

Page 1

[1] ST. AUGUSTINE - ST. JOHNS COUNTY AIRPORT AUTHORITY

[2] Regular Meeting

[3] held at 4796 U.S. 1 North

[4] St. Augustine, Florida

[5] on Monday, April 16, 2001

[6] from 4:00 p.m. to 6:06 p.m.

[7] *****

[8] BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

[9] WILLIAM "BILL" ROSE, Chairman

[10] CHARLES LASSITER

[10] DENNIS R. WATTS, Secretary-Treasurer

[11] JOSEPH CIRIELLO

[11] JIM BRYANT, County Commissioner/Airport Liaison

[12] *****

[13] BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:

[14] BARBARA BOSANKO (Leave of absence)

[15] *****

[16] ALSO PRESENT:

[17] CINDY BARTIN, Esquire, Rogers, Towers, Bailey,

[18] Jones & Gay, P.A., 170 Malaga Street, St. Augustine,

[18] FL, 32084, Attorney for Airport Authority.

[19] EDWARD WUELLNER, A.A.E., Executive Director.

[20] BRYAN COOPER, Assistant Airport Director.

[21] *****

[22] St. Augustine Court Reporters

[23] 1510 N. Ponce de Leon Blvd., Suite A

[23] St. Augustine, FL 32084

[24] (904) 825-0570

[25]

Page 2

I N D E X	PAGE
[2] 2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	3
[4] 3. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES	3
[5] 4. ACCEPTANCE OF FINANCIAL REPORTS	3
[6] 5. ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING AGENDA	4
[7] 6. REPORTS:	
[8] A. Mr. Jim Bryant - County Commissioner	4
[9] B. Mr. Tracine Anderson - Aero Sport, Inc.	4
[9] C. Mr. John Leslie - Grumman St. Augustine	4
[10] D. Mr. Robert Fleming - S.A.P.A.	4
[10] E. Ms. Cindy Bartin - Attorney	5
[11] 7. ACTION ITEMS	
[12] A. South Hangar Area Appraisals-Purchase Offers	6
[13] B. Resolution 2001-02	24
[13] C. Resolution 2001-03	35
[14] D. Resolution 2001-04	37
[14] E. Resolution 2001-05	41
[15] F. Resolution 2001-06	44
[15] G. Bid Award - Clearing & Grubbing Contract	47
[16] H. Self-Fueling Update/ Second FBO	51
[16] I. Services Access to the Airfield	92
[17] J. Regency Aviation Use Modification	98
[18] 8. AUTHORITY MEMBER REPORTS:	
[19] A. Mr. William "Bill" Rose	102
[19] B. Mr. Dennis R. Watts	102
[20] C. Mr. Charles Lassiter	104
[20] D. Mr. Joseph Ciriello	106
[21] 9. PUBLIC COMMENT	114
[22] 10. ADJOURNMENT	118
[23]	
[24]	
[25]	

Page 3

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

[2] CHAIRMAN ROSE: It's 4 o'clock and we have a

[3] quorum present, and I'll call this meeting of the

[4] St. Augustine-St. Johns County Airport Authority

[5] meeting to order. Begin with the pledge to the

[6] flag.

[7] (Pledge of Allegiance)

[8] APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

[9] CHAIRMAN ROSE: And let's see. The minutes

[10] of the last meeting, they're in your package. Is

[11] there any comment or addition or correction to

[12] the minutes?

[13] (No additions or corrections.)

[14] CHAIRMAN ROSE: If not, they'll stand

[15] approved then as they were distributed. And ask

[16] our treasurer to give us the financial report.

[17] ACCEPTANCE OF FINANCIAL REPORTS

[18] MR. WATTS: Mr. Chairman, at this time, the

[19] financials are not ready. This is -- quote, this

[20] is tax time, so hopefully we'll have -- have them

[21] available next month at the next board meeting.

[22] CHAIRMAN ROSE: So, we'll pick it up next

[23] time.

[24] MR. WATTS: Yes, sir.

[25] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Very good.

Page 4

[1] APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

[2] CHAIRMAN ROSE: You have the agenda. Are

[3] there any additions or corrections to the agenda?

[4] (No additions or corrections to the Agenda.)

[5] CHAIRMAN ROSE: It stands approved then as

[6] it was distributed. And the County Commissioner,

[7] Mr. Jim Bryant, you're number one on the list.

[8] 6.A. - COMMISSIONER BRYANT

[9] MR. BRYANT: Okay. No report, sir.

[10] CHAIRMAN ROSE: All right. Aero Sport, who

[11] is here with Aero Sport?

[12] 6.B. - AERO SPORT

[13] MS. ANDERSON: Oh, I'm sorry. Michael's not

[14] here today, but we have nothing.

[15] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Nothing?

[16] MS. ANDERSON: Thank you.

[17] CHAIRMAN ROSE: All right. And let's see.

[18] John Leslie.

[19] 6.C. - NORTHROP GRUMMAN

[20] MR. LESLIE: No report, sir.

[21] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Nothing. The Pilots

[22] Association?

[23] 6.D. - S.A.P.A.

[24] MR. FLEMING: Nothing at this time, thank

[25] you.

Page 5

[1] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Nothing. And looks like
[2] it's Cindy.

[3] 6.E. - AIRPORT ATTORNEY

[4] MS. BARTIN: The only thing that I have to
[5] report is just an update on the Bosanko appeal.

[6] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Oh, yeah.

[7] MS. BARTIN: I think y'all are interested in
[8] that. The answer brief was filed -- was due
[9] today. It was filed last week. Oral argument
[10] has been requested. The Court may or may not at
[11] their discretion grant oral argument in this
[12] matter. We should be hearing from them.

[13] There will be no reply brief from the other
[14] side, so that is the final briefing that was
[15] filed last week. So, we should be hearing
[16] something as far as a decision or a scheduling of
[17] oral argument soon from the Court. And we'll
[18] keep you posted. A copy of the answer brief that
[19] we filed is with Ed. Ed was delivered a copy of
[20] it.

[21] CHAIRMAN ROSE: So, this is about on the
[22] schedule that -- that y'all anticipated.

[23] MS. BARTIN: I think it's running basically
[24] the course that was predicted. Okay? That's all
[25] I have.

Page 7

[1] that -- that is before us --

[2] MR. ARNOLD: Yes, sir.

[3] CHAIRMAN ROSE: -- will authorize contact
[4] with these property owners to discuss the
[5] purchase of that property.

[6] MR. ARNOLD: That is correct.

[7] CHAIRMAN ROSE: And condemnation procedures
[8] would not begin until 30 days -- if they refused
[9] that offer, there's a 30-day waiting period; is
[10] that what you --

[11] MR. ARNOLD: Once we have made the written
[12] offer under Section 73.015, Florida Statutes, we
[13] have to make -- wait 30 days till upon receipt of
[14] that offer before we can institute condemnation
[15] proceedings.

[16] Of course, that would be taken on a
[17] case-by-case basis. If we feel like we're in the
[18] process of being able to negotiate a sale, we
[19] would hold off on filing those proceedings unless
[20] we were told that it jeopardizes some sort of
[21] time schedules that the Airport Authority might
[22] have for the use or the utilization of that land.

[23] CHAIRMAN ROSE: All right. Who -- who will
[24] contact these property owners?

[25] MR. ARNOLD: Our office will contact them.

Page 6

[1] CHAIRMAN ROSE: All right. Okay. Our
[2] action items. Mr. Wuellner, do you want to start
[3] us off?

[4] 7.A. - SOUTH HANGAR AREA APPRAISALS

[5] MR. WUELLNER: Yes. There's not much I have
[6] for this. This is basically a -- our -- one of
[7] our attorney items. Mr. Mark Arnold, which has
[8] been before this board before, has prepared a
[9] resolution, and I'm sure is prepared to answer
[10] any questions related to this matter. Mark?

[11] MR. ARNOLD: Good afternoon. Questions?
[12] You have before you a resolution that authorizes
[13] us to employ the power of eminent domain, which
[14] rests with the Authority, to acquire five parcels
[15] of land. The appraisals have been completed.

[16] We would not institute and cannot institute
[17] condemnation proceedings until written offers
[18] have been made to the owners based upon the
[19] appraisals, which Mr. Wuellner has in his office.
[20] And you have to wait at least 30 days after those
[21] written offers are made.

[22] We will attempt to negotiate with the owners
[23] prior to instituting any formal condemnation
[24] proceedings for the properties.

[25] CHAIRMAN ROSE: All right. This resolution

Page 8

[1] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Someone on your staff.

[2] MR. ARNOLD: Yes, sir.

[3] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Okay. Is there any public
[4] comment?

[5] (No public comment.)

[6] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Any board questions?

[7] MR. LASSITER: I have one, Mr. Chairman.
[8] Mark, once we vote on it today, and if we do give
[9] you approval, there will not be -- it will not
[10] come back to us as a board again; is that
[11] correct?

[12] MR. ARNOLD: That is correct, unless it came
[13] in closed-door session for an approval of a
[14] negotiated sale which Mr. Wuellner felt like
[15] should come back before the Board.

[16] MR. LASSITER: Okay. In other words, if the
[17] landowners decide to sell, then it would come
[18] back here if the prices are different than the
[19] appraised --

[20] MR. ARNOLD: If that's -- if that is the
[21] direction you give the Executive Director, yes,
[22] sir.

[23] MR. LASSITER: My next question is, is that
[24] in your Exhibit A, there are five parcels. On
[25] these parcels, is this a "take it all or leave

Page 9

[1] it," or can we go through and request certain
 [2] parcels be excluded and certain parcels be
 [3] included in this condemnation process?
 [4] MR. ARNOLD: As a board, you can instruct me
 [5] which pieces of property you want to acquire or
 [6] which pieces you do not want me to acquire. I
 [7] have included five parcels that I was instructed
 [8] to have appraised and to include in the
 [9] resolution. So, it is a parcel-by-parcel
 [10] determination. We have listed all five that we
 [11] have obtained title on and appraisals on.
 [12] MR. LASSITER: Okay.
 [13] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Any other questions?
 [14] MR. CIRIELLO: I do, Mr. Chairman. What
 [15] are -- what -- either you or whoever is looking
 [16] for in this agenda item tonight right now?
 [17] MR. ARNOLD: Approval --
 [18] MR. CIRIELLO: What direction are you
 [19] looking for?
 [20] MR. ARNOLD: Approval of the resolution to
 [21] begin negotiations, and if necessary, institute
 [22] eminent domain proceedings to acquire the
 [23] property.
 [24] MR. CIRIELLO: Well, personally, I feel this
 [25] whole thing has been done kind of shoddy. Right

Page 11

[1] talk to these people about the price. And they
 [2] may, like I said, all say yes, but I'm not
 [3] willing to give you the part of eminent domain
 [4] tonight. That's my feeling.
 [5] CHAIRMAN ROSE: I -- I think there's a
 [6] misunderstanding. We haven't been in a position
 [7] to offer anybody a price for their property until
 [8] this board has approved the appraisal. Am I
 [9] correct?
 [10] MR. ARNOLD: Until you've enacted a
 [11] resolution authorizing us --
 [12] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Right. Right.
 [13] MR. ARNOLD: -- there is nothing that could
 [14] be done.
 [15] CHAIRMAN ROSE: So -- so, as -- as
 [16] Mr. Ciriello is concerned that we have not had --
 [17] the property owners have not been told -- or have
 [18] not had an opportunity to negotiate with the --
 [19] with the Authority, it's been impossible to do
 [20] that, because we haven't had the resolution
 [21] authorizing these appraisals, approving the
 [22] appraisals.
 [23] MR. ARNOLD: If I may, let me point out one
 [24] thing to Mr. Ciriello. Mr. Ciriello, the law has
 [25] recently changed in the July 1998 legislative

Page 10

[1] now, at the last minute, when we're expected to
 [2] make a motion, I get a paper saying whatever.
 [3] The property owners, as far as I know,
 [4] haven't been actually contacted or discussed.
 [5] So, I wouldn't, as a board member, like to give
 [6] you any permission to start eminent domain.
 [7] I think it's okay to go out and start
 [8] negotiating with the people for the price to see
 [9] if they'll accept. And they may all just accept
 [10] and there is no problem, but I don't want to
 [11] throw that eminent domain and give you that right
 [12] to go ahead with eminent domain right tonight
 [13] until these people's had a chance to negotiate
 [14] with the Authority on the sale of their property,
 [15] because I feel they haven't been given a good
 [16] chance at that already.
 [17] I know for the last few years, they've been
 [18] here at meetings, got up where you're at, asked
 [19] the Board their intentions on acquiring their
 [20] property so they could make some decisions on
 [21] their lives, and they were given answers that
 [22] weren't really appropriate. And now, all of a
 [23] sudden, tonight, we can say let's go ahead with
 [24] the whole thing, including eminent domain.
 [25] I'm -- I'm willing to let you go ahead and

Page 12

[1] session. And I represent a lot of property
 [2] owners as well as condemning authorities.
 [3] We got the legislature to require the
 [4] condemning authorities to, at the same time they
 [5] are making their offers, provide upon request the
 [6] appraisals, plans, and right-of-way maps that the
 [7] offers are being made based upon, so that they
 [8] could adequately review those offers.
 [9] Under Florida law previously, they did not
 [10] even -- were not even afforded that opportunity.
 [11] Each owner, when they get a notification letter
 [12] from our firm, after this resolution is enacted,
 [13] will have the opportunity to have that appraisal,
 [14] to review it, and we cannot by Florida law even
 [15] institute anything for at least 30 days before
 [16] they have had a chance to review those documents.
 [17] MR. CIRIELLO: Well, would we be breaking
 [18] the law or going against it if we just tabled
 [19] this action item tonight until you've gotten to
 [20] the people and seen whether they're going to sell
 [21] or not without any trouble or problems, and then
 [22] come back, and then we could give you what you're
 [23] looking for, if that seems to be negative?
 [24] I mean, if the property owners say, "No,
 [25] we're not going to sell, we're going to fight,"

Page 13

[1] Would there be any harm in just tabling this
 [2] until you go contact the people and see how
 [3] receptive they'll be?
 [4] MR. ARNOLD: Your question being would you
 [5] be breaking any Florida law?
 [6] MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah.
 [7] MR. ARNOLD: No, you would not. I will tell
 [8] you that three of the five owners that I know of
 [9] right now are represented by attorneys that
 [10] specialize in this field of practice, so I have a
 [11] feeling I'll be dealing with their attorneys more
 [12] than I'll be dealing with them.
 [13] The fourth one, I believe, is tied up in an
 [14] estate, or may be tied up in an estate based upon
 [15] the title work, so...
 [16] MR. CIRIELLO: Well, I still feel that they
 [17] need the courtesy of being talked to and
 [18] discussed to -- maybe they've changed their mind
 [19] since what you're saying, before we hit them
 [20] with -- not hit them, but make this motion of
 [21] eminent domain and everything.
 [22] In fact, I'll make it a motion to table this
 [23] item until you have a chance to talk to the
 [24] homeowners and see how receptive they'll be.
 [25] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Mr. Ciriello has put a

Page 15

[1] some sort of Authority letter coming from the
 [2] Executive Director or the Board for us to
 [3] initiate the negotiations, yes, sir.
 [4] MR. WUELLNER: Okay. It doesn't need a
 [5] formal resolution?
 [6] MR. ARNOLD: I don't think it needs a formal
 [7] resolution, no, sir, not under Florida law.
 [8] MR. LASSITER: Mark, that was my question,
 [9] whether -- is this like a train; once you start
 [10] it, you don't stop it until it gets to the
 [11] station? And --
 [12] MR. ARNOLD: The only --
 [13] MR. LASSITER: -- if it is, I --
 [14] MR. ARNOLD: Okay. The only part of the
 [15] train that is not capable of being stopped once
 [16] it gets started is once you do a quick taking
 [17] under Florida law and you go forward and file
 [18] your condemnation suit, go before the Judge here
 [19] in St. Augustine, obtain what is called an Order
 [20] of Taking and make your deposit pursuant to the
 [21] Order of Taking, at that point in time, you as
 [22] the condemning authority, are more or less
 [23] married to the results of the valuation of that
 [24] property.
 [25] In other words, if a jury comes back and

Page 14

[1] motion on the table. Is there a second to that
 [2] motion?
 [3] MR. WATTS: I'll second it. I think it's a
 [4] good idea.
 [5] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Discussion?
 [6] MR. LASSITER: Just a quick question. How
 [7] long -- have the owners at all have -- been
 [8] receptive of these -- this paper that I have in
 [9] my hand here, the appraised values?
 [10] MR. ARNOLD: We have not contacted them yet.
 [11] MR. LASSITER: So, they don't even know
 [12] what's on this sheet.
 [13] MR. ARNOLD: They do not know what the
 [14] values are at this point in time, no, sir.
 [15] MR. LASSITER: Okay.
 [16] MR. ARNOLD: We have a notification letter
 [17] that, if the Board instructs us accordingly, we
 [18] will present to them that's drawn up in
 [19] accordance with Section 73.015, which makes a
 [20] written offer in the amount of the appraisal and
 [21] also provides to them information regarding their
 [22] rights and the acquisition process.
 [23] MR. WUELLNER: Does -- does that first step
 [24] require a resolution itself?
 [25] MR. ARNOLD: The first step would require

