real great term

192

1 for it.

2 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Couldn't we, in reviewing
3 all of the alternatives, also show an alternative
4 of Grumman not wanting that 70 acres, which is 40
5 of it that is usable --

6 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Yeah.

7 MR. WUELLNER: Sure, you could.

8 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: -- showing something in
9 there, that this is an alternative but it's not
10 available, it might not ever be available, but
11 this would be -- you know, it could be forecasted
12 to fill the need if it becomes available. If not,
13 then our long-term 20-year plan of across the
14 street solves that.

15 MR. WUELLNER: Uh-huh. You're really not --

16 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I would definitely think
17 that this right here would be the route we'd want
18 to go --

19 MR. CIRIELLO: Didn't we at one time say that
20 that Grumman land that they have that belonged to
21 us that we want might be a future site for a
22 commercial --

23 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Exactly, yeah.

24 MR. CIRIELLO: -- commercial terminal and

25 something? Because if you bring commercial

193

1 aviation in here, if you do, you're going to have
2 to separate them from general aviation.

3 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: And that would be a place
4 to do it.

5 MR. CIRIELLO: And that was where we thought
6 we could put it. So, if you go doing this in a
7 big hurry and use that up, then you're eliminating
8 the chance of bringing in commercial.

9 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: What I was -- what I was
10 suggesting is that this alternative number 2 be
11 used as our primary solution of how we're going to
12 solve our need. For the bigger piece of that
13 need, there is an option that we might solve it
14 with the Grumman stuff after 2007.

15 MR. WUELLNER: I don't even think you need to
16 extend it to laying it out. You just simply
17 designate it as aviation development area.

18 MR. JUFKO: That's exactly what he was doing.

19 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

20 MR. WUELLNER: That'd be the generic. If you
21 need to plat it, develop it, lay it out, do
22 something once you acquire actual --

23 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: And that, if we -- if we
24 leave it that way, that could also leave it up for

25 a commercial terminal --

194

1 MR. JUFKO: Absolutely.

2 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: -- you know, or a corporate
3 anything.

4 MR. WUELLNER: Could be any --

5 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Northrop Grumman did -- to
6 develop it.

7 MR. WUELLNER: Could be used for Grumman.

8 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Right.

9 MR. GORMAN: And, again, it -- it keeps us
10 focused on getting off the tax rolls. Those are
11 revenue-producing; we don't by a gold mine to do
12 it. So --

13 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Absolutely.

14 MR. GORMAN: And we still have the -- an
15 issue of more land available maybe later.

16 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yeah.

17 MR. GORMAN: Okay. It's --

18 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I would -- I would like to
19 think that the direction we'd want to give you,
20 Ed, is that whatever the cost of that land
21 acquisition, you know, and the wetlands, be rolled
22 into the rental rolls of those hangars as opposed
23 to -- our market rate is \$4.50 a foot, but we're
24 trying -- you know, these are going to be at a

25 premium because of the cost, so they've got to go

195

1 for \$5 a foot. It just gives us the ability to

2 recoup that cost.

3 MS. ANDERSEN: Because it's waterfront.

4 MR. CIRIELLO: Ed, could you look back and

5 find out how many hangars we actually had 17 years

6 ago when I moved down here? I think it was

7 practically nothing. Now, I keep hearing Jack and

8 other guys say, build revenue-making hangars, get

9 off the tax rolls.

10 Well, my point is, since 17 years when I came

11 down here, there was practically no hangars on

12 this side of the airport that we owned. Just a

13 few. And then I understand that certain pilots

14 owned their own hangars, and somehow we got them

15 and built our own hangars, and they were just

16 leasing the land.

17 So, my point, in 17 years, I don't know how

18 many hangars -- my other question to you is, how

19 many hangars have we built in 17 years to make

20 money and we're not off the tax rolls? So, Jack,

21 I don't care how many more hangars we build in

22 Araquay Park up here, it will bring revenue in,

23 but it won't get us off the tax roll.

24 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Joe, maybe the other piece

25 of that comment that you're making is, what did it

196

1 cost us to operate the airport 17 years ago and
2 what is it costing us today? I'm assuming that if
3 we've got all these hangars out here, that the
4 cost of operating it 17 years ago was here
5 (indicating) and now we're here (indicating). All
6 we're trying to say is, let's get down to the
7 other side.

8 MR. CIRIELLO: I'm just saying it doesn't
9 matter how many hangars you built, that what
10 you're -- you know, you're using as examples,
11 okay. But building more hangars and making more
12 revenues in the long term, the way this airport's
13 operated by capital improvements, you're always --
14 you know, we're talking about another airport.
15 We're talking about this. We're talking about
16 that. Means spending and borrowed money.

17 This airport, the way it's run, nothing wrong
18 with anybody, there's no crookedness going on,
19 there's no stealing; it's just the way it's run.
20 You can't help it. It's going to be subsidized by
21 taxpayers. You're always going to be paying ad
22 valorem taxes. Mr. Rich was concerned about that.

23 We can only go as high as a half a mill by
24 charter. And what we're paying right now -- I'm

25 paying I think \$11 a year ad valorem taxes to the

197

1 airport. I mean, poor as I am, I can afford that.

2 So, even if we went to the maximum of a half a

3 mill, we're not going to break anybody. I mean,

4 I'd like to get off the tax rolls. But try to use

5 that as an annual -- an analogy to make it seem

6 like, ooh, are we doing a great job. We're never

7 going to get off the tax rolls. Just let's --

8 let's be practical about this. I'm not against

9 building hangars, but it's not going to get us off

10 the tax rolls.