Page 16

[1] says, "You're wrong; we think it's worth \$5
 [2] million," you've got to pay that. But up until
 [3] that point, you have the discretion, and
 [4] oftentimes happens with condemning authorities,
 [5] you try to negotiate, and if you decide you don't
 [6] want to purchase it at that time, until you've
 [7] actually filed the suit and gotten an Order of
 [8] Taking, you can withdraw.
 [9] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Mark --
 [10] MR. CIRIELLO: Well, this motion isn't going
 [11] to hurt the process, is it, just by tabling it
 [12] for however long it takes you to contact these
 [13] people and find out they may all be receptive or
 [14] not? This motion's not going to interfere with
 [15] that, is it?
 [16] MR. ARNOLD: I -- I don't think that's a
 [17] legal question. That's -- that's more of a
 [18] business decision that I don't feel like I'm
 [19] qualified to give you an answer on.
 [20] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Mark, if we approve this
 [21] resolution that's before us --
 [22] MR. ARNOLD: Yes, sir.
 [23] CHAIRMAN ROSE: -- not the one that Joe
 [24] made, and you and your staff contact these
 [25] property owners, and one or maybe several do not

Page 17

[1] accept your offer, do we still have the option to
 [2] stop the eminent domain procedure if we want to?
 [3] MR. ARNOLD: Yes, sir. I would --
 [4] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Up until the point, as you
 [5] just --
 [6] MR. ARNOLD: Of an Order of Taking. And I
 [7] would tell you, I would not file any lawsuit --
 [8] I'm not going to run down in 30 days and file a
 [9] lawsuit on these properties without receiving
 [10] guidance from your Executive Director as to where
 [11] we should go, what sort of time frames we're
 [12] trying to meet, and those sort of issues that
 [13] need to be taken into consideration.
 [14] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Cindy, do you have a
 [15] comment?
 [16] MS. BARTIN: I'm just wondering if this
 [17] could be in some way crafted so -- what I'm
 [18] hearing the members suggest is that they would
 [19] like maybe a second review, like go ahead and
 [20] open up the negotiations, present the offers,
 [21] talk to these people, and if there is a need to
 [22] file a lawsuit, they want the ability to say,
 [23] "Yes, go ahead and file," or "No, not."
 [24] MR. ARNOLD: Uh-huh.
 [25] MS. BARTIN: So, is there a way that that

Page 19

[1] problems. And then we'll work from there. If we
 [2] have problems, we'll work from there. That's
 [3] simply what my motion is.
 [4] MS. BARTIN: Mark, one question that I would
 [5] have on behalf of the members, is there any
 [6] downside in not having this resolution as you go
 [7] into these negotiations and offers?
 [8] MR. ARNOLD: The only downside is your time
 [9] frames for which you're trying to fulfill for
 [10] whatever utilization you plan on making of the
 [11] land.
 [12] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Are there any other
 [13] questions?
 [14] MR. WUELLNER: The only other question I
 [15] have is just pertaining to the actual resolution,
 [16] apparently later. Does -- does the resolution
 [17] need to state which method of taking is being
 [18] pursued?
 [19] MR. ARNOLD: No. The resolution is worded
 [20] so that that, at this point in time, would be up
 [21] to the attorneys to decide to do a quick taking
 [22] or a slow taking. It can state that, yes.
 [23] So, if you wanted us to draft it in such a
 [24] manner as a slow taking, which is different from
 [25] a quick taking in that you don't become married

Page 18

[1] can be done? I mean, you're saying the first
 [2] stage, you don't even need this resolution, but
 [3] in order to file the legal action, you would need
 [4] this resolution.
 [5] MR. ARNOLD: You have to have a resolution
 [6] before you can file an eminent domain action.
 [7] The first part as far as negotiating, we do not
 [8] need a resolution. I would prefer direction from
 [9] the Board on -- to proceed with negotiations and
 [10] to make written offers.
 [11] CHAIRMAN ROSE: All right.
 [12] MS. BARTIN: Is there any --
 [13] MR. CIRIELLO: Wait a minute. Wait a
 [14] minute. You said you don't need direction of the
 [15] Board if you get that resolution.
 [16] MR. ARNOLD: No. I -- I said I would want
 [17] direction of the Board on what we should settle
 [18] at, should they come back at an offer over and
 [19] above your appraised value.
 [20] MR. CIRIELLO: Well, my motion's not even
 [21] giving you a resolution, is it? It's just --
 [22] MR. ARNOLD: No, sir.
 [23] MR. CIRIELLO: It's just telling you to go
 [24] ahead and get to these people and see if they'll
 [25] accept the money, and if they will, we have no

Page 20

[1] to the price under a slow taking until such time
 [2] as a jury reaches a verdict, and then you have 20
 [3] days to deposit the money that is within that --
 [4] that is dictated by that verdict to buy the
 [5] property.
 [6] MR. WUELLNER: I would think that this board
 [7] would want to reserve that until which time as a
 [8] number's known, and -- or -- and make that
 [9] determination, perhaps even on a case-by-case
 [10] basis.
 [11] MR. LASSITER: Exactly.
 [12] MR. WUELLNER: Without speaking for you, you
 [13] know.
 [14] CHAIRMAN ROSE: I want to be sure we have
 [15] the right motion before us, Joe.
 [16] MR. CIRIELLO: Can you read it?
 [17] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Can I read it?
 [18] MR. CIRIELLO: No, the beautiful lady over
 [19] here.
 [20] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Well, I -- I know what
 [21] motion you made. My concern is that I think what
 [22] we need to do is have a motion to approve -- to
 [23] approve the appraisals that have been submitted
 [24] by our -- by our attorney here, and ask him to go
 [25] ahead with the negotiation process, but not to

Page 21

[1] enter condemnation until he has reported back to
[2] the Board.
[3] MR. CIRIELLO: Basically, that's what I'm --
[4] my motion is. It's -- it's a motion to table the
[5] resolution to give him condemnation and
[6] everything else. It's telling him to go ahead,
[7] see these people, tell them how much money we're
[8] going to offer them, and see if they'll accept
[9] it.

[10] And if they will, there's no problems. And
[11] if they won't, then he's got to come back to us,
[12] and then we have to make a decision to give him
[13] the permission to go ahead and do condemnation.
[14] That's all.

[15] I'm not telling him he can't -- I'm telling
[16] him I want him to negotiate with these people,
[17] but I want to table the resolution, because I'm
[18] not ready to give him a process to go ahead on
[19] his own and do condemnation.

[20] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Okay. All right. There's
[21] no problem. We don't have to table anything.
[22] All we have to do is -- is approve the appraisals
[23] and authorize him to go ahead with the
[24] negotiations.

[25] MR. CIRIELLO: Well, I've got a motion on

Page 22

[1] the floor, and I didn't pull it back. So, you've
[2] got to either vote it up or down before you can
[3] go along with what you're saying.

[4] CHAIRMAN ROSE: That's right.

[5] MR. LASSITER: I think, Mr. Chairman, that
[6] the only difference is, is that you seek approval
[7] of this board of these appraisals, where Joe's
[8] was to ask the attorney to give these appraisals
[9] to the people and enter into negotiation. That's
[10] the only difference between the two of you.

[11] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Okay.

[12] MR. LASSITER: I don't know if Joe wants
[13] to --

[14] CHAIRMAN ROSE: The motion's on the floor.

[15] MR. LASSITER: Yes.

[16] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Are you ready for the
[17] question?

[18] MR. LASSITER: Call the question.

[19] CHAIRMAN ROSE: All in favor, say aye.

[20] MR. WATTS: Aye.

[21] MR. CIRIELLO: Aye.

[22] MR. LASSITER: Aye.

[23] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Opposed? Aye. I'm opposed.
[24] Motion is carried.

[25] MR. ARNOLD: Thank you.

Page 23

[1] CHAIRMAN ROSE: So, your instructions now
[2] are to go ahead and negotiate -- present the
[3] appraisals and negotiate with these property
[4] owners and report back to the Board on the --
[5] what develops as a result of that process.

[6] MR. ARNOLD: Just for clarification, do
[7] y'all seek monthly status reports on the
[8] negotiations?

[9] MR. WUELLNER: I think so.

[10] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Well, I would hope we'd
[11] proceed, yes.

[12] MR. ARNOLD: Okay. I just want to make
[13] sure.

[14] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Don't you think? Monthly
[15] reports?

[16] MR. CIRIELLO: I mean, do you think that
[17] this is going to take that long? I would think
[18] if tomorrow, if you went over there and talked to
[19] all five people, you'd have an answer from five
[20] of them right tomorrow. And then you could come
[21] back and say, "Well, I've got three people to say
[22] yes to," or, "No," or "All five agreed." I
[23] didn't think it was going to take a month, to
[24] tell you the truth.

[25] CHAIRMAN ROSE: We'd like to have a monthly

Page 24

[1] report.

[2] MR. CIRIELLO: Oh, yeah.

[3] MR. ARNOLD: Yes, sir.

[4] MR. CIRIELLO: We want a report.

[5] MR. ARNOLD: I'll proceed in that manner.

[6] MR. CIRIELLO: I didn't think it would be
[7] that long. That's all.

[8] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Thank you.

[9] All right. Item -- Item B. -- 7.B., Ed.

[10] 7.B. - RESOLUTION 2001-02

[11] MR. WUELLNER: Yes, sir. Item 7.B. refers
[12] to Resolution 2001-02, which is a Supplemental
[13] Joint Participation Agreement with the Florida
[14] DOT.

[15] This particular Joint Participation
[16] Agreement would amend only the grant description
[17] pertaining to the Florida DOT project
[18] 21718218401, which is the -- effectively the
[19] Taxiway B -- one of the two Taxiway B grants.
[20] And it would amend the grant description to
[21] include language that would allow for FDOT
[22] participation under that grant in a self-fuel
[23] facility to be pursued by the airport. And it
[24] doesn't require, but does provide the ability to
[25] fund it using this grant.

Page 25

[1] This is the shortest or most expedient route
 [2] to funding with DOT that we can imagine, and any
 [3] other method, you're looking at a minimum of
 [4] probably 18 months at this point, maybe even
 [5] longer, before it would show up as its own
 [6] stand-alone project within the work program with
 [7] DOT, assuming funds were available and they
 [8] agreed to it.

[9] So, this is probably the best possible
 [10] short-term solution available to the Airport
 [11] Authority. And it would be Staff's
 [12] recommendation that the Authority approve
 [13] Resolution 2001-02.

[14] CHAIRMAN ROSE: All right. Is there any
 [15] public comment?

[16] MR. WUELLNER: I'm sorry. This one also
 [17] requires amendment of the budget, the 2000-2001
 [18] budget, to reflect the project itself. It just
 [19] divides part of the Taxiway B project into this
 [20] project. Doesn't change the total dollars.

[21] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Public comment?

[22] (No public comment.)

[23] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Board members, comment?
 [24] Questions?

[25] MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah, I do, naturally. I

Page 26

[1] kind of feel -- I can understand where Ed's
 [2] coming from about the time -- time element, but
 [3] adding something to something that's already been
 [4] done, to me is just like when politicians add
 [5] amendments to bills that are being passed that
 [6] have nothing to do with the bill.

[7] But I think it's like letting the cart out
 [8] be -- or however that saying goes. If you want
 [9] to get money to build something and you don't
 [10] even know who's going to operate it, where it's
 [11] going to be exactly, and all that, I -- I would
 [12] really like to see, say like a bid put out to
 [13] anybody that might want to take over this
 [14] facility, since I've read in the report that the
 [15] FBO's not interested at all, and so we can't feel
 [16] any sympathy toward them if they don't want it.

[17] But if I'm not mistaken, could we, Ed, allow
 [18] any business in here and just call them an FBO
 [19] even though they're not a complete, full FBO,
 [20] like say if somebody just wanted to come in and
 [21] take over just fuel sales?

[22] MR. WUELLNER: No, sir. Right now, your
 [23] Minimum Operating Standards prohibit stand-alone
 [24] fuel operators.

[25] MR. CIRIELLO: It does?

Page 27

[1] MR. WUELLNER: Yes, it does.

[2] MR. CIRIELLO: Well, then, how can we do it?
 [3] We can't go against our own rules, unless we're
 [4] Congress.

[5] MR. WUELLNER: You would have to amend your
 [6] Minimum Operating Standards for commercial
 [7] operators.

[8] MR. CIRIELLO: So then, that's a delay. So,
 [9] why does this little --

[10] MR. WUELLNER: But we could -- no.

[11] MR. CIRIELLO: Huh?

[12] MR. WUELLNER: You misunderstood me. What I
 [13] mean is that for anyone else to do it other than
 [14] us, you'd have to amend your grant -- your
 [15] Minimum Operating Standards.

[16] MR. CIRIELLO: Well, my question is: Why
 [17] can we do it if nobody else can?

[18] MR. WUELLNER: Because they're your rules.

[19] MR. CIRIELLO: I mean, are we like Congress,
 [20] that we make rules for ourselves and nobody else?

[21] MR. WUELLNER: In effect.

[22] MR. CIRIELLO: I can see your time element,
 [23] and I understand it that now, compared to 18
 [24] months from now, but --

[25] MR. WUELLNER: Well, really --

Page 28

[1] MR. CIRIELLO: -- I'd still like to see
 [2] the -- it resolved first. If it's going to be --
 [3] you know, we may do it and nobody wants to
 [4] operate it, and then we're going to have to do
 [5] it. And then that means --

[6] MR. WUELLNER: I think you're mixing two
 [7] different requests here. That -- that's a later
 [8] agenda item, and I'm sure we can beat it up. All
 [9] this does is create the mechanism to build it or
 [10] fund it in the event you elect to do it.

[11] It doesn't require you to build it, but it
 [12] does allow you to do it should you wish to move
 [13] through it.

[14] MR. CIRIELLO: Okay. Does that -- what word
 [15] am I looking for? Does that make us responsible
 [16] for that amount of money? Say like would it have
 [17] to show in the budget or something the amount of
 [18] money that we would have to contribute toward it,
 [19] and then if some case -- you know, at some time
 [20] we decided not to, but that money would not be
 [21] available to us?

[22] MR. WUELLNER: I'm not sure I fully
 [23] understand your question now.

[24] MR. CIRIELLO: Wait a minute now. Sometimes
 [25] in budgeting, somebody will budget some money,

Page 29

[1] and not knowing whether they're going to use it
 [2] or not, but let's say that out of the total
 [3] budget, that much money that they've done can't
 [4] be used or touched. Like a credit.

[5] MR. WUELLNER: Okay.

[6] MR. CIRIELLO: So like if -- but if you
 [7] don't include it now, and down the road, you
 [8] decide not to do it, there would be no monetary
 [9] subtracting, adding, or anything, because it was
 [10] never --

[11] MR. WUELLNER: Correct. It would, in
 [12] effect, not exist if you elected not to do it.
 [13] It's -- it's only in the budget because it would
 [14] reflect a revenue in the event you elected to
 [15] construct it. It doesn't exist as a revenue.
 [16] You don't get the money and then decide whether
 [17] to build the project. You have to build the
 [18] project to get the money.

[19] MR. CIRIELLO: But does it count against our
 [20] budget, though? Our total budget figures, would
 [21] it count --

[22] MR. WUELLNER: It currently does. It's just
 [23] currently earmarked, because it was a part of a
 [24] total that was described in the budget as Taxiway
 [25] B, Taxiway B, when it's funded, will be funded as

Page 30

[1] a federal grant program. It will be funded
 [2] jointly with us and the State, up to a level of
 [3] 95 percent. So, we'll only have 5 percent
 [4] participation in lieu of 80 percent.

[5] It was originally funded at 80 percent with
 [6] Florida DOT. Once we found out we could get
 [7] DO -- excuse me, FAA funds for this -- for the
 [8] taxiway project itself, we elected not to expend
 [9] Florida DOT funds on that project, waiting 95
 [10] percent participation by a different agency.

[11] MR. CIRIELLO: I gotcha.

[12] MR. WUELLNER: So, the money frees -- in
 [13] effect, frees up. It's still the same total;
 [14] it's just divided.

[15] CHAIRMAN ROSE: But the point is, if at some
 [16] point we decide we don't want this fuel
 [17] operation, we can not act on that and the
 [18] money -- those funds would be used somewhere
 [19] else.

[20] MR. WUELLNER: Correct. It's a simple
 [21] letter back to DOT.

[22] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Any other questions of
 [23] Mr. Wuellner or --

[24] MR. LASSITER: I think I can reserve my
 [25] questions. I think later on, we'll get into the

Page 31

[1] actual fueling location.

[2] MR. WUELLNER: Right.

[3] MR. LASSITER: I take it from your approval
 [4] of this or request for approval, that you found
 [5] this to be the most expedient way to cover our
 [6] needs for funding if we do decide to --

[7] MR. WUELLNER: This is the only way you
 [8] could react in a reasonable time line.

[9] MR. LASSITER: Okay.

[10] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Any other comment? I'll
 [11] call the question. All if favor --

[12] MR. WUELLNER: You have public comment. I
 [13] don't know if you --

[14] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Well, I asked for public
 [15] comment. Nobody --

[16] MR. HOLIDAY: Sorry. I didn't hear you. I
 [17] must be --

[18] CHAIRMAN ROSE: That's all right. Go ahead.
 [19] Come on up, Dan.

[20] MR. HOLIDAY: Don't laugh. I forgot my
 [21] glasses. You brought this thing up --

[22] CHAIRMAN ROSE: State your name.

[23] MR. HOLIDAY: My name is Dan Holiday. I am
 [24] a resident of St. Augustine and a long-time
 [25] supporter of Aero Sport. We brought this subject

Page 32

[1] up about a month ago, and I'm very gratified that
 [2] Mr. Moeller -- Wuellner -- Mr. Wuellner, Ed
 [3] Wuellner, picked up the ball and ran with it.

[4] In going to the Sun 'n Fun fly-in in
 [5] Lakeland, Florida this week, I ran across a
 [6] company, and I think I gave -- brought this in
 [7] (indicating). Actually, the man lives in Ponte
 [8] Vedra. I didn't -- I didn't -- I didn't realize
 [9] he lives in Ponte Vedra. We got talking, and he
 [10] was very familiar with St. Augustine.

[11] But it's called SuperSafe Tanks,
 [12] Incorporated. And they bring it in, literally,
 [13] totally self-contained. And I was impressed with
 [14] it, but I don't know that much about it. I kind
 [15] of liked the guy. But this, at least research
 [16] and see what -- what their game is, I would -- I
 [17] would recommend.

[18] The wording in here about additional FBO
 [19] makes me a little nervous, but that's just
 [20] business, I guess. I really think we need an
 [21] alternate fuel source in this airport. I, as a
 [22] pilot -- and I am now flying down to Flagler
 [23] Beach and buying my fuel for -- the last time I
 [24] bought about 60 gallons, was \$2.06 a gallon.

[25] That's a considerable saving over -- even

Page 33

[1] with the price of the fuel here at St. Augustine
 [2] Airport and then the additional discount that is
 [3] given, offered to local pilots. And it's
 [4] certainly worth me going down there and getting
 [5] fuel. If I just --
 [6] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Dan, we had this discussion
 [7] last week, and I think we understand --
 [8] MR. HOLIDAY: Okay. All right, then.
 [9] CHAIRMAN ROSE: -- the point you're making.
 [10] MR. HOLIDAY: Thank you very much.
 [11] CHAIRMAN ROSE: And that's why we're trying
 [12] to move ahead with this.
 [13] Ed, did you want to say something?
 [14] MR. WUELLNER: The only thing I want -- I
 [15] just want to point out, not to -- it's just,
 [16] you're referring to the agenda item that's coming
 [17] up, not the item we're talking about right now.
 [18] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Yeah.
 [19] MR. WUELLNER: All we're talking about is
 [20] just the grant resolution. We've got an item
 [21] coming up in just a couple of minutes that deals
 [22] specifically with the report you're referring to.
 [23] MR. HOLIDAY: I just read the first page.
 [24] MR. WUELLNER: And -- well, they're related
 [25] there.

Page 35

[1] CHAIRMAN ROSE: No. The motion is carried.
 [2] All right. 7.C., Mr. Wuellner.
 [3] 7.C. - RESOLUTION 2001-03
 [4] MR. WUELLNER: Okay. Again refers to
 [5] Resolution 2001-03, which pertains to the
 [6] additional funds that we promised at I believe
 [7] last month's and the previous months when we
 [8] voted to -- when the Board voted to add the
 [9] additional work elements to the terminal project,
 [10] I promised you we would get the grant information
 [11] back to you sometime over the summer.
 [12] Well, DOT, in their infinite wisdom, has
 [13] found the additional matching funds and has
 [14] provided that at this date for us so that we have
 [15] it much sooner than we anticipated. And this
 [16] refers to the expansion of the FBO buildings over
 [17] in the terminal area, reference 21716918401.
 [18] And it would be Staff's recommendation that
 [19] the Authority adopt Resolution 2001-03 in regards
 [20] to the additional funds for this project.
 [21] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Public comment?
 [22] (No public comment.)
 [23] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Board members, any questions
 [24] or comments?
 [25] MR. WATTS: Mr. Chairman, I have a question

Page 34

[1] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Okay.
 [2] MR. HOLIDAY: I'm not too bright.
 [3] MR. WUELLNER: In hindsight, I'd have
 [4] reversed -- reversed the order, so we didn't do
 [5] one before the other.
 [6] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Keep your glasses handy,
 [7] Dan. You're going to need them.
 [8] MR. LASSITER: See you in a minute.
 [9] CHAIRMAN ROSE: All right. Any other
 [10] discussion?
 [11] (No further discussion.)
 [12] CHAIRMAN ROSE: I'll -- I'll entertain a
 [13] motion concerning Staff recommendation on
 [14] Resolution 2001-02.
 [15] MR. LASSITER: So-move.
 [16] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Is there a second?
 [17] MR. WATTS: I'll second.
 [18] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Any discussion? All in
 [19] favor, say aye.
 [20] MR. CIRIELLO: Aye.
 [21] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Aye.
 [22] MR. LASSITER: Aye.
 [23] MR. WATTS: Aye.
 [24] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Opposed?
 [25] (No opposition.)

Page 36

[1] for Mr. Wuellner, please. Ed, is this, the
 [2] difference in the approval for the DOT, is that
 [3] already budgeted with the other work that's being
 [4] done over there?
 [5] MR. WUELLNER: I believe it is. The
 [6] total -- the total project is -- is contained in
 [7] the current year budget.
 [8] MR. WATTS: Okay. Thank you.
 [9] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Any other questions?
 [10] MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah. According to these
 [11] figures, \$700,000 net change, we've got to come
 [12] up with \$350- of that, and FDOT for the other
 [13] \$350-.
 [14] MR. WUELLNER: That's correct.
 [15] MR. CIRIELLO: And you say we've already got
 [16] the \$350,000; we're not going to have to borrow
 [17] it or go in the hole to get it?
 [18] MR. WUELLNER: No, we budgeted the project
 [19] at the total; we just didn't have the grant funds
 [20] secured at that point.
 [21] MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah. Okay.
 [22] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Any other comment? I'll
 [23] entertain a motion on Staff resolution 7.C.
 [24] MR. CIRIELLO: I'll make it.
 [25] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Second?

Page 37

[1] MR. LASSITER: Second.

[2] CHAIRMAN ROSE: All in favor?

[3] MR. CIRIELLO: Aye.

[4] MR. LASSITER: Aye.

[5] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Aye.

[6] MR. WATTS: Aye.

[7] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Motion carried. Item 7.D.,

[8] Ed.

[9] 7.D. - RESOLUTION 2001-04

[10] MR. WUELLNER: Again refers to Resolution

[11] 2001-04, again a Supplemental JPA with Florida

[12] DOT. This would facilitate the additional funds

[13] related to the airfield electric vault, adds

[14] \$475,000 to the total -- I'm sorry, adds \$300,000

[15] to the total, which was originally an 80/20

[16] grant. This would facilitate full funding by DOT

[17] at 80 percent for the balance of the airfield

[18] electric vault, consistent with the contracts for

[19] the tower and vault project.

[20] Now, these, the totals -- even before you

[21] ask, the totals exceed the amounts budgeted in

[22] the current year, but the expenditures related to

[23] these will not be until the next fiscal year and

[24] will be facilitated in the budget process and

[25] carried forward, those portions that are not

Page 39

[1] have to come back and ask for more money? Why

[2] can't we do with what we're supposed to?

[3] MR. WUELLNER: It's not always a case of the

[4] bid being different. It's maybe the funds

[5] available at DOT at the time we initiate the

[6] project. So, what they're doing is catching the

[7] funding up to where the project is.

[8] Many times, it's split over the years, and

[9] they're simply augmenting their -- the existing

[10] project funds to that -- to that level.

[11] But referring to the vault itself, just --

[12] this is a case where the funds were never

[13] appropriately budgeted with DOT originally, so

[14] when they did fund it, it -- the project cost

[15] didn't agree with what ultimately was budgeted by

[16] DOT. So, we were back trying to find the

[17] additional funds once it was designed.

[18] This is -- this one is -- this one and the

[19] tower, they're -- each have a little different

[20] twist to it. The vault itself, we were somewhat

[21] held -- held to mercy on the field-related work

[22] to the vault construction itself; the

[23] installation of the conduits, the fact that that

[24] will cross a taxiway and a runway with all of the

[25] conduits necessary for the Home Run cables on the

Page 38

[1] expended in this year. So, you have a separate

[2] process for it.

[3] CHAIRMAN ROSE: So, it will be in two years,

[4] two budget years.

[5] MR. WUELLNER: Well, the next fiscal year

[6] after October. Most -- a good majority of the

[7] construction dollars won't be expended until

[8] after October.

[9] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Public comment?

[10] (No public comment.)

[11] MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah, I've got something to

[12] say again. Not specifically on this subject, Ed,

[13] because it is a needed project, no two ways about

[14] it.

[15] But I see on tonight's agenda, there's at

[16] least three different action items asking for

[17] more funds, and I know of in the past years, that

[18] the Board has okayed projects to be built, you

[19] know, hangars and whatnot, and invariably they

[20] come back and ask for more funds because it can't

[21] be done by the bid project and everything.

[22] I'm just wondering why is that happening? I

[23] mean, is there a good reason for that happening,

[24] or is -- or are we getting some bad bids or bad

[25] consultant prices or something? Why do we always

Page 40

[1] airport, and that was included in the project.

[2] It was not originally in the first scope of work

[3] when this was put in the DOT work plan some

[4] three, probably four years ago.

[5] It was not in -- the site was not

[6] identified, and the details of the project had

[7] not been scoped. So, it was just a case of the

[8] project scope ultimately exceeded what the

[9] available dollars were.

[10] Now, the tower itself, the additional cost

[11] in that came from the equipment related to the

[12] vault. If you look at the actual tower

[13] construction, you're almost exactly on the

[14] numbers of what was originally estimated by

[15] the -- by the engineers on this project, and

[16] again, prior to finalizing design.

[17] If you remember, we're still only at 30 --

[18] around 30 percent design on the project. So, it

[19] was -- and this board elected to take it as a

[20] design/build project from that point forward.

[21] MR. CIRIELLO: So, this isn't an unusual

[22] process in doing things.

[23] MR. WUELLNER: No, there are a myriad of

[24] things that enter into whether we end up with a

[25] supplemental agreement or need to enter one for

Page 41

[1] that matter.
 [2] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Anything else, Joe?
 [3] MR. CIRIELLO: No.
 [4] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Any other comment? I'll
 [5] entertain a motion of Resolution 2001-04.
 [6] MR. LASSITER: Make a motion that we approve
 [7] Resolution 2001-04.
 [8] MR. WATTS: I second it.
 [9] CHAIRMAN ROSE: All in favor?
 [10] MR. CIRIELLO: Aye.
 [11] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Aye.
 [12] MR. LASSITER: Aye.
 [13] MR. WATTS: Aye.
 [14] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Motion is carried.
 [15] Let's move on to item -- let's see, E.--
 [16] 7.E.
 [17] 7.E. - RESOLUTION 2001-05
 [18] MR. WUELLNER: Okay. Again, Resolution
 [19] 2001-05. It's another supplemental -- refers to
 [20] a resolution pertaining to supplemental
 [21] agreement, again with Florida DOT.
 [22] It's related to the air traffic control
 [23] tower, and it facilitates full funding of the air
 [24] traffic control tower project. It adds \$150,000,
 [25] total dollars to the project from -- from DOT,

Page 43

[1] MR. WUELLNER: So, it's fully funded at 80
 [2] percent now.
 [3] MR. WATTS: Okay.
 [4] MR. WUELLNER: That makes the total -- if
 [5] you're in the resolution, it discloses the total
 [6] amount of the project, the total eligible cost at
 [7] this point, which is \$1,387,500, which includes
 [8] all of the equipment related to it.
 [9] MR. LASSITER: This -- this is the total
 [10] hard dollar number that we know --
 [11] MR. WUELLNER: Correct.
 [12] MR. LASSITER: -- coming out of contract.
 [13] So, we're there, is what I'm trying to say.
 [14] MR. WUELLNER: Exactly. And fully funded.
 [15] MR. LASSITER: Okay.
 [16] MR. WUELLNER: This is the last piece of it.
 [17] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Joe, anything else?
 [18] MR. CIRIELLO: Well, no. This thing is
 [19] already off the ground and flying right from the
 [20] very get-go.
 [21] Even when you, the Board, started talking
 [22] about it a couple of years ago, I was against it.
 [23] I didn't think we needed a control tower; it was
 [24] too expensive. I still feel that way. But I'd
 [25] just like it to be on the record that I don't

Page 42

[1] again an 80 percent level, but does provide --
 [2] facilitate full funding of the tower and the
 [3] related equipment.
 [4] And it's Staff's recommendation that the
 [5] Authority approval Resolution 2001-05, and that
 [6] references Florida DOT number 40449618401.
 [7] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Any public comment?
 [8] (No public comment.)
 [9] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Questions by the Board?
 [10] MR. WATTS: Mr. Chairman, I have a question,
 [11] please.
 [12] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Go ahead.
 [13] MR. WATTS: Ed, the DOT, out of the kindness
 [14] of their heart, doesn't just give us these
 [15] increases. I know you work pretty hard for these
 [16] things, too, don't you?
 [17] MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, we have to smile a lot.
 [18] MR. WATTS: That's what I thought. And so,
 [19] what -- where does this bring the total
 [20] contribution versus a total cost for the tower?
 [21] Where are we standing now?
 [22] MR. WUELLNER: Well, total DOT funding for
 [23] the tower is at \$1,110,000, which is 80 percent
 [24] of the total project cost.
 [25] MR. WATTS: Okay.

Page 44

[1] think we need it, and I'm not really happy about
 [2] it, but I won't give a negative vote on this
 [3] resolution.
 [4] CHAIRMAN ROSE: All right. I'll entertain a
 [5] motion to accept this Resolution 2001-05.
 [6] MR. WATTS: Mr. Chairman, I make the motion
 [7] that we accept Resolution 2001-05.
 [8] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Is there a second?
 [9] MR. LASSITER: I'll second.
 [10] CHAIRMAN ROSE: All in favor, say aye.
 [11] MR. CIRIELLO: Aye.
 [12] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Aye.
 [13] MR. LASSITER: Aye.
 [14] MR. WATTS: Aye.
 [15] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Motion is carried. We'll
 [16] move on to 7.F.
 [17] 7.F. - RESOLUTION 2001-06
 [18] MR. WUELLNER: Okay. You have another
 [19] resolution, 2001-06, which referred -- is a new
 [20] Joint Participation Agreement with the Florida
 [21] DOT. And this would facilitate additional design
 [22] and construction of corporate hangars on the
 [23] airport. It is a 50 percent grant and would
 [24] provide a half a million dollars of Florida DOT
 [25] money that would ultimately be matched by local

Page 45

[1] money in the development of additional corporate
[2] hangars.

[3] The project specific to this will be a part
[4] of the budgeting process going into next year.
[5] This simply identifies the funds. Additionally,
[6] FDOT's identified another \$300,000 that they will
[7] augment this with later in the year, bringing the
[8] total to \$800,000 state money or a total project
[9] potential of \$1.6 million.

[10] It's -- will probably be our recommendation
[11] to you during the budget process that this go to
[12] several projects on the airport that we currently
[13] have a waiting list for corporate-type hangars.
[14] And again, we'll have that discussion at budget
[15] time.

[16] Nothing -- that we won't be expending
[17] dollars in the current year on this. So, as
[18] such, no additional action related to the budget
[19] is anticipated at this time.

[20] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Public comment?

[21] (No public comment.)

[22] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Board members?

[23] MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah. Ed, has this -- this
[24] project been bid out yet? Has it been bid and
[25] okayed?

Page 47

[1] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Okay, Joe. Okay, Ed. Any
[2] other questions or comments by the Board?