11 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Joe, let -- let me throw

12 out something that I -- I urge you to sit with

13 Donna and Ed and investigate and go into. The

14 Grumman facility on the other side of the runway

15 over there, comes off of their prepaid rent in the

16 year 2007. Theoretically, 2008, we've got a \$400-

17 to \$500,000 of cash coming in because we made that

18 investment 20 years ago. If we don't continue to

19 make these investments, you don't get those

20 windfalls on the other end.

21 MR. CIRIELLO: But things in between keep

22 coming in and coming in. It -- it's not going to

23 get you off the tax rolls. Come on, you're a

24 businessman, a financial man. You ought to know

25 that.

198

1 MR. GORMAN: I'm going to -- I'd like to
2 put -- I'm going to -- to compliment Mr. Wuellner,
3 which is something new for me, and --

4 MR. WUELLNER: I appreciate it.

5 MR. GORMAN: -- and I'm going to ask -- I'm
6 going to ask him that I have heard that you have
7 said it is possible, carefully managed, to come
8 off the tax rolls in five years.

9 MR. WUELLNER: I think that's a fair
10 statement. And we're going to be working through
11 that and are working through that. You are
12 largely -- if you forego a capital development
13 program, you are off the tax rolls currently.

14 MR. CIRIELLO: I moved here --

15 MR. WUELLNER: I can -- I can wrap my efforts
16 up over the next two weeks, present a budget
17 that's exactly what the airport earns and
18 currently has in asset value, and we walk away and
19 continue to operate it in a -- however, it does
20 nothing to improve the ability of the airport to
21 react to the needs of this community, in the first
22 place.

23 Second place, it does absolutely nothing in
24 the event of catastrophic events or the need to

25 repair or replace or maintain any of the capital

199

1 facilities around here.

2 It's just bad decision-making to jump off the
3 tax rolls at the earliest possible date. It takes
4 good sound planning financially to get to a
5 position where it can be self-sustaining, meaning
6 you don't need to go back to the taxpayers to
7 continue to operate and to continue to develop and
8 to continue to maintain this airport.

9 MR. CIRIELLO: I'm not knocking the airport,
10 its staff, or anything else.

11 MR. WUELLNER: I know you're not. I don't
12 mean it.

13 MR. CIRIELLO: I'm just being practical.

14 When I first moved here 17 years ago, the
15 first thing I heard -- and I started Grumman the
16 day after I got here. And I was on this airport
17 six days a week for six years. And I flew from
18 the -- you know, the rental place over there and
19 everything. And the first thing I heard from
20 pilots and Aero Sport, "This airport will --" and
21 guys on this board back then -- "will be
22 self-sustaining in ten years." That was every
23 time the guys campaigned to get election (sic).
24 "We will be self-sustaining and off the tax rolls

25 in ten years."

200

1 It's 17 years now, and we're still not, and
2 you're talking -- you're saying maybe five years;
3 other guys say ten years. And it's just a big
4 vicious circle. And -- and I don't care how you
5 juggle -- you -- you can juggle the figures
6 around -- I'm not saying it's wrong. I mean, but
7 it's a matter of fact. Juggle things around to
8 make it look like, boy, we're breaking even.
9 We're doing this.

10 But when you add up the things, the budget
11 like I do, the daily expenditures against the
12 daily income, the last, oh, four or five budgets
13 I've been doing that, we generally in rough
14 numbers come up about \$225,000 short. We're
15 spending daily now on little things. You know,
16 I'm taking out the taxes. I'm taking out capital
17 improvements. Just daily operating practices.
18 \$225,000, we're spending more than we're making.

19 And I don't mean this -- don't take it the
20 way -- but if you would subtract the staff's
21 payroll, you and Bryan and all the girls and the
22 seven maintenance men and everything, some --
23 this, I'm going back seven or eight years now, but
24 that time was about \$400,000. And we're \$200,000

25 short of being breaking even. If you take and

201

1 eliminate that \$400,000, we'd be \$200,000 in the
2 clear.

3 So, I'm just saying that daily expenses
4 against daily income, we aren't going to break
5 even. We're not going to get off the tax rolls,
6 because we do need capital --

7 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Let's see how we can get
8 off this subject and so we can get back to the
9 workshop. You want to take --

10 MR. CIRIELLO: You guys keep bringing it up.

11 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: No, you want to take
12 another, you know, 30 seconds, one minute to
13 summarize? What do you want us to do to give you
14 the information that will either solidify your
15 feeling that we're never going to get off the tax
16 roll or reverse your feeling and have you feel
17 like we are? What do you want us to do?

18 MR. CIRIELLO: Nothing. I'm not -- I'm not
19 complaining the way things are going. I'm not the
20 one that's saying that we need to get off the tax
21 rolls or we're going to. I'm not saying that.
22 I'm not complaining about the way Staff's running
23 things or anything else. I'm -- and I'm for a lot
24 of this future stuff that we're talking about on

25 this Master Plan.

202

1 But I want to be -- like you, I want to be
2 practical about it. If it's doable, I want to go
3 ahead with it. But if it's pie in the sky moving
4 the highway and the railroad --

5 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Exactly.

6 MR. CIRIELLO: -- forget it.

7 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Right. Well, let's get
8 back to -- okay. We get -- are you in concert
9 with me on Alternative 2, you know, as the initial
10 phase, because that's the least out of our pocket
11 and, you know, is the most doable?