[3] (No further comments.)

[4] CHAIRMAN ROSE: I'll entertain a motion on
[5] 2001 -- Resolution 2001-06.

[6] MR. CIRIELLO: I'll do it.

[7] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Do I hear a second?

[8] MR. LASSITER: Second.

[9] CHAIRMAN ROSE: All in favor, say aye.

[10] MR. CIRIELLO: Aye.

[11] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Aye.

[12] MR. LASSITER: Aye.

[13] MR. WATTS: Aye.

[14] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Motion is carried.

[15] Mr. Wuellner, we move to 7.G.

[16] MR. WUELLNER: H. H., right? G., you're
[17] right. I'm sorry.

[18] 7.G. - BID AWARD - CLEARING & GRUBBING CONTRACT

[19] MR. WUELLNER: This is a bid award for
[20] tree -- tree clearing and grubbing, and it's
[21] specific to the northeast area of the airport.

[22] It is in support of two specific projects,
[23] one being the additional clear-zone requirements
[24] that become part and parcel to establishing an
[25] ILS, and the other is it's also -- actually

Page 46

[1] MR. WUELLNER: No. There is -- there is no
[2] specific project attached to this. As I was just
[3] explaining, it's -- it's identification of funds
[4] to go ahead and develop a project. This is one
[5] of those occasions where we actually have all of
[6] the money in advance and can develop the project
[7] to stay within the budget.

[8] MR. CIRIELLO: I already thought we was
[9] building a hangar for Regency.

[10] MR. WUELLNER: Well, it was -- we did the --
[11] we've moved through the engineering. The
[12] engineering's undeveloped, but the actual
[13] construction dollars for that project is not --
[14] this is likely to be one of those projects that's
[15] funded by it.

[16] MR. CIRIELLO: So, whatever funds we get now
[17] or in the future, whatever, will end up being
[18] what his rent will be based on. I mean, he's --
[19] he's not fixing to pay a certain rent and then we
[20] get more money -- like that paint hangar deal.

[21] MR. WUELLNER: No, no.

[22] MR. CIRIELLO: It's nothing like that.

[23] MR. WUELLNER: That was the last of the
[24] deals before I got here. We know what we're
[25] going to get before we expend a dollar.

Page 48

[1] adjoins the new development area in the
[2] northeast, which is where the SK Logistics
[3] hangar, it is being designed at this point. This
[4] basically clears that property, as well as the
[5] additional clear zone.

[6] This is the second bid. As you recall, this
[7] was brought up, I believe at the last meeting,
[8] and you'll find that the dollars involved here is
[9] certainly much more in line with what we had
[10] after revising the scope of work and resoliciting
[11] bids.

[12] And it's the airport staff's contention
[13] that -- or recommendation that we award
[14] construction contract for the tree removal to D.
[15] B. Smith as the low bidder and subsequently award
[16] a contract. And that actual award will be based
[17] on the conditions as they're in place and ready
[18] to be moved through.

[19] We solicited four distinct methods of
[20] disposal of the debris, and that's why the
[21] varying prices, everything from moving it all off
[22] the property. There's a method there that part
[23] of it can be plowed into the ground. There's an
[24] option there that allows them to burn it on-site.
[25] There's also another option that allows them to

Page 49

[1] basically turn it into mulch on-site and become
 [2] our problem for disposal.
 [3] CHAIRMAN ROSE: And these are the options
 [4] that are listed here?
 [5] MR. WUELLNER: Those are the four options.
 [6] I honestly don't recall what the order is, but
 [7] I'm sure the -- must be option 2, would be
 [8] hauling it off the site, because that would be
 [9] the most expensive.
 [10] And I think we actually were making award as
 [11] promised in the bid specs based on option number
 [12] 1, which was the mulching in place and leaving.
 [13] And the reason being that we were -- we felt it
 [14] not fair to award based on the burning on-site,
 [15] because we weren't sure that we would actually be
 [16] able to obtain the permits and all that
 [17] necessary, given the general conditions, drought
 [18] conditions in this part of the -- this part of
 [19] the state.
 [20] So, it was out there as an option, but not
 [21] necessarily a final way of disposing it, despite
 [22] the fact it's a little bit cheaper.
 [23] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Do we know this contractor?
 [24] Has he worked --
 [25] MR. WUELLNER: They -- their qualifications

Page 51

[1] once we get into it.
 [2] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Any other board questions or
 [3] comments?
 [4] (No further questions.)
 [5] CHAIRMAN ROSE: I'll entertain a motion then
 [6] on this Resolution 2001- -- no, it's -- we don't
 [7] have a number on it, do we? It's the -- except
 [8] for the award.
 [9] MR. WUELLNER: Yes.
 [10] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Staff recommendation to
 [11] accept the bid and award the contract. Do I hear
 [12] a motion to that effect?
 [13] MR. LASSITER: I'll make the motion that we
 [14] approve Staff's recommendation to award the bid
 [15] to D. B. Smith.
 [16] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Is there a second?
 [17] MR. CIRIELLO: And I'll second it.
 [18] CHAIRMAN ROSE: All in favor, say aye.
 [19] MR. CIRIELLO: Aye.
 [20] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Aye.
 [21] MR. LASSITER: Aye.
 [22] MR. WATTS: Aye.
 [23] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Motion is carried. Item
 [24] 7.H., the self-fueling update.
 [25] 7.G. - SELF-FUELING UPDATE/SECOND FBO

Page 50

[1] were reviewed by -- as a part of the --
 [2] determined to call them Kaiser, but Earth Tech's
 [3] review of the bids.
 [4] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Is there any public comment?
 [5] (No public comment.)
 [6] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Board comments, questions?
 [7] MR. LASSITER: One quick one. Ed, we
 [8] mulched last time when we cleared over here. Did
 [9] we have trouble getting rid of that?
 [10] MR. WUELLNER: Actually, it was not our
 [11] problem to get rid of it last time; it was a part
 [12] of the overall construction project. They chose
 [13] to mulch it, and basically anybody that wanted
 [14] any could come get it there for quite a while.
 [15] And then they -- ultimately, the contractor found
 [16] another contractor who was in need of mulch, and
 [17] they got the balance of it hauled off.
 [18] I don't expect any real problems, and it may
 [19] very well be that we can elect to plow that
 [20] section in. There's about a four- or five-acre
 [21] piece up there that a good majority of this can
 [22] be plowed in and just basically allowed to turn
 [23] to topsoil. It will never be developed because
 [24] of its location off the end of the runway there.
 [25] So, it may very well be the most suitable option

Page 52

[1] MR. WUELLNER: Okay. This is a report that
 [2] you have a copy of that basically looked at the
 [3] self-serving -- self-serving -- self-service
 [4] aviation fueling facility, and also looked at
 [5] parameters surrounding second FBO development.
 [6] We tried to devise the report such that it
 [7] provided, under each major topic of discussion, a
 [8] recommendation from Staff, hopefully
 [9] consistent -- that will form some sort of
 [10] direction from -- from this board back to Staff
 [11] regarding each of the items.
 [12] Just to walk you through, because I know a
 [13] lot of you have not had sufficient chance to
 [14] actually read through this and go through the
 [15] details; but, in a sense, based on conditions
 [16] largely economic and out of the control of the
 [17] average person, fuel prices, as we all know, have
 [18] in some respects gone through the roof.
 [19] When we first, "we" being the Authority,
 [20] reviewed self-fueling back in 1996, FBO-related
 [21] prices for fuel were around \$1.90 a gallon. And
 [22] we've since seen that come up to, and at one
 [23] point here in the last few months, up to in
 [24] excess of \$2.90 a gallon. This is always subject
 [25] to volatility in the market.

Page 53

[1] When we looked at self-fuel the first time,
 [2] self-fueling, the disparity in what it actually
 [3] costs versus what it could be delivered to your
 [4] aircraft in a full-service capacity, was
 [5] generally less than 25 cents a gallon. And it,
 [6] in a sense, didn't make any real sense at that
 [7] time to pursue -- pursue self-fueling, especially
 [8] if the Authority was going to spearhead such a
 [9] project.

[10] And at that point, again, the FBO hadn't --
 [11] didn't really have an interest in self-fueling,
 [12] as they felt it somewhat counterproductive to
 [13] being able to deliver the fuel themselves and
 [14] control that entity.

[15] You have been inundated in the last few
 [16] months with Pilot Association requests, as well
 [17] as from individual pilots maybe not affiliated
 [18] with the Pilots Association, requesting
 [19] self-fueling.

[20] Self-fueling, back in '96, was kind of in
 [21] its infancy in the state. Although it's been
 [22] used in automobiles for years, it was just kind
 [23] of getting its own life in aviation. Since that
 [24] time, it's become pretty much available routinely
 [25] across the state. Not at every airport, but

Page 55

[1] everybody needs to -- to make a reasonable profit
 [2] on their cost of actually putting fuel in
 [3] someone's aircraft.

[4] Normally, governmental entities don't take
 [5] this on unless somebody effectively doesn't want
 [6] to do it or you've been unable to attract an FBO
 [7] or some other market condition that makes it
 [8] extremely difficult to put an FBO on the field.

[9] In this case, we have certainly a very good
 [10] quality FBO; however, their current -- appears
 [11] their current business plan does not generally
 [12] lend itself towards supporting a self-fuel
 [13] approach to -- especially for the lower-end
 [14] general aviation pilot. And as such, the retail
 [15] price has been a significant obstacle to many
 [16] people being able to use and enjoy their
 [17] aircraft.

[18] At that point, we kind of have to, as an
 [19] Authority, make the decision as to whether we
 [20] effectively compete with the FBO in the fueling
 [21] arena at all. There are very different products
 [22] and there are certainly levels of client service
 [23] that are not envisioned as a part of a
 [24] self-fuel-type facility. There are operators of
 [25] aircraft who simply would never use a self-fuel

Page 54

[1] certainly it's proliferated to a -- to a number
 [2] that you can generally find someplace to do
 [3] self-fueling if you'd like.

[4] There's a significant difference in cost at
 [5] this point, and our guess currently put that at
 [6] in excess of 50 cents a gallon self-fueling
 [7] versus full service. As such, we elected -- or
 [8] you directed Staff to look at the matter in some
 [9] detail, which is why you're having this report
 [10] done today.

[11] We believe that self-fueling is probably in
 [12] the best interest of the local community, local
 [13] airport community, as that the price of aviation
 [14] gas is directly proportionate to the ability of
 [15] many of these people to -- to actually fly
 [16] aircraft, as it's the single largest cost item in
 [17] operating the aircraft. And it's our belief that
 [18] self-fueling should be facilitated at the
 [19] airport.

[20] Now, who should operate self-fueling? I
 [21] guess in an ideal world, self-fueling would
 [22] probably never need to exist in that it would be
 [23] able to be delivered at the same cost in a
 [24] self-fuel -- or in a -- a full-service capacity.
 [25] But that's not the way the world operates, as

Page 56

[1] facility. And in that respect, there are very
 [2] different markets of users.

[3] However, in order to make a facility such
 [4] as -- such as one operated by the Authority or
 [5] any other entity competitive or even reasonable
 [6] in price, obviously a significant volume has to
 [7] be generated in order to make it make sense.
 [8] It's become, as I said, very commonplace in the
 [9] State of Florida, and the economic disparity
 [10] between full- and self-service has gotten very
 [11] significant.

[12] Without meaningful competition on the
 [13] self-fuel side, it would be our recommendation
 [14] that the Authority, on an interim basis -- and I
 [15] want to emphasize that -- facilitate the
 [16] establishment of self-fueling on the airport.

[17] And this would -- conditions that I'd throw
 [18] on there would be that the Authority would
 [19] develop and operate the facility, but only for as
 [20] long a period of time as necessary to accommodate
 [21] the development and attraction of a meaningful
 [22] second FBO operation. And that would likely take
 [23] some time, less than five years, to do.

[24] As a part of that second FBO development, it
 [25] would be our suggestion that you roll the

Page 57

[1] self-fuel facility into that request for
 [2] proposals from a second FBO and make that a
 [3] condition of accepting a proposal from a second
 [4] FBO, in that they take over the self-fuel
 [5] operation when that second FBO is placed on the
 [6] airport; and that the request for proposals
 [7] related to that second FBO, should you go that
 [8] direction, contain reasonable assurances within
 [9] that contract that allow for a meaningful
 [10] disparity to continue to exist between self-fuel
 [11] and full service so that fuel should be available
 [12] to those who wish to self-fuel on a long-term
 [13] basis and at a significant reduction in cost from
 [14] that of full service.

[15] We believe that to be in -- the most
 [16] consistent in terms of protecting the public's
 [17] long-term interest in being able to access their
 [18] aircraft and be able to fly.

[19] Next obvious question is: Well, what would
 [20] self-fueling cost? There are two distinct items
 [21] within that development, one being
 [22] infrastructure, which is pretty obvious, but is
 [23] things such as the taxiway access, the pad
 [24] itself, and the environmental constraints that
 [25] are placed on it in the permitting process.

Page 59

[1] be very difficult to accomplish. It would also
 [2] require aircraft to stage out on another taxiway
 [3] and block that while someone else is fueling.

[4] The other distinct element is the equipment
 [5] cost, the actual cost of things such as the tank,
 [6] pumps, any lighting or other equipment that would
 [7] be involved in making this happen. Card reader,
 [8] credit card reader, those things are estimated
 [9] based on numerous proposals we saw, probably
 [10] somewhere around \$65,000, with about \$20,000 of
 [11] that being dedicated specifically to the card
 [12] reader itself. Those are fairly pricey and
 [13] remain that way and have been that kind of a
 [14] dollar figure since even back through '96.

[15] However, that technology's advanced to the
 [16] point where it's finally reliable and is
 [17] generally getting fairly good reviews by other
 [18] airports and users in terms of reliability.
 [19] Bringing the total cost anticipated of the
 [20] project at about \$165,000 to develop.

[21] Since you cannot legally just place a tank
 [22] in a -- in a field and make it work -- and we
 [23] wouldn't want to do that anyway, as there are
 [24] certainly environmental implications to placing
 [25] any type of fuel in the open ground out there,

Page 58

[1] You have to have vehicle access out to that
 [2] site in order to accept loads of fuel. There are
 [3] things such as electricity to the site, any other
 [4] taxiway access, all of those types of things, and
 [5] it's our guess, based on information that was
 [6] developed in the '96 report, as well as recent
 [7] costs that were effectively putting a -- or
 [8] recommending a pad that would be something very
 [9] similar to what was put out there for the
 [10] aircraft wash rack in terms of dimensions, type
 [11] of construction.

[12] It would very differently -- it would be
 [13] very different in terms of how it's -- some of
 [14] the costs related to it, in that we're not trying
 [15] to treat the waste or the water off of this thing
 [16] such that we are with the wash rack. So, there's
 [17] some economies there, but some of those economies
 [18] are lost in providing other utilities to the site
 [19] that aren't in the aircraft wash rack.

[20] And there's an additional piece of taxiway
 [21] that would need to be constructed to allow the
 [22] fuel facility to function in a -- at a
 [23] satisfactory way such as an ingress and an egress
 [24] taxiway versus trying to bring aircraft in and
 [25] out the same single taxiway access, which would

Page 60

[1] we'd want to make sure that the project itself is
 [2] completely meeting all the requirements of all
 [3] the permitting agencies that would be involved.

[4] We looked at a number of sites on the
 [5] airport. The most meaningful that we could
 [6] identify and the easiest in terms of access and
 [7] operations would be a site that would be in front
 [8] of -- basically between the tower and the
 [9] taxiway, along Taxiway D or just, if you're
 [10] looking at that drawing where it says "ATC
 [11] tower," it's generally in that location.

[12] CHAIRMAN ROSE: (Indicating.)

[13] MR. WUELLNER: We'd, again, be between the
 [14] actual tower, because it's closer to the road,
 [15] and the taxiway itself.

[16] In order to keep those development costs,
 [17] the infrastructure costs down, it would be our
 [18] recommendation that you cross-utilize the last
 [19] T-hangar access taxiway that was put in there and
 [20] use that as either an entrance or an egress
 [21] taxiway, and then just simply construct a single
 [22] taxiway to facilitate again either the ingress or
 [23] egress, depending on which way it makes sense to
 [24] make it flow, traffic flow, that is. Again,
 [25] about a 100 x 100 pad.

Page 61

[1] It also does a couple of side benefits.
 [2] It -- it allows someone to rapidly find the
 [3] location, as it is kind of synonymous in location
 [4] with the tower. So, it's going to be visible
 [5] from anyplace on the airport.

[6] It also provides another set of eyes that at
 [7] least can see that facility, if not monitor the
 [8] activity, but certainly identify an emergency or
 [9] some sort of problem that might happen at that
 [10] facility during the hours of operation of the
 [11] tower, anyway, and could even cut the time,
 [12] response time of firefighting or emergency
 [13] equipment to that site, should it become
 [14] necessary at some point.

[15] So, it's our belief that that probably
 [16] represents the best overall location on the
 [17] airport. It's also immediately adjacent to at
 [18] least one general aviation runway that will be --
 [19] those two runways will remain in a general
 [20] aviation capacity and more accommodating to
 [21] smaller aircraft versus 13/31. So, it's very
 [22] proximate to the users in this case also.

[23] Also, it's very visible for aircraft taking
 [24] off, landing, and arriving and departing and
 [25] taxiing. It's -- it should be very easy to find

Page 63

[1] thing as long as it -- there's significant --
 [2] there's enough market there, users to allow both
 [3] operations to be successful. That's a
 [4] determination the Authority would ultimately have
 [5] to make.

[6] In looking at -- looking over various sites,
 [7] there are -- it's not done the same way probably
 [8] anywhere. Many -- there are airports with one
 [9] FBO that are as big or bigger than we are in
 [10] terms of operations and do fine, but that
 [11] certainly requires that you have a strong
 [12] commitment from the FBO to be totally aware of
 [13] the needs of that local airport and the customers
 [14] that use it and be totally responsive to those
 [15] types of needs.

[16] And generally, that's been the case, at
 [17] least up until very recently. That's -- by all
 [18] appearances, there's been very little interest in
 [19] establishing a second FBO, because frankly, we've
 [20] had such a good FBO in the past, that most people
 [21] figured that was probably not worth the trouble
 [22] in developing.

[23] But nonetheless, I think it's a healthy
 [24] process that the Airport Authority from time to
 [25] time look at the necessity of a second FBO and --

Page 62

[1] on the airport as well.

[2] It also does another spinoff benefit, as
 [3] self-fueling doesn't -- as the name implies,
 [4] doesn't require an attendant on-site during the
 [5] operation, as such, makes av gas, anyway,
 [6] available on a 24-hour-a-day basis, and without
 [7] additional charges to come out and fuel the
 [8] aircraft and the like during the -- during off
 [9] hours or hours when the FBO would normally be
 [10] closed.

[11] The facility, at least under this proposal,
 [12] would only be av gas, would not facilitate jet,
 [13] nor is the facility being designed to accommodate
 [14] jets at this point, at least at that site. So,
 [15] we don't -- we don't expect any operation issues
 [16] with that, too.

[17] In regard to the question of second FBO --
 [18] and we asked the question, did it -- is a second
 [19] FBO necessary? And our conclusion is kind of
 [20] two-fold. Strictly speaking, no. A second FBO
 [21] is never really a requirement on -- on an
 [22] airport.

[23] However, fundamental capital beliefs and
 [24] market and the like tend to indicate that a
 [25] little bit of competition is probably a good

Page 64

[1] and make those determinations, without prejudice
 [2] to the existing one, even, but just making sure
 [3] that the existing FBO remains competitive and
 [4] responsive to the local community, as well as
 [5] those who are just simply accessing our
 [6] community.

[7] In short, it ends up basically a decision of
 [8] this board as to whether a second FBO should be
 [9] facilitated. But in the event it's determined
 [10] that a second FBO would be in the best interest
 [11] of the airport, there are several methods to
 [12] which we typically facilitate on, and three
 [13] methods I came up with pretty quick, and one
 [14] requires -- would require no public
 [15] capitalization; that is, there'd be no Airport
 [16] Authority dollars in its development.

[17] You know, as that implies, with no money in
 [18] it, also comes very little revenue back to the
 [19] Airport as a result of it, because you're
 [20] expecting that effectively that FBO developer to
 [21] come in and facilitate it, capitalize the entire
 [22] project, which by our estimates would probably
 [23] exceed a minimum investment of about \$3 million
 [24] to make it work.

[25] Other options include paying for it entirely

Page 65

[1] out of public dollars and leasing it at market
[2] value. Long term, that presents the best cash
[3] flow opportunities for the Airport Authority.

[4] Bad side there is, given that total of
[5] dollars needed to develop the project, it would
[6] likely take potentially upwards of five years to
[7] find all the capital dollars to -- on the DOT
[8] side to actually bring it into construction,
[9] which is not necessarily a bad thing.

[10] The other would be kind of a hybrid where
[11] you -- there's public investment in certain
[12] facilities on that FBO -- would be on that FBO
[13] leasehold, and as a result, you're going to
[14] require in the RFP process, a -- some sort of
[15] capital investment in the development of their
[16] FBO facility also.

[17] So, it kind of gives a hybrid location
[18] that's very similar to the way -- the situation
[19] we have with Aero Sport. There are certain
[20] buildings on their leasehold that are owned
[21] entirely by Aero Sport. There are also buildings
[22] on there that are entirely owned by the Airport
[23] Authority and which the Authority receives
[24] revenue from.

[25] So, it's -- that is probably as typical as

Page 66

[1] any, that and the total public capitalization
[2] where you are out effectively making the
[3] determination there's adequate market; you're
[4] willing to put the money up and make that
[5] facility -- put that facility in place and then
[6] concurrently or at least toward the latter stages
[7] of the development, you go out and say, "We've
[8] got a facility. This is what the rent's going to
[9] be. We're looking for an FBO," or, "This is what
[10] we expect from the FBO, not only from operating
[11] requirements, to hours of operation, but this is
[12] also what we believe to be the minimum fair rent
[13] for that; and if you're interested, submit a
[14] proposal related to that."

[15] So, as a result, I think the partial and
[16] total self-funded -- or public-funded probably
[17] makes the most sense from a revenue side. It --
[18] it probably has the best chance of success, too.

[19] In today's environment, it's very difficult
[20] or sometimes impossible for FBOs to capitalize
[21] facilities, certainly in the area of \$3 million,
[22] and especially if you were looking at relatively
[23] new or startup-type companies. That would be a
[24] pretty difficult nut to get out and get financed
[25] if you were trying to do that on the private

Page 67

[1] side.

[2] Again, the qualifications and all, that
[3] would be a function of an RFP that the Authority
[4] would develop over time. And again, depending on
[5] the method you use, you know, you might get
[6] partial funding over the next year or two and be
[7] able to, you know, joint that with someone else
[8] and get something in -- in the development stages
[9] over a couple of years here.

[10] If you wanted to do it entirely public, it
[11] could take outwards of five years by the time it
[12] works its way through the grant process from DOT
[13] and actually gets programmed and eventually
[14] funded and finally a project. A lot depends on
[15] the necessity that this board determines, if any,
[16] relative to a second FBO, and basically be fair
[17] about it, kind of dumps it back in your lap as to
[18] whether a second FBO is indeed necessary.

[19] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Ed, tell me, before we start
[20] our discussion -- this is a very comprehensive
[21] overview that you've given us, and I don't think
[22] any of us had seen it until just now.

[23] But what action do you -- are you looking
[24] for from the Board now or in the near future?
[25] What do you -- what do you -- what are you

Page 68

[1] looking for? What kind of decisions are you
[2] looking for us to make now?

[3] MR. WUELLNER: We are approximately -- I
[4] would think by the time your next meeting came
[5] about, that you'd be in a position, the grant
[6] documents would be executed and back to us, which
[7] would basically allow us to expend funds under
[8] that grant related to -- well, we would modify
[9] the grant description and provide for
[10] self-fueling.

[11] You'd be in a position about 30 days to
[12] award a contract for design, if you wanted to
[13] move that rapidly, although that would be
[14] entirely up to you guys again. If it's something
[15] you want to pursue, you know, again it still
[16] remains our recommendation that it be rolled into
[17] a second FBO in some foreseeable future.

[18] Now, that doesn't necessarily mean it has to
[19] be this year or two years or even five years down
[20] the road. I'm just -- I'm not too -- I'm not
[21] overly thrilled with the idea of the Airport
[22] Authority being in the fuel business long term,
[23] and a viable, you know, retailer of fuel.
[24] That -- I think that is not what our overall
[25] function long term should be.

Page 69

[1] But I think it's also not necessarily a bad
[2] move to get this kind of a project off dead
[3] center, capitalize it, get something in place.

[4] But I really would like to see that liability for
[5] future operations transferred to another FBO.

[6] And it wouldn't have -- another option
[7] that's out there for that is you wouldn't have to
[8] absolutely roll it into the second FBO. You
[9] would have the ability at that point to basically
[10] accept bids from the two FBOs as to which one
[11] wants to operate it. It wouldn't have to go only
[12] to the second FBO. It's just currently, the
[13] indications from the existing FBO are that
[14] they're not overly interested in doing it
[15] themselves.

[16] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Well, you're not looking for
[17] any action then today.

[18] MR. WUELLNER: Well, you tell me. I mean,
[19] I'm willing -- we can wait as long as you -- you
[20] want.

[21] CHAIRMAN ROSE: No. Well, I just think
[22] there's a lot here --

[23] MR. WUELLNER: The Pilots Association's on
[24] fire.

[25] CHAIRMAN ROSE: -- to think about.

Page 70

[1] MR. WUELLNER: I mean, they'd like to have
[2] it yesterday, but...

[3] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Okay. Well, let's open up
[4] to the public. Dan, this kind of follows up on
[5] what you were -- what you were talking about
[6] earlier. So, we'll put you back on the stand.

[7] MR. HOLIDAY: Again, Dan Holiday, St.
[8] Augustine, Florida. I -- I think I pretty much
[9] said it all when I was up here before, because I
[10] was trying to keep it as short as possible. So,
[11] basically, to recoup it, I believe that the time
[12] has come to have a self-fueling facility here.
[13] This particular one, I was amazed. That's the
[14] first time I've ever seen anything in an exhibit
[15] form at any of the fly-ins, and it's a pretty
[16] impressive operation.

[17] Whether or not you go that way, I don't
[18] know. It was just the first time I'd ever seen
[19] it, and knowing fully well that we were going to
[20] be up here today, I grabbed a brochure and talked
[21] with him for about a half an hour. I'm surprised
[22] he isn't here today, because he was very
[23] enthusiastic.

[24] That's -- that's about it, guys, gals. I
[25] don't know if you need to kick it around, but I

Page 71

[1] just really, really believe we should go forward
[2] with it as a community.

[3] I don't know how much in the -- that the
[4] Airport Authority has spent on the existing fuel
[5] farm, but it's certainly a lot of money that's
[6] spent over there on that fuel farm. I don't know
[7] if you have a number off the top of your head,
[8] Ed, but it's a bunch of money.

[9] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Thank you, Dan. Appreciate
[10] it. Appreciate your comment.

[11] MR. HOLIDAY: Okay? Have a nice day, kids.

[12] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Thank you very much. Yes,
[13] ma'am?

[14] MS. UPSON: Hi. I'm Marlene Upson, and I'm
[15] the comptroller at Aero Sport. And I just wanted
[16] to point out that in your consideration for
[17] developing self-service FBO, during the period of
[18] time that the Airport Authority would be
[19] operating this and at -- selling fuel in
[20] competition with Aero Sport, you would be in
[21] effect subsidizing the pilots who use the
[22] self-serve facility.

[23] Aero Sport pays the Authority as part of its
[24] monthly service a monthly rent -- excuse me, fee,
[25] 3 percent of gross fuel sales and 2 cents per

Page 72

[1] gallon for fuel farm maintenance, and that would
[2] all be not earned by the Airport Authority in
[3] this self-serve fuel scenario.

[4] So, in effect, you would be subsidizing the
[5] pilots who use the self-serve and denying the St.
[6] Johns County public that revenue to -- to
[7] subsidize the pilots. So, I just wanted to point
[8] that out to you, because I think that's something
[9] important to consider.

[10] I think the taxpayers have been talked to a
[11] lot about getting the Airport Authority off the
[12] tax roll. So, if you're taking their money to
[13] subsidize the end users to give them cheaper
[14] fuel, I think that's just something else that has
[15] to be weighed into the picture.

[16] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Thank you.

[17] MS. UPSON: Thanks.

[18] MR. WUELLNER: If you -- just responding to
[19] that, it was never the intention to -- that the
[20] Authority's fuel-flow policy would extend to the
[21] Authority's operation of it, too. It was always
[22] in the equation, in the '96 valuation of the
[23] costs.

[24] MR. FLEMING: Robert Fleming. I'm speaking
[25] as a pilot, but then also as a member of the

Page 73

[1] Pilots Association. One of the problems that I
 [2] think Aero Sport is experiencing now that they
 [3] don't realize are a lot of our pilots are not
 [4] buying fuel from them anyway at this point, so
 [5] that the Airport Authority is losing some of
 [6] those revenues already.

[7] Now, one of the things related to the
 [8] self-fuel facility -- and Wayne George is not
 [9] here -- but because of the number of members that
 [10] we have, one of the things that we had spoken
 [11] about, if there was some need for oversight
 [12] related to the facility, if that's what the Board
 [13] wants to do, is that you have a resource of
 [14] pilots that may be in a position to work with you
 [15] from the standpoint of some oversight from the
 [16] standpoint of liability. Thank you.

[17] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Okay. Thank you. Any other
 [18] comment?

[19] (No further public comment.)

[20] CHAIRMAN ROSE: I'll open it up for board
 [21] discussion.

[22] MR. WUELLNER: I would just --

[23] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Ed, do you want to make any
 [24] other comment?

[25] MR. WUELLNER: I would just offer that at no

Page 74

[1] point during the discussions or requests that I'm
 [2] aware of, has anybody requested or even suggested
 [3] that fuel in any form or fashion be subsidized or
 [4] be sold at something less than what it -- what a
 [5] market condition would be for that.

[6] And it -- it would not make much sense for
 [7] the Authority to go in there and basically offer
 [8] it at cost. And I don't think anybody out there
 [9] actually, you know, made that request and is
 [10] looking for us to do anything that would not make
 [11] financial sense.

[12] CHAIRMAN ROSE: I think the only position
 [13] we're in, that issue's been raised and it's just
 [14] something that we need to keep in mind and be
 [15] sure that we address. Any comments, now? Joe,
 [16] you want to start?

[17] MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah, if anybody wants to get
 [18] a sandwich, it would be a good time now, because
 [19] I've got a lot on my mind. First off, I am not
 [20] against a self-service facility. I'm not against
 [21] that. It might seem it's that way, but I'm not.

[22] In lieu of what Mr. Fleming and Mr. Holiday
 [23] said, I was under the same situation up north. I
 [24] had my airplane based at Beaver County Airport,
 [25] and Columbiana County, which is just about as far

Page 75

[1] as from here to Bunnell, sold gasoline about 20
 [2] cents a gallon cheaper. And instead of
 [3] supporting my home base, I took my plane down to
 [4] Columbiana and filled it up with gas because it
 [5] was cheaper.

[6] But -- and Mr. Fleming made a point about
 [7] some of the pilots already go down there or other
 [8] places. A lot of them -- or not a lot of them,
 [9] but some of them I know use auto glass in their
 [10] airplanes, so Aero Sport's losing this.

[11] But I wonder if Aero Sport could give me an
 [12] idea of how many transient gallons flow through
 [13] here in round numbers, because that's really what
 [14] you're talking about.

[15] If you put a self-service fuel facility out
 [16] here, and pilots coming in -- they may not do it
 [17] the first time they come in here, they may taxi
 [18] right up to Aero Sport, but they're going to find
 [19] out that you have a self-service facility here,
 [20] selling gas X number of cents cheaper than them,
 [21] and all the transient sales -- not all, but most
 [22] all of the transient sales will be going to the
 [23] self-fuel facility to save the 20 or 30 cents a
 [24] gallon.

[25] So, every gallon of gas you syphon away from

Page 76

[1] Aero Sport on the transient pilots, which are
 [2] numerous, you're going to take away from them.
 [3] So, you're going to take away the, what,
 [4] approximately 8 cents a gallon total we get from
 [5] you guys? Or whatever. You're going to take
 [6] away that out of your kitty, because they're
 [7] going to lose that business.

[8] So, one of my questions is: How much do you
 [9] think -- do you have a wild guess at how much per
 [10] gallon that we would make if we did this facility
 [11] for you're saying up to five years? And once you
 [12] get started, you'll probably never get rid of it.
 [13] But are you going to make double what Aero Sport
 [14] would pay us? Because you're going to have to do
 [15] that to make up the difference you're going to
 [16] lose from the people syphoning business away from
 [17] them.

[18] MR. WUELLNER: You're actually asking --
 [19] there are two separate issues. The fuel flowage
 [20] fee would be identical to that of Aero Sport, so
 [21] whether it's pumped here or pumped somewhere else
 [22] on the airport, even if it -- even if -- and
 [23] we've had those requests, some of our corporate
 [24] operators establishing their own fuel facilities.
 [25] Not open for business, nothing like that, but

Page 77

[1] just for their own, which is something we can
[2] regulate but can't prevent. They would be
[3] subject to the same fuel flowage fee. There's --
[4] there's no disparity or no -- no separation
[5] between us and them in terms of that flowage fee.