12 MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah, I could buy that.

13 MR. GORMAN: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. So, let's go to
15 Araquay Park now.

16 MR. WUELLNER: All right. That's -- that's
17 your ownership, is the gray.

18 MR. GORMAN: I've got a couple of things I
19 want to ask. Here we go. What's the buffer that
20 you need to build around these people, distance,
21 right now (indicating)? What's the amount of
22 distance right now?

23 MR. WUELLNER: Well, what we -- what we've
24 been able to determine, you need a minimum of

25 30-foot buffer. That includes a six-foot-high

203

1 architecturally approved fence that goes around
2 that facility. And it's got specific landscaping
3 requirements within that buffer.

4 MR. GORMAN: How about this area here
5 (indicating)?

6 MR. WUELLNER: You'll also have to keep --
7 continue to have access to their property.

8 MR. GORMAN: A buffer here (indicating). My
9 contention is --

10 MR. WUELLNER: Anything around the red or
11 white.

12 MR. GORMAN: -- one of the alternatives I am
13 asking for is a plan to just start building,
14 encompassing something that's fairly intelligent
15 so that if this is acquired and this is acquired
16 (indicating), then they can be encompassed into
17 some type of a plan. But -- so that we actually
18 have an alternative plan to start.

19 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. Well, from the
20 beginning --

21 MR. COOPER: You're not picking up on that
22 recorder.

23 MR. WUELLNER: From the beginning, the -- the
24 issue you're wanting to focus on is not the issue

25 that's keeping T-hangars from being developed in

204

1 there. And that -- the issue is really, how do we
2 get aviation access back into the neighborhood?

3 We embarked upon the development of the -- the
4 apron concept, if you will, a couple of years ago
5 with the intent of that providing the access --

6 MR. GORMAN: Ed --

7 MR. WUELLNER: -- aviation access.

8 MR. GORMAN: -- not to be acidic, but I don't
9 want to obscure the issue of there may be a
10 possibility to build around these people initially
11 and immediately.

12 MR. WUELLNER: I don't see how. In order to
13 provide access to that neighborhood, you've got to
14 come in at this point -- if you're going to
15 maximize the use of the existing property you own,
16 you've got to come in around the east end of
17 Araquay Park, something consistent with the
18 intersection of Estrella and Indian Bend.

19 Could I go around that individual lot?
20 Absolutely. But look at the length and width of
21 T-hangars, standard length. You're looking at
22 abandoning all of those road right-of-ways.
23 You've still got a legal obligation to provide
24 access to all those red properties, road access.

25 MR. GORMAN: We're talking about using a

205

1 linear line and we're not talking about -- I'm
2 talking about the possibility of moving the
3 alignment of these roads and actually, you know --

4 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah.

5 MR. GORMAN: -- maximizing the use of the
6 trees, minimizing hopefully the loss of land, but
7 getting going quickly.

8 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Well, I think before --
9 before the County will give us Araquay Avenue
10 there, you know, and shut that whole exit off,
11 we're going to have to have all the property on
12 that road under our control.

13 MS. LOUNGEWAY: And one of the things that
14 will have to happen is you have to get airfield
15 access across Estrella somewhere, or at the corner
16 of Estrella and Indian Bend.

17 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I already own that
18 property. That's coming in right here
19 (indicating).

20 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Right. Right.

21 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: That's a nonissue.

22 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Okay.

23 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. Let me take off what
24 you're saying and go one step -- and take one step

25 further about giving direction to come up with an

206

1 alternative that says, I don't worry about
2 acquiring this right here (indicating), but I only
3 worry about acquiring this in here (indicating)
4 with the long-term plan of, yes, I am going to
5 acquire that, but I don't force these people out
6 now because this whole section in here
7 (indicating) -- not including this (indicating),
8 but this whole section (indicating) will satisfy
9 my growth needs or my needs of the airfield for
10 the next eight years, seven years.

11 By that time, these people will have sold to
12 us or be tired of hearing, you know, noise of
13 airplanes coming in and out of here.

14 MR. WUELLNER: I think you entirely hamstring
15 both the planning and the actual engineering of
16 any of that neighborhood if you do that.

17 If you attempt to accommodate individual
18 landowners back there, you have such a majority
19 interest back there, that it's no longer feasible
20 to allow individual residents to remain in that
21 neighborhood if you're going to viably develop
22 that. You've cut -- you've cut yourself off from
23 revenue potential, which is the whole reason
24 you're back in there, by allowing those -- those

25 folks back in there.

207

1 You're going to limit what the County can
2 approve in terms of -- of developments and
3 buildings and -- and the like in that
4 neighborhood. It's just simply not going to be
5 approved by the County Planning and Zoning.
6 You're going to be allowed to use the property you
7 have. But where it comes close to these things,
8 you're going to see the County balking every time.

9 MR. GORMAN: And what type of a -- of an
10 actual linear distance are you talking about the
11 balk is?

12 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Thirty feet is what he
13 said.

14 MR. WUELLNER: Well, they're going to
15 require -- we just ran across it with our
16 maintenance building. For our use, they were
17 going to require that that six-foot fence, you
18 know, we call it, but it's got basically a block
19 wall. The landscaping, 30 foot wide dimensionally
20 all around it with certain size and caliper of
21 trees, ground covers and scapes that have to be in
22 place that associate with that wall at every one
23 of those locations.