[6] Now, if you're asking what the actual profit
[7] per gallon or whatever that would be, that's
[8] going to be a function of where this board sets
[9] the retail price of it and what profit margin
[10] they consider -- would consider acceptable, which
[11] are things beyond where we are today with it,
[12] so...

[13] MR. CIRIELLO: I'm not sure if I understand
[14] what you said. Let's say you and I are both
[15] flying, and you land and I land right behind you,
[16] and you taxi up to Aero Sport and fill up some
[17] gas, and I think well, hey, I'm going to get gas
[18] over here cheaper, so I go over here and get the
[19] gas cheaper. So, that 50 gallon of gas I would
[20] have got if I followed you, Aero Sport's losing
[21] and we're losing 8 cents a gallon. You're --
[22] you're saying --

[23] MR. WUELLNER: No. We're not losing 8 cents
[24] a gallon from anyone. We get the 8 cents a
[25] gallon at our pump, their pump, anybody else on

Page 78

[1] the airport that pumps gas. We get the 8 cents a
[2] gallon regardless of whether we own it or are
[3] just simply --

[4] MR. CIRIELLO: Okay. I think I see where --
[5] CHAIRMAN ROSE: I -- I don't think we want
[6] to get into a -- into a detailed --

[7] MR. CIRIELLO: Well, okay.

[8] CHAIRMAN ROSE: No, Joe. We're talking
[9] about the concept, and if we want to go ahead
[10] with it, then you need to get the answer to --

[11] MR. CIRIELLO: Well, I'm trying to get to
[12] that. Now, that was one of my points, that --
[13] why I don't -- you know, I'm not too happy about
[14] it. But then the other thing -- what the hell
[15] was it? Let me see.

[16] Oh, this gentleman that Mr. Holiday gave you
[17] the brochure for, is there any reason that maybe
[18] you couldn't contact this guy personally and see
[19] if maybe we could have a workshop and he come
[20] down here and present his proposal to us? And it
[21] might be an easy, cheap way to go, so that we
[22] could think about that.

[23] MR. WUELLNER: Well, regardless, you would
[24] have to put the facility on the airport using
[25] competitive bidding. And there would be no

Page 79

[1] reasonable reason for this guy to come down here
[2] with the expect --

[3] MR. CIRIELLO: What, you just can't award it
[4] to him?

[5] MR. WUELLNER: No.

[6] MR. CIRIELLO: I had some other things.

[7] Okay. Now, the Chairman said we're here to
[8] try to make a decision whether to go ahead or not
[9] with this thing. And like I said earlier, we're
[10] putting the cart before the horse. You've
[11] already got the money allotted in that Proposal A
[12] or whatever.

[13] Now, I can't see going any further with even
[14] thinking of doing it until we get a definite
[15] person, persons or whatever, to say they will
[16] operate this thing. Because I don't think the
[17] Authority wants to get into one or two or five
[18] years and operate it until we can find somebody.
[19] I think we need to find somebody first. I don't
[20] think this is one of those cases if you build it,
[21] they'll come.

[22] Now, I -- I'm not unhappy with the idea, and
[23] I'm not against it or anything, but I would like
[24] to see something firm in hand that's going to be
[25] operated before we expend any money towards doing

Page 80

[1] it one way or another. And if we don't have
[2] that, then I'm not going to be for it.

[3] I'll probably think of other things later,
[4] but go ahead. I think I've got my point across.

[5] MR. LASSITER: Okay. My turn? Ed, I don't
[6] want to get into -- I'm going to talk in
[7] generalities here. You had indicated in your
[8] opening statement that the FBO operator, the
[9] present one, was not interested in his business
[10] plan to fit this in. Was this due to the low
[11] profit margin of his, or can you give me an idea
[12] why they're not interested at all in this?

[13] MR. WUELLNER: They did not detail it in the
[14] conversation we had.

[15] MR. LASSITER: Okay. Okay. Having said
[16] that -- and this touches on what Joe was
[17] saying -- but it's obvious that as an agency, if
[18] we run it, we expect a profit out of it, as we do
[19] any other facility that we operate or own or
[20] lease or whatever the case.

[21] If it's able to -- if the present FBO
[22] operator does not provide the service and it's
[23] demanded by the group here that uses the airport,
[24] then it's something we -- we in essence should
[25] look at and provide, but provide at a profit.

Page 81

[1] MR. WUELLNER: Absolutely.

[2] MR. LASSITER: And I think that given a cap

[3] rate of 10 percent on \$165,000, we should look at

[4] least at, you know, \$16,500 a year profit above

[5] the flowage fee.

[6] I don't know what kind of numbers we're

[7] talking about as far as flowage, but I think that

[8] this is a service that if the FBO operator does

[9] not want to provide and it is provided at a

[10] multitude of other facilities, then we do need to

[11] look at it, because as it's stated, there's

[12] definitely already a loss to the airport of

[13] people who go elsewhere to fuel their planes; and

[14] therefore, we're losing that 8 cents before they

[15] even come up to -- they use our facility and go

[16] and buy their gas somewhere else. So, I think we

[17] need to look at that.

[18] I have a quick question. When talking about

[19] the FBO, if we put the fueling station and the

[20] FBO takes care of it, I know in the past there

[21] was a big question as to where the facilities for

[22] the second FBO would be placed. Are you looking

[23] in that area as well, in the fueling area that

[24] you're talking about?

[25] MR. WUELLNER: In the absence of revising

Page 83

[1] this single dimension --

[2] MR. WUELLNER: Basically a management

[3] contract?

[4] MR. LASSITER: Yes. Exactly.

[5] MR. WUELLNER: I don't believe there's

[6] anything to prevent that at this point.

[7] MR. LASSITER: Okay. So, that's --

[8] MR. WUELLNER: That's another thing that

[9] could be developed.

[10] MR. LASSITER: -- a potential -- okay. I

[11] think that's my first question. I probably will

[12] have more. I think as -- as Bill had said, that

[13] I think this is a concept that we really are

[14] going to have to look strongly at.

[15] It's obvious that the pilots are demanding

[16] this, and I think rightfully so. I think

[17] competition is one of these things where if

[18] something is way out of whack in pricing, then

[19] that is what you need to bring it into control.

[20] MR. WATTS: Ed, question: On this -- on the

[21] fueling, has -- have you looked at permits or

[22] even thought about permits for like fuel-spill

[23] containment and things of that nature? I know

[24] there the EPA is pretty hot and heavy on that,

[25] so...

Page 82

[1] the master plan, which you're going to do over

[2] the next -- well, starting in about a year,

[3] you -- you know, I'd be hard-pressed to find a

[4] location that I was 100 percent sure would

[5] ultimately be a second FBO location on the

[6] airport.

[7] What I am comfortable with is this location

[8] would not be it, in that it's a very limited site

[9] and also cuts off access to much of the area

[10] we're acquiring today. So, it -- short of

[11] developing a whole new area and all the

[12] infrastructure that would go with it, this is

[13] probably the best site.

[14] MR. LASSITER: I'm not really in favor of a

[15] second FBO at this time, unless somebody can give

[16] me a compelling reason. I think we're -- to

[17] supply fuel for the pilots is not a compelling

[18] reason to -- to look at it, although I understand

[19] that the -- the Authority does not want to be a

[20] single-dimension provider of services. They'd

[21] rather run the airport and provide all of it.

[22] But again, in something that was brought up

[23] by Joe earlier where you said that we could not

[24] bring another FBO per se in there, is it possible

[25] to bring someone in as pure operations of just

Page 84

[1] MR. WUELLNER: We did a -- something we

[2] didn't attempt to revise for this discussion, but

[3] in '96, we did a fairly detailed, lack of better

[4] terms, spreadsheet that looked at the cost of

[5] everything from insurance to capitalizing it to

[6] operating costs of the facility, fuel flowage

[7] fee, plugged in the retail prices, taxes,

[8] wholesale pricing, plugged all of that in and

[9] basically ran -- it runs kind of as a model in a

[10] sense and gave you some snapshots at, I believe

[11] it was 50,000 gallon increments. My memory may

[12] not be quite correct on that. But starting at

[13] 50,000, or 10,000, and went to 50-, then a

[14] hundred, a hundred fifty, 2-, 250, based on the

[15] number of gallons, moved through the facility,

[16] what -- you know, what would need to be moved

[17] through the facility in order for the thing to

[18] effectively pay for itself.

[19] And the number was somewhere -- if my

[20] memory's correct, somewhere between 50- and

[21] 75,000 gallons of fuel on an annual basis

[22] generated a profit and -- you know, and certainly

[23] capitalized and covered all of the operating

[24] expenses.

[25] And obviously, the more that you move

Page 85

[1] through the facility, the better the profit
 [2] potential on it at any given retail price.
 [3] It also looked at what would -- the model
 [4] determined that if you were to effectively cover
 [5] all your costs at different flowage levels, what
 [6] would be the minimum retail price you could
 [7] accept on the facility and meet those -- those
 [8] numbers?
 [9] I mean, we'd be more than happy to, you
 [10] know, redress that model, effectively plug in
 [11] today's numbers. There are only a few pieces of
 [12] information we'd be missing, one being, you know,
 [13] more current reflection of wholesale price today;
 [14] you know, verify the taxes are effectively the
 [15] same per gallon; revise and get requoted on
 [16] insurance-related costs so that we have a good
 [17] idea of what those actual -- those actual costs
 [18] are; plug those back in; and you can literally
 [19] generate your profit numbers based on a
 [20] percentage or whatever you want to use in the
 [21] scenario.
 [22] But it gave a real nice snapshot of what it
 [23] was. And I think initially, it was just going to
 [24] take so many gallons pumped that were beyond --
 [25] it was nearly -- I'm trying to remember back that

Page 87

[1] contract and -- not construction contract -- an
 [2] engineering agreement to develop construction
 [3] documents? Is that too fast? Do you want to
 [4] wait, make these determinations, make them
 [5] concurrently, make one, then go to the next?
 [6] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Ed, I think what this board
 [7] would like to do is have an opportunity to take
 [8] your report and study it in a little more detail
 [9] after listening to your explanation, and if we
 [10] have any questions, we can come out and talk to
 [11] you about it.
 [12] And then I'd like to be in a position at the
 [13] next meeting to give you some direction as to
 [14] whether we want to go ahead or whether we don't,
 [15] or, you know, just kind of give you the overview.
 [16] MR. WUELLNER: That's fine.
 [17] CHAIRMAN ROSE: How does the Board feel
 [18] about that? I just don't think we're ready to do
 [19] that today.
 [20] MR. CIRIELLO: Well, no. But I have another
 [21] question for Ed.
 [22] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Well, I'll get to them.
 [23] MR. CIRIELLO: Okay. Earlier, I mentioned
 [24] about just a fueling facility, and I think you
 [25] said the minimum standards says that right now,

Page 86

[1] far, but I thought it was somewhere like 75 or 80
 [2] percent of the existing general aviation market
 [3] in order to make the facility generate any sort
 [4] of profit back to the Airport Authority, which
 [5] was -- which obviously was silly. But at the
 [6] time, there was just a very small margin between
 [7] what full service and self-service above cost, it
 [8] was a very, very thin margin. It was less than
 [9] 25 cents a gallon.
 [10] Now those numbers are 50 cents or more a
 [11] gallon. And, you know, the total dollars -- or
 [12] total number of gallons needed to be pumped is
 [13] much less in that scenario than it was in 1996.
 [14] It makes a whole lot more -- I think it
 [15] financially makes a whole lot more sense today
 [16] than it does then. Well, this -- this is the '96
 [17] one Bryan found, but you get the idea of what was
 [18] all plugged in there and what those -- what those
 [19] were. But we could certainly update -- as I
 [20] said, update it with today's numbers. We'll
 [21] bring that back to you at next meeting.
 [22] I guess the direction I'm just really trying
 [23] to find out is: How quickly do you want to move
 [24] these things? Do you want us to be in place next
 [25] month to be able to approve a construction

Page 88

[1] we don't allow that. And I think you mentioned
 [2] in here that it'd take a second FBO around \$3
 [3] million investment to come in here for being an
 [4] FBO, including fuel and everything else.
 [5] So -- and then you said we just couldn't
 [6] award this thing to that man there, that it'd
 [7] have to be put up for bid. So, if you put it out
 [8] for bid, and it's going to take somebody \$3
 [9] million, they might look the other way.
 [10] But if we -- can we change the minimum
 [11] standards just for this one particular item and
 [12] make it just a self-fuel facility on its own and
 [13] then put it out for bid in that light, then maybe
 [14] you'd get more action on it.
 [15] MR. WUELLNER: You have the ability to do
 [16] what you want. I mean, it may or may not be
 [17] popular at the time you do it, but you can
 [18] certainly amend your Minimum Operating Standards
 [19] at any time you choose.
 [20] MR. CIRIELLO: And then like I said earlier,
 [21] that until we have somebody that's willing to
 [22] take this thing over, run with it, I'm not going
 [23] to vote yes on anything.
 [24] CHAIRMAN ROSE: We have a couple of people.
 [25] Dan -- no. Yeah. Come on up. And then Dan.

Page 89

[1] Are you going to talk, or is she talking?
 [2] MS. ANDERSON: I'm Tracine Anderson, the
 [3] general manager. And I just wanted to say that
 [4] we're not totally opposed to running the
 [5] self-serve. There was just many issues involved
 [6] in this.

[7] A big part of our cost is our operational
 [8] cost with employees and going back and forth. If
 [9] everybody over there decides to use the
 [10] self-fueling, where we would not have to go back
 [11] and forth with trucks and extra personnel, that's
 [12] a different scenario. Whose insurance is it
 [13] going to be under? There's many questions that
 [14] we had.

[15] We also had talked about maybe the Pilots
 [16] Association buying some bulk fuel and storing it
 [17] in our tanks, where if they prebought this fuel,
 [18] we could offer a totally different price. And
 [19] again, that would be, you know, considered of if
 [20] we're going over there to fuel or if they're
 [21] coming onto our facility to fuel.

[22] I mean, we're -- we're not opposed to
 [23] looking at this a little bit further. And we're
 [24] definitely not opposed to a self-serve facility.
 [25] I mean, they're all over the state and they are

Page 91

[1] 150 gallons a day.

[2] Also, when I first started flying at Aero
 [3] Sport, there was a pump out front, right out
 [4] front (indicating), and it was Aero Sport's pump.
 [5] And Lord knows, I don't know how to run an FBO,
 [6] but I'll tell you something: If I was an FBO and
 [7] I had the chance to have this kind of facility,
 [8] self, I would keep that, because not everybody
 [9] wants to run up and pump their own gas. There's
 [10] a tremendous amount of people who aren't running
 [11] around in Navahos and Chieftains and everything
 [12] else that's -- that want the full service. But
 [13] that's why I don't believe in my own heart that
 [14] this is anti-Aero Sport. It's pro progress and
 [15] it's pro doing something.

[16] We can sit on our hands. This Airport
 [17] Authority can sit on its hands and do nothing and
 [18] sit around and nitpick. And Charlie's been on
 [19] the board with me. Well, I don't nitpick. I
 [20] just hit it right between the eyes. No sweet
 [21] stuff. And it's that simple.

[22] We really need to act, make a decision,
 [23] stick with it. Because you're losing money every
 [24] day, guys going down there (indicating). And
 [25] also, it's 5 cents cheaper at New Smyrna, and

Page 90

[1] needed.

[2] But we just -- we just wanted to have more
 [3] answers as to what everybody is looking for,
 [4] because it is a big expense to take the trucks
 [5] back and forth, and also an operational, you
 [6] know, on Ed's part as far as us driving across
 [7] the ramp, too.

[8] But we are open. We're not totally opposed
 [9] to it.

[10] CHAIRMAN ROSE: All right. Thank you.

[11] MS. ANDERSON: I just wanted to let you know
 [12] that.

[13] MR. HOLIDAY: I'll leave the other glasses
 [14] on. You're talking 50,000 gallons, Ed? You were
 [15] referring to a number of 50,000 gallons a minute
 [16] ago?

[17] MR. WUELLNER: I was generically referring
 [18] to --

[19] MR. LASSITER: '96.

[20] MR. HOLIDAY: Which -- which really breaks
 [21] down to kind of an interesting number, which my
 [22] cohort -- that's a thousand pumps or three a day
 [23] of 50 gallons.

[24] You started -- you started saying that
 [25] that -- that's not a lot of fuel per day. It's

Page 92

[1] it's 10 cents cheaper at -- now, I don't know,
 [2] because I've never purchased fuel at Kissimmee,
 [3] but I understand it's \$1.95 in Kissimmee.
 [4] Everybody says, "Well, how can they do it?"
 [5] Well, somebody must be doing it.