24 You're only going to be able to obscure

25 certain directions on those properties and still

208

1 remain -- have access. You're assuming those
2 landowners will also buy into the fact that you're
3 going to fortress yourself around their properties
4 when it comes time to do those things in front of
5 the Planning and Zoning Commission.

6 MR. GORMAN: The thing is, it's a compromise.
7 I mean, you -- you've got a political firestorm
8 going on here. You've got all kinds of issues
9 going on here. And I'm just afraid this whole
10 thing is going to get mired in litigation and
11 we're not going to move forward.

12 MR. WUELLNER: The process -- I don't know
13 how to make it any clearer. Your attorneys keep
14 making it clear. The process of eminent domain is
15 sure-fire slam dunk simple to do.

16 MR. GORMAN: And what happened with this
17 terminal?

18 MR. BURNETT: Let me answer --

19 MR. WUELLNER: That's a different matter.
20 This is statutorily specific.

21 MR. GORMAN: I wish I believed all of this
22 dialogue. I don't.

23 MR. BURNETT: Let me just --

24 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

25 MR. BURNETT: -- weigh in and say one thing.

209

1 The terminal is a -- is a lawsuit to collect
2 damages and recover damages. That is completely
3 different than a government entity exercising its
4 right to condemn property and take property. It's
5 a different exercise. You don't have a right to a
6 certain -- you don't necessarily have a right to a
7 certain dollar amount. You have to prove a dollar
8 amount in a lawsuit for damages. You have a right
9 to take property.

10 MR. CIRIELLO: Because you have a right to do
11 it doesn't mean it's right.

12 MR. WUELLNER: It's a different matter.

13 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

14 MR. CIRIELLO: It is not.

15 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Ed, you're saying that the
16 idea that I just laid off of taking Indian Bend
17 and keeping that as a viable road and only going
18 into Araquay Park and the -- and the other section
19 is just -- totally hamstrings us for --

20 MR. WUELLNER: I think it -- it precludes any
21 meaningful development back there, other than
22 adding maybe a couple of T-hangar units
23 assuming --

24 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. Precluding -- I

25 think you were saying it -- it precludes an

210

1 optimum or an efficient development of it.

2 MR. WUELLNER: A financially feasible
3 development back there. When you factor in what
4 it costs to build, the acquisition of property,
5 the development of the apron that surrounds it,
6 the core infrastructure that's got to be put in
7 place back there, along with any capital
8 development in terms of buildings to develop
9 revenue off of, that's -- that's a huge nut.

10 MR. BURNETT: You're also talking about going
11 through the vacation process twice to get the
12 County to vacate the roads. If you only do part
13 of it now and you come back again later to do a
14 road vacation, you're talking about going through
15 that County process twice. And it's --

16 MR. WUELLNER: And you can literally -- once
17 you acquire these red properties, eminent domain,
18 you literally can vacate all the roads east of
19 Casa Cola. They're no longer county right-of-way.
20 They're no longer county roads. It's simply a
21 part of --

22 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: How long does the process
23 of vacating roads take? Is it --

24 MR. WUELLNER: It's like a --

25 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Somebody used the term --

211

1 MR. WUELLNER: -- zoning issue.

2 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: It's a what?

3 MR. WUELLNER: A zoning issue. Probably 60
4 days.

5 MR. GORMAN: This is assuming none of the
6 residents --

7 MR. WUELLNER: It's a fairly straightforward
8 administrative process with the County.

9 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. You -- you see where
10 the properties are. Can we get back to one of the
11 alternatives? Bring up Alternative A to this.

12 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Ed, can we change the source?

13 MR. GORMAN: I wish we could overlay them,
14 actually overlay a transparency.

15 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Well, we're not, so...

16 MR. GORMAN: I know. I wish we could.

17 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

18 MS. LOUNGEWAY: I think Casa Cola goes --

19 MR. WUELLNER: You can see the road coming
20 into the bottom (indicating) --

21 MR. JUFKO: You can see the roads --

22 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Yeah.

23 MR. WUELLNER: It's about where the green
24 hangar is.

25 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Right here (indicating).

212

1 This here is Casa Cola (indicating), right?

2 MR. WUELLNER: Yes.

3 MS. LOUNGEWAY: Yes. This is Casa Cola. And
4 this is Indian Bend under here (indicating).

5 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. Is this the water
6 line, or is this the water line (indicating) and
7 that's --

8 MS. LOUNGEWAY: This is the water line
9 (indicating). And these are box hangars
10 (indicating).

11 MR. WUELLNER: That's a road next to it.

12 MS. LOUNGEWAY: And this is road and parking
13 (indicating).

14 MR. WUELLNER: And the brown stripe kind of
15 looking thing along there is the edge of the
16 wetland.

17 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. Ed --

18 MR. WUELLNER: See, one thing this doesn't --

19 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: -- what you're saying is,
20 coming in here (indicating) -- bear with me -- and
21 doing this piece -- let's say we were trying to
22 get 48 hangars as our initial stage. That gives
23 us a 40 -- 60 percent fallout of our list.

24 If we -- if we came in and cut that across

25 here (indicating) down and gave us -- wouldn't

213

1 that give us the 48 hangars and still give you all
2 of the ramp space and still give you all of that,
3 but still leave these five property owners here
4 (indicating)?

5 I realize what you're saying is, Wayne,
6 you're just going to postpone the aggravation.
7 But am I going to postpone the aggravation --
8 based on the need in the forecast, am I going to
9 postpone it eight years, ten years, twelve years?
10 Then it's no aggravation, because that property
11 will eventually -- it's my guess it will come to
12 us. You don't think it's worth asking them to do
13 an alternative, you know, to see what we can put
14 in there.

15 MR. WUELLNER: My opinion, you stay the
16 course -- and you're asking for my professional
17 opinion.

18 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I am.

19 MR. WUELLNER: And my professional opinion is
20 you stay the course you charted last October when
21 you began the wholesale acquisition of the balance
22 of the property. You open up all viable
23 alternatives as a result of that and you move
24 forward.

25 There's -- there's -- these people know this

214

1 is coming. They for the most part have already
2 accepted the fact that this is a done deal. It's
3 just a matter of walking through the balance of
4 the proceedings.

5 I mean, I'm sorry it's a noisy, you know,
6 contentious issue, and it is. And it's not a fun
7 issue. But we've -- the Authority did this same
8 stuff three years ago: Got to this point, got
9 cold feet, ran away. The fact is you're three,
10 four, five years behind in your development plan
11 in being able to respond to T-hangars because of
12 that inaction.

13 MR. CIRIELLO: You say they got cold feet and
14 ran away --

15 MR. WUELLNER: They looked at the price tag
16 and ran running.

17 MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah, I understand what you're
18 saying, but maybe they just had a little bit of
19 compassion. You're putting it a little hard, Ed.

20 MR. WUELLNER: No. If you recall the
21 discussion, it was entirely monetary. Guys like
22 Charlie Lassiter looked at the bottom line and
23 said why would I spend a million dollars on a home
24 and dig a hole?

25 MR. CIRIELLO: Oh, I was -- I made that point

215

1 myself because of the retention pond.

2 MR. WUELLNER: That's dollars and cents.

3 MR. CIRIELLO: And it wasn't monetary. Only
4 with me, it wasn't. It was disposing peoples out
5 of their homes.

6 MR. GORMAN: And no offense, my only
7 contention is, is that -- and no offense to Doug,
8 whom I think tries hard here, but you are assuming
9 that there will be no flaws in this eminent
10 domain.

11 MR. WUELLNER: This is one of the few
12 amazingly simple processes.

13 MR. GORMAN: You're also assuming that the
14 political fallout that's going to come from that
15 won't come from some other direction.

16 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Now, the political is
17 not -- that's not Ed's problem. That's our
18 problem.

19 MR. GORMAN: Well --

20 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: You started to say
21 something, Doug?

22 MR. BURNETT: Just one quick example. When
23 was the last time you heard DOT stopping building
24 a road because they couldn't effectively condemn a

25 piece of property to continue building the road or

216

1 the overpass or the intersection or -- or the
2 like? It just -- it's a different type of
3 litigation, although I have respect for what
4 you're saying.

5 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yes, it is.

6 MR. BURNETT: It is a different -- it's a
7 different type of litigation.

8 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Right. You're absolutely
9 correct.

10 MR. CIRIELLO: They're no more
11 compassionate --

12 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: And -- and I'll bet you
13 that --

14 MR. CIRIELLO: -- than we are. That's all
15 you're saying.

16 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: -- you know, that an
17 individual with a face on it with a telephone
18 number cannot be found in that DOT for somebody to
19 aggravate.

20 I would like to see an alternative -- the
21 board's got to vote on this, not me. But I would
22 like to see an alternative developed that only
23 goes into it as I have outlined it right there,
24 and that way, it will be a full discussion before

25 the whole board. Doug?

217

1 MR. BURNETT: The only one comment that I
2 would raise is the property that is on the far
3 northeast on the marsh, for a couple of reasons,
4 may cause you problems for vacating -- is it
5 Araquay Avenue that goes through the middle?

6 MR. WUELLNER: Yes.

7 MR. BURNETT: It may cause you a problem in
8 being able to vacate Araquay Avenue.

9 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: You have to identify that
10 property. But, you know, we've all -- we've all
11 seen four red splotches that are inside that
12 corridor. And if there's a problem with another
13 red splotch because of an easement, you have to
14 identify that to me. But -- and at the same time,
15 I need to know from -- from you, Phil, what are my
16 next five- and ten-year demands on those type of
17 things?

18 MR. WUELLNER: Let me throw two other things
19 out there, because I -- we've never really touched
20 on them here. But you've got two other potential
21 financial nightmares related to not wrapping it up
22 and doing it.

23 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

24 MR. WUELLNER: You know, you're -- you're

25 absolutely correct in that you could put a buffer

218

1 around these homes or whatever you want to call it
2 and effectively do this. However, you're still
3 fully and totally exposed to nuisance lawsuits
4 from all of those property owners for excessive
5 noise, vibration, and anything else that happens
6 on the adjacent land use, by not owning it. You
7 don't walk away from that liability potential
8 for -- for being a nuisance.

9 The other is, if you build around them and
10 allow this to happen, they can come through the
11 back door and accuse you of adverse condemnation
12 for these properties and actually recover not only
13 the value of their properties, but any damages
14 that they can -- that they can establish in court.

15 They can actually make you take the property,
16 and then the court's establishing a value that's
17 way in excess of how you do it through eminent
18 domain because you failed to do what you should
19 have done as a public body. So, you -- you have
20 two other -- I mean, let him comment on it.
21 They're out there.