[6] CHAIRMAN ROSE: All right. Thank you, Dan.

[7] MR. HOLIDAY: Thank you, Bill.

[8] CHAIRMAN ROSE: All right. Gentlemen, I
 [9] think -- I think what we will do is ask our
 [10] director to put this issue on the agenda at the
 [11] next meeting, and in the meantime, each of us
 [12] let's look into it, talk to Ed if you need to.
 [13] Just don't talk among ourselves, or Cindy will
 [14] come get you. But let's -- let's try to provide
 [15] some direction to Ed next week (sic), okay?

[16] MR. CIRIELLO: Next month.

[17] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Next month, excuse me. Next
 [18] month. Thank you, sir. Shall we move on?
 [19] The -- let's see. Oh, I., item I., 7.I.,
 [20] service -- services access.

[21] 7.I. - SERVICES ACCESS TO THE AIRFIELD

[22] MR. WUELLNER: We've had requests for people
 [23] to access facilities, public facilities at the
 [24] airport for the purposes of providing services
 [25] that are not otherwise provided or are not

Page 93

[1] exclusively controlled under FBO-type agreements.
 [2] And it's not specifically addressed in our
 [3] lease-related policy, because it kind of falls
 [4] out -- outside the guidelines of lease in this
 [5] particular case.

[6] They're not aviation items where they're
 [7] subject to the minimum standards for -- for
 [8] public services, but we felt like we probably
 [9] needed to run that by the Authority here and get
 [10] some general agreement for us to be able to
 [11] negotiate on a case-by-case basis some sort of
 [12] use agreement, something that formalizes their
 [13] access relationship to the airport before that
 [14] ends up creating a problem long term with people
 [15] just showing up and conducting business without,
 [16] one, any benefit to the Authority, and certainly
 [17] outside of any control the Authority might wish
 [18] to exert, so that before this becomes a problem
 [19] long term, is sort of nip it in the bud and --
 [20] and develop some -- some direction to -- for
 [21] Staff related to these types of requirements.

[22] And it was our recommendation to you that
 [23] you allow us to develop, and obviously with
 [24] consultation with our attorney, some sort of a
 [25] use agreement as appropriate to the nature of the

Page 95

[1] to these particular requests. Kind of like our
 [2] base lease agreement, and it ends up being --

[3] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Charlie?

[4] MR. LASSITER: I just think that the idea of
 [5] being more or less the gatekeeper on service
 [6] provided on the airport is good; we control it
 [7] then and we don't let it get out of hand. I
 [8] think it's a great idea.

[9] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Would you like a motion as
 [10] to --

[11] MR. WUELLNER: I think that would probably
 [12] be a good idea.

[13] MR. CIRIELLO: I got a question to ask. I
 [14] thought maybe Dennis was going to say something.

[15] Aero Sport's sitting there, but it says
 [16] here, "You have been approached by...so
 [17] forth...related services using the terminal
 [18] facilities."

[19] My only question is: Would this infringe
 [20] upon any area that the FBO has covered under
 [21] their leasehold? Would you have to get their
 [22] permission, too?

[23] MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, I wish it were that
 [24] simple to -- to answer. But as things are,
 [25] they're always more difficult than you hope.

Page 94

[1] request that's being made for the facilitation of
 [2] minor services to aircraft users.

[3] I mean, there -- there are a number of those
 [4] types of scenarios out there that are not
 [5] exclusively covered by FBO. And they range from
 [6] people wanting to do signoffs on annual
 [7] inspections to aircraft, that right now could
 [8] wander in and do that as they see fit. You have
 [9] people cleaning, polishing, and doing other
 [10] things to airplanes.

[11] There are just any number of services that
 [12] could be provided that aren't exclusive in
 [13] nature. We haven't given some exact privilege or
 [14] specific privilege to only a specific vendor on
 [15] the airport. And as such, that's the nature of
 [16] what we're asking to do here.

[17] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Are you proposing that --
 [18] that we ask you to develop a policy or a set of
 [19] guidelines for our staff to follow when --

[20] MR. WUELLNER: Basically we're asking to
 [21] develop --

[22] CHAIRMAN ROSE: -- vendors need services?

[23] MR. WUELLNER: -- an agreement of some sort,
 [24] be generic in nature in its initial, but we'd
 [25] have to -- it will be more specific when you get

Page 96

[1] You have a public access requirement, public
 [2] use and benefit and public access requirement
 [3] that goes with operations such as the FBO. So,
 [4] regardless of the fact that an operating area
 [5] might be under an FBO lease, it has to be made
 [6] available to the public. That doesn't mean that
 [7] they can't assess -- or assess a charge for the
 [8] use or something along that line, but it does
 [9] have to be made available to the public openly
 [10] and equally.

[11] So, I guess getting to it, there are areas
 [12] within the terminal area as an example that
 [13] are -- we hold exclusive right to; that is, it's
 [14] the Authority's property. It's public clearly.
 [15] It's accessible to anyone without interference
 [16] from a tenant. It's common area, if you want to
 [17] call it that. That includes parking lot.
 [18] Probably a majority, if you looked at the square
 [19] footage of the terminal itself, is outside of the
 [20] actual formal lease arrangements with the FBO.

[21] But there are areas that are leased
 [22] exclusively to the FBO that are -- you know, we
 [23] would not allow another FBO to come on, for
 [24] instance, the apron and conduct FBO operations
 [25] with on what is their leasehold.

Page 97

[1] Now, that doesn't mean that somebody who's
 [2] conducting something that's not exclusive, a
 [3] privilege that's been granted to the FBO, could
 [4] have equal access to that apron area, because
 [5] it's not something that's been given the
 [6] privilege by the Airport Authority through a
 [7] lease agreement to them. And I identified a
 [8] handful of those types of items.
 [9] And, you know, some are more -- are very
 [10] intermittent, maybe a one-time request. Other
 [11] times, you know, it's somebody wanting to conduct
 [12] or have access routinely. And, yes, you know,
 [13] you wouldn't want -- no more than a second FBO in
 [14] this scenario would want Aero Sport coming,
 [15] conducting business at their -- on their
 [16] leasehold.
 [17] So, things that are exclusive to FBO, and
 [18] you've granted specific privileges within the
 [19] lease agreements for, those are not items we're
 [20] talking about, such, as an example, the right to
 [21] fuel an airplane is a privilege that's given in
 [22] the lease agreement if it's done on their
 [23] leasehold. Only Aero Sport could do that, unless
 [24] they acquiesced and allowed someone to do that.
 [25] But there are items that are ancillary in nature

Page 99

[1] today, basically lifting the storage-only
 [2] requirement that has been placed in the lease
 [3] agreements over there, and thereby allowing the
 [4] use of facilities for other aviation-related
 [5] uses. As the example in case Regency Electric
 [6] would like to be able to use their aircraft in
 [7] charter, periodically. It's not anything that's
 [8] high volume.
 [9] Currently, we've made provisions to
 [10] accommodate SK over there. They have a
 [11] requirement in their lease that requires them to
 [12] pick those people up at the terminal area. But
 [13] obviously, that -- that costs a fair amount of
 [14] money to do that. But that kept the use
 [15] consistent in that area. But SK, as an example,
 [16] is moving to a different area of the airport
 [17] where we have not placed that limitation on the
 [18] property.
 [19] So, all we're -- we've checked with what is
 [20] amounts to the only other use in the area that is
 [21] not operating under some waiver, if you will,
 [22] which is Future First over there, and they had no
 [23] problem at all in allowing, you know, that --
 [24] that requirement to be lifted and interposed no
 [25] objection to it, and as such, as long as it's

Page 98

[1] that aren't covered.
 [2] CHAIRMAN ROSE: I understand. Any other
 [3] comment? I'll entertain a motion to approve
 [4] stack -- Staff recommendation on 7., let's see
 [5] here, 7.I.
 [6] MR. LASSITER: I make that motion,
 [7] Mr. Chairman.
 [8] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Is there a second? No
 [9] second.
 [10] MR. WATTS: Oh, I'm sorry. I second.
 [11] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Oh, okay. Motion's been
 [12] made and seconded. And all in favor?
 [13] MR. CIRIELLO: Aye.
 [14] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Aye.
 [15] MR. LASSITER: Aye.
 [16] MR. WATTS: Aye.
 [17] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Opposed?
 [18] (No opposition.)
 [19] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Motion's carried.
 [20] MR. WUELLNER: Okay. Last --
 [21] CHAIRMAN ROSE: 7.J.
 [22] 7.J. - REGENCY AVIATION USE MODIFICATION
 [23] MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. The last item I have
 [24] for you is a request to change the approved uses
 [25] within the eastside corporate area, as it's known

Page 100

[1] being uniformly applied, I really don't care.
 [2] CHAIRMAN ROSE: So, you need board
 [3] approval --
 [4] MR. WUELLNER: I think we do to lift that
 [5] restriction in the eastside corporate area and
 [6] allow --
 [7] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Is there any public comment?
 [8] (No public comment.)
 [9] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Any questions or comment by
 [10] the Authority members?
 [11] MR. LASSITER: Yes. Ed, will there be some
 [12] kind of threshold control that you'll still
 [13] maintain over this?
 [14] MR. WUELLNER: Well, we still have to
 [15] negotiate the actual lease agreement related to
 [16] the expansion that would allow this to happen.
 [17] But, yeah, we're -- obviously, we're going --
 [18] they're still subject to the op -- the Minimum
 [19] Operating Standards. It's just they -- in that
 [20] case, they would easily meet the minimums
 [21] required as a result of the leasehold development
 [22] there.
 [23] MR. LASSITER: Okay. But this is not just
 [24] opening the gate.
 [25] MR. WUELLNER: No, no, no. It's just simply

Page 101

[1] we had a storage-only requirement, that when
[2] we -- we kind of made promises to Regency, as
[3] well as everybody else in there, that it was
[4] going to be remain corporate in nature and not be
[5] subject to more traffic in that immediate area as
[6] a result.

[7] Since that time, they've all kind of said,
[8] "Well, we'd kind of like to do other things. Now
[9] that we're here, now, can we --" you know, "Is it
[10] possible to change that -- that storage-only
[11] requirement to allow us to do other aviation?"

[12] As long as they don't care, I'm not sure we
[13] really should.

[14] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Any discussion?

[15] MR. WUELLNER: As long as it's being done
[16] safely, obviously.

[17] CHAIRMAN ROSE: I'll entertain a motion to
[18] approve resolution on item 7.J.

[19] MR. CIRIELLO: Okay. I'll motion.

[20] CHAIRMAN ROSE: And a second?

[21] MR. WATTS: Second.

[22] CHAIRMAN ROSE: All in favor?

[23] MR. CIRIELLO: Aye.

[24] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Aye.

[25] MR. LASSITER: Aye.

Page 102

[1] MR. WATTS: Aye.

[2] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Motion is carried. Ed, that
[3] concludes your business?

[4] MR. WUELLNER: Yes, sir.

[5] 8. - Authority Members

[6] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Well, we'll -- we have an
[7] opportunity now to reach the Authority members to
[8] comment.

[9] The only thing I want to say on this
[10] business of the -- of the self-service fuel
[11] operation, I've been on a lot of boards in my
[12] day, and I've seen a lot of public agencies try
[13] to do private work, and it doesn't work. And if
[14] you've got a retail private business, it ought to
[15] be run by an entrepreneur that's interested in
[16] making that business go.

[17] I've been through that on several boards,
[18] and I wouldn't want to go through it again here.
[19] I think we need to be sure we -- as far as I'm
[20] concerned, we ought to be in the -- headed in the
[21] direction of having any fueling operation managed
[22] and controlled and operated by private
[23] enterprise.

[24] And with that, you're up, Mr. Watts.

[25] MR. WATTS: I just -- am I allowed to ask

Page 103

[1] one more question to Mr. Wuellner?

[2] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Well, you can try.

[3] MR. WATTS: Okay. Have we -- and going with
[4] what our illustrious chairman said here, have we
[5] been approached by any FBOs at all? I know we
[6] haven't -- and I'm sure you haven't been
[7] soliciting, but I know --

[8] MR. WUELLNER: Over the years that I've been
[9] here, yes, by several companies interested in it.
[10] We provide Minimum Operating Standards to them,
[11] and in those cases, we were in no position to
[12] capitalize anything, as we had not programmed
[13] anything for those kind of things.

[14] When they look at meeting minimum standards
[15] and the fact that they've got to capitalize the
[16] whole thing, most of them disappear in that it
[17] doesn't make much sense for them to go through.

[18] The other requirement we've had is that
[19] effectively, they need -- have had to prove to
[20] us, both staff and at -- and board level, the
[21] ability for a second FBO to be accomplished on
[22] the airport to the -- to the point where it's not
[23] a detriment to the overall airport; basically
[24] make them prove the market exists before just
[25] willy-nilly allowing, you know, five other FBOs

Page 104

[1] to develop. That -- that didn't make long-term
[2] sense to the airport.

[3] If they could establish there's a market and
[4] customer base there and then prove to us their
[5] ability to be profitable and be a long-term
[6] viable tenant of the airport, then I -- any of
[7] those would have moved forward. But so far, they
[8] usually stop well short of even beginning that
[9] process.

[10] MR. WATTS: Thank you.

[11] MR. WUELLNER: If that answers your
[12] question.

[13] MR. WATTS: Yes.

[14] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Charles?

[15] MR. LASSITER: I just have a comment again.
[16] I think I said it last month. I think that we
[17] have an FBO operator here. And we've heard
[18] interest today about this self-fueling.

[19] I think the pilots would like to see this
[20] thing happen, and I think they're right. I think
[21] we need to provide services for them. That's
[22] what we're here for. And I think we need to do
[23] it as expeditiously as possible, but at the same
[24] time, giving some preferential to let them move
[25] ahead and get their questions answered, if

[1] they'll take it. If not, then we need to go out
[2] and find somebody to run it.

[3] And I agree with your comment about private
[4] enterprise. I think it definitely is something,
[5] when there's a motive there to make a profit,
[6] there's always a strong will to do it right.

[7] MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. I would say you may --
[8] it may be difficult to just develop such a
[9] facility and turn it over to a -- to an operator
[10] outside, because it's not covered currently by
[11] your existing lease agreement. And my concern
[12] is --

[13] MR. LASSITER: There's Cindy here.

[14] MR. WUELLNER: You may need to develop a --
[15] lack of better terms -- an RFP or something that
[16] says, "Look, we're going to put this facility in.
[17] It's going to be like this. Looking for folks to
[18] either lease or manage it. Submit your proposal,
[19] and we'll go from there."

[20] CHAIRMAN ROSE: That's why we have such a
[21] highly skilled staff and an attorney that can
[22] work with us and see that these things happen.

[23] MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, I see where this is
[24] going.

[25] MR. LASSITER: I think that's well under

[1] your purview. You have the ability and
[2] direction.

[3] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Okay. Mr. Ciriello?

[4] MR. CIRIELLO: I get to speak?

[5] CHAIRMAN ROSE: You get to speak.

[6] MR. CIRIELLO: Okay. Something has been
[7] bugging me for many, many years. Not just
[8] recently. But getting the packets for the
[9] Airport Authority month after month after month,
[10] financials were not available at this time. Now,
[11] I can't understand, unless there's some ruling or
[12] law or something it has to be done that way, why
[13] the finances month to month has to go through the
[14] accountant who is where, in Timbuktu someplace.

[15] So, the organization I belonged to once as a
[16] treasurer, the financial reports from month to
[17] month, you go and you say: "We had X number of
[18] dollars in our checking account as of the end of
[19] the month," say last month, March. "We have sent
[20] out bills totaling so many checks for so much
[21] money. We paid so much. We brought in so much
[22] on revenue. And our balance is this." And it
[23] was simple as that.

[24] So, I don't know why we can't get monthly
[25] financial reports from our own people on what our

[1] business is from month to month to month and why
[2] we have to send all that information to this
[3] attorney -- or accountant, wherever he's at, and
[4] then wait for him to come back.

[5] And then you've got three weeks almost from
[6] the time this meeting's over till the next
[7] meeting, and it's always late. And I don't
[8] understand. Unless there's some justification
[9] that it's -- why it's late, I'd like to hear the
[10] explanation why we don't have this every month on
[11] time. I'm waiting for an answer.

[12] MR. WUELLNER: Allow me to get to the
[13] microphone.

[14] MR. CIRIELLO: I didn't necessarily mean you
[15] had to answer it, Ed.

[16] MR. WUELLNER: The -- the establishment of
[17] that -- the compilation that you generally
[18] receive every month, although occasionally with a
[19] problem, was a direct result of this board's
[20] direction to do so. It is not, as I understand
[21] it, any statutory requirement to provide those
[22] types of financials to any level to this board.