22 MR. BURNETT: I wasn't getting --

23 MS. ANDERSEN: And I'll add one more.

24 MR. BURNETT: I wasn't getting into too much

25 detail, but that is why, if you don't take the far

219

1 northeast property, vacating -- the County may not
2 vacate Araquay Avenue for that reason, because
3 Araquay Avenue is a straight shot into that
4 property. And that's presumably the -- the road
5 they use when they leave their home and go to and
6 from.

7 MR. GORMAN: Things can be negotiated at
8 times.

9 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: As we talked about
10 alternatives, you know, once we define the
11 alternatives, we define the exposure. So, we just
12 defined another exposure. But I -- I would like
13 to see that -- that alternative. How would you
14 feel about it?

15 MR. GORMAN: I think that it's -- as a board
16 and as responsible to the public, we have to
17 discuss that alternative. Even though we don't
18 like it or we don't think it's financially proper,
19 it's got to be discussed.

20 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Joe?

21 MR. CIRIELLO: Well, I've said it before; it
22 wouldn't be easy, but it would be doable, to just
23 stop -- we haven't built a thing. We haven't
24 moved in there, other than the maintenance hangar.

25 But we haven't, you know, taken anybody's homes

220

1 that didn't want taken and everything. And just
2 stop right now and then work out -- now, Ed told
3 me one a while back, I think Ed, that if we did do
4 what I'm saying, sell everything, that you have to
5 give, what, the State back a lot more money than
6 they gave us to start with or -- it wouldn't be an
7 easy process. But -- it is doable, but it
8 wouldn't be easy. That's -- that's the only thing
9 that will satisfy me, to stop this all together.

10 So, you only have four people in there --

11 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Well, that's why we need to
12 bring that up at the next meeting when all the
13 board -- because we don't make decisions, you
14 know, right here.

15 MR. CIRIELLO: Oh, I know we're not making a
16 decision. But you asked for my opinion, and
17 that's what my opinion is. Just stop and -- and
18 say we're not going to do this. We're not going
19 to -- you know, and figure out how to get out of
20 it.

21 Just because some board years ago started
22 this snowball down the hill doesn't mean that we
23 have to continue it. And as a matter of fact, I
24 think back 15 years ago when the first properties

25 were bought in here, I don't think any board

221

1 member or any staff member at that particular time
2 envisioned that some day they're going to own all
3 them just because they want to put hangars in. I
4 think people come in here and wanted to sell their
5 homes for whatever reason, and the board said,
6 okay, we'll buy them, you know --

7 MR. WUELLNER: No --

8 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: What alternative would you
9 like to see them present to take care of the need
10 that they've already defined? If we don't -- if
11 we stop Araquay Park and give all of the property
12 back and all the money and everything, what
13 alternative to satisfy need? Because you're an
14 elected official to take care of the needs of St.
15 Johns County and its aviation needs. And we paid
16 them good money to come up with what those needs
17 are.

18 I guess my point is, I understand what you're
19 saying, but we -- we've got something in front of
20 us that wasn't taken care of three years ago, and
21 we've got to have an alternative, rather than,
22 "I'm not going to vote for this."

23 MR. CIRIELLO: All right.

24 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: So, what's the alternative?

25 MR. CIRIELLO: Go ahead, wait three more

222

1 years and get that Grumman property over there and
2 put all of this stuff here you want over there.

3 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: That's an alternative.

4 MR. CIRIELLO: You've got room enough to put
5 a hundred hangars in over there and still have
6 room for something else. You know, I mean, it
7 doesn't mean it has to be in this area. We can
8 put it over there.

9 And this area here that you're talking about,
10 the corporate hangars, that will bring in a lot
11 more money than little T-hangars. We could be
12 doing that for the next couple of years until we
13 get that land away from Grumman.

14 As a matter of fact, if we can take people's
15 property off of them by eminent domain, why can't
16 these guys think up some way of getting Grumman to
17 release our property that we own in the first
18 place back to us?

19 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Grumman -- Grumman has
20 already offered to let us do that.

21 MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah, under a special deal.
22 They want two or three years of free rent. That's
23 a couple of hundred thousand dollars.

24 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Four years -- four years of

25 free rent at a half a million a year, roughly.

223

1 So, that's a \$2 million cost, you know.

2 MR. CIRIELLO: So, I'd rather wait and get it
3 all and, you know -- because we can do other
4 things for the next two of three years to be
5 helping ourselves waiting for that.

6 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: All right.

7 MR. CIRIELLO: We could be working in another
8 area while we're waiting for this area. I mean,
9 they're just opinions. I mean, you know --

10 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I realize. But I don't
11 know where you're going to work, Joe; there's no
12 land left.

13 MR. CIRIELLO: Here (indicating). You're not
14 going to build these overnight.

15 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: So, you're saying that with
16 all the demand that we have, a hundred and plus
17 people on the waiting list for T-hangars, that our
18 solution is, you guys sit there for another three
19 years; we're going to build twelve corporate
20 hangars.

21 MR. WUELLNER: More like five years.

22 MR. CIRIELLO: That waiting list --

23 MR. WUELLNER: It's three till you can get
24 the property.

25 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yeah.

224

1 MR. CIRIELLO: That waiting list, I
2 understand. But I've known from past experience
3 up in Beaver County, they had a waiting list for X
4 number of people. They went ahead and built a
5 whole bunch of hangars. Less than half the people
6 that was on that waiting list wanted them. A lot
7 of people just, knew, oh, we're putting out a
8 hangar list. They went up and put their name on
9 it and they had no intentions at the time they did
10 it to get a hangar. They just did it.

11 So, all of these hundred and some people
12 you're thinking about, if you provided hangars for
13 them, half of them are going to not want them now.

14 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: We're saying 60 percent --
15 we're saying 60 percent's not going to want them.

16 MR. CIRIELLO: Well, so --

17 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: So, we're in sync with you.

18 Okay. Let me see if I can wrap this up. I'd
19 like to see an alternative, you know, of going
20 into Araquay Park in the immediate five- to
21 eight-year time -- or you tell me when the need
22 says that I have outstripped my capacity in that
23 area, you know, going like that, and then put all
24 the plusses and minuses, you know, down on it and

25 let the whole board vote which way they want to

225

1 go.

2 And -- and the risk of lawsuits, you know,
3 that's the one thing that's -- you know, that's --
4 that I've heard that makes me say, yeah, bite the
5 bullet. Sooner or later, you've got to do it.

6 But I'd like to see, you know, what we can do in
7 there just going with that far right now.

8 MR. GORMAN: I agree.

9 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Agree with that?

10 MR. WUELLNER: Is that under the assumption
11 you're not -- you won't acquire any of the
12 red-shaded property?

13 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: No. Anything that's within
14 that Indian Bend --

15 MS. LOUNGEWAY: So you'd get those five red
16 properties.

17 MR. JUFKO: So, at some point in the future,
18 we could --

19 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Right.

20 MR. JUFKO: -- still talk about this other --

21 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I'm saying that we continue
22 with the -- with the proceedings to acquire this
23 (indicating) legally or whatever. If you're
24 telling me that I've got a problem right here

25 (indicating) in coming around, then I'm going to

226

1 have to include that one, too.

2 MR. BURNETT: And -- and the reason is that
3 you may not get Araquay Avenue vacated.

4 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. All right. I
5 understand that. And I've got to have Araquay
6 Avenue --

7 MR. GORMAN: And what --

8 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: -- vacated.

9 MR. GORMAN: And what governing body will
10 dictate the vacation?

11 MR. WUELLNER: The County.

12 MR. GORMAN: And they are negotiable at
13 times.

14 MR. BURNETT: Sure. But they -- they -- my
15 experience has been that they will not vacate a
16 property like that or they will be extremely
17 reluctant to, more so than any other case, when
18 they have a property at the end that it would
19 appear clearly drives to it down -- to and from
20 Araquay Avenue.

21 The property farther to the south, it's much
22 more -- it's much more difficult for them to make
23 the argument that they go up to go around Araquay
24 Avenue to go -- to go to and from their home,

25 rather than just drive Indian Bend. But the one

227

1 property, the farthest right, it would appear that
2 they would go down Araquay Avenue.

3 MR. GORMAN: But that's a discussible
4 opinion.

5 MR. COOPER: Let me say something about that
6 opinion, though.

7 MR. GORMAN: Go ahead.

8 MR. COOPER: There's been three of those
9 property owners that have talked to me and said
10 that they would file a lawsuit against the County
11 to vacate any of those streets, because as it
12 stands now, they have a minimum of two ways in and
13 out of their property. And if we took and vacated
14 just Estrella Avenue and Araquay, and less -- just
15 left Indian Bend, that now they only have one way
16 in and one way out, which they've got a real
17 problem with, which backs up what Ed says; you
18 take it all or none.

19 MR. GORMAN: And that's a -- that's a point.
20 But again, you see the reason this has to be
21 discussible issues. It just has to be. But
22 that's another point. That's fine.

23 MR. BURNETT: And -- and --

24 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: I think Staff should get in

25 touch with the County and see how they feel about

228

1 that.

2 MR. BURNETT: Well, you -- you have a -- a
3 conservative County Attorney's office that keeps
4 the County out of trouble a lot of the times.

5 And -- and because of that, the County Attorney
6 over there will give them conservative advice
7 related to this, because he has in the past. And
8 that's why I've -- in particular, Araquay Avenue
9 on that far right property stood out to me.

10 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Doug, do we have the
11 possibility --

12 MR. GORMAN: I understand.

13 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: -- of limiting our risk
14 from future lawsuits of these property owners by
15 presenting them with, hey, we want -- we need all
16 of it, we're going to need it in the next eight
17 years, but we are willing to do the initial here
18 so that you can keep your property for another
19 eight years, provided you sign a release that
20 you're not going to sue us for this, you're not
21 going to sue us for this, you're not going to sue
22 us for that? Can that be done?

23 MR. BURNETT: That is a possibility, yes.

24 MR. GORMAN: Again, negotiating.

25 MR. BURNETT: Uh-huh.

229

1 MR. GORMAN: Okay.

2 MR. BURNETT: That release would have to
3 cover the County, though, on the vacation --

4 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Absolutely.

5 MR. BURNETT: -- because we're not going to
6 get their cooperation if -- or -- they're less
7 likely to get their cooperation, because if they
8 vacate the roads, it's not just that the Airport
9 may get sued; it's that the County would get added
10 as a party.

11 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: But the whole point of
12 having this discussion is so it brings all of this
13 to light so that the public understands what we're
14 having to go through in making this decision, and
15 the more things like this that comes up, if the
16 answer is, we're just not going to take it all, I
17 think that this board's willing to stand up to
18 that. But we need the ammunition to at least
19 analyze it.

20 MR. GORMAN: Exactly. The public needs to be
21 aware of the evolution necessary so that the
22 public understands that the board is being
23 responsible to the public at large.

24 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. Is there anything

25 else that -- excuse me. Phil, is there anything

230

1 that you were hoping to get accomplished out of
2 this meeting that has not been accomplished? No,
3 you're not getting a raise.

4 MR. JUFKO: Is that the only direction you
5 want to give us in terms of Araquay Park?

6 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: What direction are you
7 looking for?

8 MR. JUFKO: Well, if something just didn't
9 sit right with you. I mean, we can talk about
10 anything. I mean, obviously you hit on a very
11 important issue, and -- and I understand why you
12 went -- you went that way, but if there is
13 something between the three alternatives and there
14 was something that you just --

15 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Let's quickly go through
16 them again and --

17 MR. JUFKO: -- didn't rest -- rest with
18 you -- well with you --

19 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: All right. David? You had
20 some comments to make?

21 MR. KNIGHT: In regards to noise complaints.
22 In regards to noise complaints, I would like to
23 see an additional alternative that's not listed.
24 If you plan on going towards Araquay Park, I would

25 like to see that as small aircraft hangars, okay?

231

1 If you're looking for another FBO that --
2 that entertains larger, louder aircraft, I would
3 recommend that you look towards the area of the
4 PGA hangar, where that's located, for a potential
5 FBO. It's more centrally located for the runways
6 in how it's set up. That's my comment.

7 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. John?

8 MR. RODERICK: Yes. The observation general
9 purpose building, community, there was one
10 alternative where it was near Highway 1. I much
11 favor out by the -- near the hangar, by the tower.

12 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: That gives them a better
13 view of airplanes.

14 MR. RODERICK: Exactly. You want to be
15 closer to the action.

16 MR. BURNETT: I just recall earlier y'all
17 were talking about an Alternative 3, that it got
18 tight for the access.

19 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Well, I think that if
20 you -- when we were talking about Alternative 3,
21 it was with what we just got through discussing in
22 mind, and that was to limit the acquisition back
23 in here and trying it here (indicating).

24 Ed brought up a point that if that's the way

25 you're going to go, you run that taxiway down here

232

1 (indicating). And that gives you the ability to

2 have some crossing-over problems, but...

3 MR. JUFKO: Just to let you know, in -- and

4 in interest and in response to -- to your request,

5 we may very well take Alternative 3 and rework 3

6 to meet that. I'm not -- so, we aren't throwing

7 so many alternatives out there. And it will still

8 give us a fresh look at some different

9 perspectives.

10 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Well, I've got -- I had

11 another thing that I just thought of, too. All of

12 your alternatives are showing you going 20 years

13 down the road for the Casa -- Casa Cola west. You

14 know, maybe another one that -- that depicts, you

15 know, the five, ten year, fifteen year, that shows

16 us not using the stuff from U.S. 1 back to Casa

17 Cola.

18 MR. JUFKO: Well, remember, we're showing you

19 alternatives that include the entire planning

20 period. We realize that portions of this are

21 going to be built in that short term that

22 you're -- you're really focussing on. But we --

23 we do, for this portion of -- of our analysis, we

24 look at the 20-year period.

25 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. My -- my point was

233

1 that if the board has already said, you know,
2 money-wise or whatever-wise, we are not going to
3 go west of Casa Cola at the present time, then you
4 need to put that in your long-term thinking that
5 says, maybe this is better to shift all of these
6 T-hangars down to Casa Cola and wind up with a
7 bigger area up here (indicating).

8 MR. JUFKO: In that type of alternative.

9 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Yeah.

10 MR. JUFKO: Well, another way -- another way
11 of looking at it also is that's why we have a
12 couple of different alternatives that show
13 development on one end versus another that I think
14 might give you some options.

15 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay.

16 MR. GORMAN: One silly thing I'm going to
17 interject really quickly. I was just flying an
18 amphibious seaplane. And maybe Dave can help me.
19 How are you going to get to the seaplane flight
20 school? Are you going to land and go over the --
21 I don't get it. Are you going to land on that
22 little bitty creek?

23 MR. JUFKO: You would continue to land --

24 MS. LOUNGEWAY: In the river.

25 MR. JUFKO: -- where they land now.

234

1 MS. LOUNGEWAY: In the waterway.

2 MR. JUFKO: Yeah, Bryan, I'd like you to talk
3 to him.

4 MR. RODERICK: There's a canal around that.

5 MR. COOPER: Jack, I think one of the options
6 that's being discussed is possibly relocating --
7 possibly relocating where the seaplane ramp's
8 at -- possibly relocating where the seaplane
9 ramp's at, so you would be -- you would have
10 automobile access to it. We're trying to find a
11 way to do that.

12 MR. GORMAN: And you'd be -- you would be
13 taxiing a seaplane down those convoluted creeks?

14 MR. COOPER: We don't know yet.

15 MR. GORMAN: Okay. That's what -- I'll just
16 leave it like that. Fine. That's fine. I'll
17 leave it alone.

18 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: Okay. Any other points
19 that need to be discussed? Anybody want to make
20 any final comments? Joe? Jack? Then this
21 work -- Ed?

22 (No further comments.)

23 CHAIRMAN GEORGE: This workshop has ended.

24 (End of workshop.)

1 REPORTER'S 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 19th day of June, 2004.

13

14

JANET M. BEASON, RPR-CP, RMR, CRR
Notary Public - State of Florida
My Commission No.: DD102224
Expires: April 30, 2006

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