[23] The only financial reporting obligation you
[24] have is related to an annual audit, and that is
[25] absolute statute and, you know, we're going to

[1] have -- we continue to comply with that.

[2] It was brought in to -- originally, to
[3] alleviate all of the questions that surrounded
[4] the financial dealings of the Airport Authority.
[5] And that's much in the same way that -- the
[6] method by which we do minutes of the Airport
[7] Authority was designed to eliminate the
[8] discussion surrounding, "I didn't say that; he
[9] did." You know, it really got ugly, as I
[10] understand it. Thankfully, all of that predated
[11] when I got here.

[12] But they -- it's really at your direction.
[13] Between us, we -- you know, we have internally
[14] elected to review that as a part of next year's
[15] budget process. We felt we are probably at a
[16] point where that review could come at a much less
[17] frequent interval and perhaps the level of detail
[18] provided could be reduced so that it meant some
[19] meaningful savings to the Authority in terms of
[20] what it costs to provide the CPA-related
[21] services.

[22] But at the same point, we wanted to make
[23] sure that a very high level of competence in what
[24] you were seeing and what is going on here was
[25] maintained. This -- we could assure you

Page 109

[1] statements if we delayed their presentation to
 [2] you beyond what they are now.
 [3] The problem we have is that, as with
 [4] probably your own personal checking accounts, you
 [5] don't get -- you don't get the bank-related
 [6] statements, which are the core of the financial
 [7] statements that are developed, we don't get those
 [8] until I think it's around the 9th or 10th of the
 [9] month many times, which puts us up very close --
 [10] in many cases, we're already into the second week
 [11] waiting, you know, less than several days in some
 [12] cases from having to put the agenda on the street
 [13] to you folks. And very often, it's been a
 [14] problem getting the current CPA to get that done
 [15] in a couple of days and back to us.
 [16] We are also looking at a different CPA firm
 [17] at this point. Some -- someplace current.
 [18] People are out of Jacksonville. We've been
 [19] talking with someone who's local, who's familiar
 [20] with the accounting package we use. And I think
 [21] we -- we intended, as early as May of this year,
 [22] to be in a position to maybe move that forward
 [23] with somebody local and get a much better local
 [24] response to getting those things done in a timely
 [25] fashion and consistently on time, which has been

Page 111

[1] expenditures are going for month to month. And I
 [2] don't know how hard that would be for Patty,
 [3] but --
 [4] MR. WUELLNER: It -- it isn't difficult to
 [5] provide that you raw information. The only
 [6] concern I have is that when that information is
 [7] presented, you know, we want it to be reflective
 [8] of what's actually happened and that's been
 [9] appropriately entered in the journals and
 [10] registers of the airport.
 [11] We don't want that being, if you want to
 [12] call it, made public in an erroneous way. It
 [13] needs to be exactly what it was and be shown that
 [14] way.
 [15] I'm not a CPA. I don't profess to be a CPA.
 [16] Neither does Pat.
 [17] MR. CIRIELLO: Well, I'm --
 [18] MR. WUELLNER: We don't hire -- we don't
 [19] have anybody at a level that you could be -- have
 [20] that high level of competence. Now, is it
 [21] being --
 [22] MR. CIRIELLO: I'm not sure if --
 [23] MR. WUELLNER: As I said, we're reviewing it
 [24] to see if maybe it's being done too often. Maybe
 [25] a monthly review of that is too often.

Page 110

[1] our problem.
 [2] MR. CIRIELLO: Well, I'm not really -- well,
 [3] we can change or undo anything we've done --
 [4] MR. WUELLNER: Absolutely.
 [5] MR. CIRIELLO: -- but I'm not saying that
 [6] what you just described's a bad thing. I'm just
 [7] saying that simply for a month-to-month
 [8] statement, I can look into my checkbook and tell
 [9] you how much money -- how many checks I've
 [10] written, how much money I've spent, without
 [11] waiting on the bank to send me a verification.
 [12] So, I'm just simply saying that for our simple
 [13] little monthly report for us monthly, that I
 [14] don't know if -- where'd she run off to?
 [15] MR. WUELLNER: Pat. Yeah, Pat.
 [16] MR. CIRIELLO: Patty could just say, "Well,
 [17] we sent out this many checks and spent a thousand
 [18] dollars. We got \$900 revenue. Our checking
 [19] account balance as of March 31st was \$5,000."
 [20] And -- and just something simple like that to
 [21] come monthly. I'm not saying we need this big
 [22] certified public accountant's statement month by
 [23] month that comes in late all the time.
 [24] I think that's what the monthly statement's
 [25] for, just to let us know how our daily

Page 112

[1] But I can tell you, having lived through it
 [2] a few times in the past, including when I first
 [3] got here, you don't want to have to be in a
 [4] position where the only time the CPA looks at us
 [5] is at the end of the year and you've got to
 [6] straighten out a year's worth of transactions and
 [7] entries and the like.
 [8] I mean, that -- that's exactly where we were
 [9] when I walked in the door. And I promised this
 [10] board, and I was directed back, it ain't
 [11] happening again.
 [12] MR. CIRIELLO: Well, I'm not saying that --
 [13] MR. WUELLNER: No, nothing against you.
 [14] MR. CIRIELLO: -- it shouldn't be looked at.
 [15] I'm just saying a simple monthly statement.
 [16] Let me give you an example. Our union back
 [17] home was worth probably as much money as this
 [18] airport's worth. And every month, the treasurer
 [19] gave a -- he read at the meeting the financial
 [20] transactions that happened in the past month, and
 [21] the board -- or the people out in the audience,
 [22] those union members, voted to accept or deny it.
 [23] When he read, say, pay vouchers -- like
 [24] every union employee, and there was a gang of
 [25] them, shop stewards and what, turned in pay

Page 113

[1] vouchers, itemized on their pay voucher for every
 [2] second that they're turning in money for. But
 [3] whenever the treasurer gave -- he turned in --
 [4] have a pay voucher for Joe Ciriello for \$110.
 [5] And then he went on to the next guy, next guy,
 [6] next guy. And he didn't detail everything that I
 [7] did to get that \$110.

[8] And at the end of -- people, okay, I accept
 [9] it or we deny it, you know, made a motion. If
 [10] anybody had a question that somebody, "Hey, that
 [11] pay voucher for Ciriello seemed pretty high; what
 [12] did he do?" And then he would go and say, "Well,
 [13] he did this, he did that."

[14] So, I'm just saying a simple monthly report
 [15] shouldn't be hard for us to get without the
 [16] technicalities of anybody reviewing it. Because
 [17] the CPA will eventually review it. I'm done.

[18] MR. WUELLNER: My concern with adopting it
 [19] or approving it in advance of the CPA looking at
 [20] it is that it very possibly will change. How
 [21] it's entered. It's not the numbers changed, but
 [22] where it goes.

[23] CHAIRMAN ROSE: The accounts that are --
 [24] that are -- the distribution of those --

[25] MR. WUELLNER: Exactly. How it's -- how

Page 114

[1] it's shown.

[2] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Well, I think you know how
 [3] Mr. Ciriello feels.

[4] MR. WUELLNER: Absolutely.

[5] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Let's see. Is there any
 [6] public comment?

[7] MR. HARVEY: Yes.

[8] 9. - PUBLIC COMMENT

[9] MS. HARVEY: Shirley Harvey, 417 Indian Bend
 [10] Road. There was an article in the newspaper
 [11] about the airport a month or so ago, and all I
 [12] know about airports is what I've learned from
 [13] this Airport Authority and from watching
 [14] airplanes out my kitchen window. The article
 [15] stated that we had 160,000 takeoff and landings
 [16] every year?

[17] MR. WUELLNER: Yes, ma'am.

[18] MS. HARVEY: That amounts to 438 every day.
 [19] That seems -- and that's 24 hours a day, in a
 [20] 24-hour day. That seems a little bit high to me,
 [21] but I don't know who's counting.

[22] MR. WUELLNER: If I could, the answer to
 [23] that is, they -- they were not counted by us.
 [24] They were counted by the RSVP folks. The Retired
 [25] Senior Volunteers literally sat out here for, I

Page 115

[1] don't know -- it was a total of maybe about three
 [2] months -- counting airplanes in and out of this
 [3] facility. And those numbers were then
 [4] extrapolated on a -- and annualized, and that
 [5] effectively was the data used in support of the
 [6] tower and the contract tower.

[7] And to be honest with you, the reliability
 [8] of the data was -- was high enough that FAA chose
 [9] not to come down and recount it. So, I mean,
 [10] it's physically counted.

[11] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Somebody else want -- okay.

[12] MS. ANDERSON: Real quick. I know
 [13] everybody's anxious to leave. I had another
 [14] comment on the service access.

[15] Our question is: At the gate that people
 [16] are coming through at our gate, we're responsible
 [17] for somebody coming through that gate and what
 [18] they're doing on the ramp that we're paying a
 [19] tremendous amount of liability insurance on that
 [20] ramp for. I mean, if -- all we're asking is when
 [21] somebody comes to the gate, there are people with
 [22] cards that are just coming in, and we have no
 [23] idea where they're going or what they're doing.

[24] And all we're asking is that those gate
 [25] cards be limited, that the buzzer has to be

Page 116

[1] pushed, that we have to know what -- what
 [2] somebody's coming on the ramp for.

[3] And a big issue is the responsibility of the
 [4] liability. I mean, if a \$40 million Gulfstream
 [5] is sitting on the ramp and it gets hit, you know,
 [6] who does that go to? We're covered for our
 [7] people on the ramp and for our equipment and for
 [8] our cars, or if one of our personnel is driving
 [9] our car, we pay a tremendous amount for that.

[10] But do these other people coming on the ramp
 [11] have that insurance, is our question?

[12] MR. WUELLNER: Real good point and real good
 [13] question. We -- we attempted -- back when
 [14] Richard was there, we had the general agreement
 [15] that we do not issue -- and I think this still
 [16] goes today -- we do not issue gate cards for that
 [17] particular gate or onto that leasehold that
 [18] haven't received an approval from the FBO as to
 [19] the legitimacy of the need and that their
 [20] desire -- they basically concur in that desire to
 [21] come through that gate.

[22] That's one of the reasons we send a lot of
 [23] people back over there, because they're looking
 [24] for a card for that gate and do not have
 [25] basically your stamp of approval on it before we


Page 117

[1] issue it.
 [2] We've been working that direction for a
 [3] couple of years now, I believe, or at least since
 [4] the end down by the fuel farm was ultimately
 [5] fenced in completely and access secured there.
 [6] If you're aware of people that have cards
 [7] that access that gate and you don't -- you have
 [8] not specifically authorized them, let us know.
 [9] The beauty of the system we use is we can
 [10] invalidate those cards and those cards will no
 [11] longer work in the system on a gate-by-gate
 [12] basis, even. So...
 [13] MS. ANDERSON: Like I said, it's not that we
 [14] don't want to --
 [15] MR. WUELLNER: No, I fully appreciate it.
 [16] One of the things --
 [17] MS. ANDERSON: We're just trying to find out
 [18] who's coming through the gate.
 [19] MR. WUELLNER: Frankly, we did not want,
 [20] from an Authority side, to do that because of
 [21] those very reasons. That's -- that's your
 [22] leasehold. We're ultimately holding you
 [23] accountable for the activities on there in many
 [24] respects, and as such, you need to tell us who
 [25] you want on that apron or have access to the

Page 118

[1] apron via -- that isn't authorized on a
 [2] day-to-day basis, but somebody that had a card.
 [3] If you haven't authorized somebody that has
 [4] access or they're accessing a way that they
 [5] shouldn't be accessing, we need to be made aware
 [6] of that and we'll take care of it.
 [7] CHAIRMAN ROSE: All right. Is there any
 [8] other discussion?
 [9] (No further discussion.)
 [10] CHAIRMAN ROSE: Meeting is adjourned. And
 [11] we'll meet on Monday, May 14th, at 4 o'clock.
 [12] Thank you very much.
 [13] (Thereupon, the meeting concluded at 6:06 p.m.)
 [14]
 [15]
 [16]
 [17]
 [18]
 [19]
 [20]
 [21]
 [22]
 [23]
 [24]
 [25]

Page 119

[1] REPORTER'S MEETING CERTIFICATE
 [2]
 [3] STATE OF FLORIDA)
 [4] COUNTY OF ST. JOHNS)
 [5]
 [6] I, JANET M. BEASON, RPR-CP, RMR, CRR, certify that I
 [7] was authorized to and did stenographically report the
 [8] foregoing proceedings and that the transcript is a true
 [9] record of my stenographic notes.
 [10]
 [11] Dated this 30th day of April, 2001.
 [12]
 [13] 
 [14] JANET M. BEASON, RPR-CP, RMR, CRR
 [15] Notary Public - State of Florida
 [16] My Commission No.: CC 705710
 [17] Expires: April 30, 2002
 [18]
 [19]
 [20]
 [21]
 [22]
 [23]
 [24]
 [25]

\$	118/4	attempt 84/2
\$1.95 92/3	accessible 96/15	attempted 116/13
\$110 113/4, 113/7	accessing 64/5, 118/4, 118/5	attendant 62/4
\$16,500 81/4	accommodate 62/13, 99/10	attorney 93/24, 105/21, 107/3
\$165,000 81/3	accommodating 61/20	audience 112/21
\$3 64/23, 66/21, 88/2, 88/8	accomplished 103/21	audit 107/24
\$40 116/4	account 106/18, 110/19	Augustine 70/8
\$5,000 110/19	accountable 117/23	Authority 63/4, 63/24, 64/16, 65/3, 65/23, 67/3,
\$900 110/18	accountant 106/14, 107/3	68/22, 71/4, 71/18, 71/23, 72/2, 72/11, 73/5, 74/7,
	accountant's 110/22	79/17, 82/19, 86/4, 91/17, 93/9, 93/16, 93/17, 97/6,
	accounting 109/20	100/10, 102/5, 102/7, 106/9, 108/4, 108/7, 108/19,
	accounts 109/4, 113/23	114/13, 117/20
	acquiesced 97/24	Authority's 72/20, 72/21, 96/14
'96 72/22, 84/3, 86/16, 90/19	acquiring 82/10	authorized 117/8, 118/1, 118/3, 119/7
	act 91/22	auto 75/9
1	action 67/23, 69/17, 88/14	av 62/5, 62/12
10 81/3, 92/1	activities 117/23	available 62/6, 96/6, 96/9, 106/10
10,000 84/13	activity 61/8	aviation 61/18, 61/20, 86/2, 93/6, 98/22, 101/11
100 82/4	address 74/15	aviation-related 99/4
10th 109/8	addressed 93/2	award 68/12, 79/3, 88/6
13/31 61/21	adequate 66/3	Aye 98/13, 98/14, 98/15, 98/16, 101/23, 101/24,
14th 118/11	adjacent 61/17	101/25, 102/1
150 91/1	adjourned 118/10	
160,000 114/15	adopting 113/18	B
1996 86/13	advance 113/19	Bad 65/4, 65/9, 69/1, 110/6
	Aero 65/19, 65/21, 71/15, 71/20, 71/23, 73/2,	balance 106/22, 110/19
	75/10, 75/11, 75/18, 76/1, 76/13, 76/20, 77/16,	bank 110/11
	77/20, 91/2, 91/4, 95/15, 97/14, 97/23	bank-related 109/5
	agencies 102/12	base 75/3, 95/2, 104/4
2	agency 80/17	based 74/24, 84/14, 85/19
2 71/25, 84/14	agenda 92/10, 109/12	basis 62/6, 84/21, 93/11, 117/12, 118/2
20 75/1, 75/23	agree 105/3	BEASON 119/6
24 114/19	agreement 87/2, 93/10, 93/12, 93/25, 94/23, 95/2,	beauty 117/9
24-hour 114/20	97/7, 97/22, 100/15, 105/11, 116/14	Beaver 74/24
24-hour-a-day 62/6	agreements 93/1, 97/19, 99/3	belief 61/15
25 86/9	aircraft 61/21, 61/23, 62/8, 94/2, 94/7, 99/6	beliefs 62/23
250 84/14	AIRFIELD 92/21	Bend 114/9
	airplane 74/24, 97/21	benefit 62/2, 93/16, 96/2
3	airplanes 75/10, 94/10, 114/14, 115/2	benefits 61/1
3 71/25	airport 61/5, 61/17, 62/1, 62/22, 63/13, 63/24,	bid 88/7, 88/8, 88/13
30 68/11, 75/23	64/11, 64/15, 64/19, 65/3, 65/22, 68/21, 71/4, 71/18,	bidding 78/25
31st 110/19	72/2, 72/11, 73/5, 74/24, 76/22, 78/1, 78/24, 80/23,	bids 69/10
	81/12, 82/6, 82/21, 86/4, 91/16, 92/24, 93/13, 94/15,	big 63/9, 81/21, 89/7, 90/4, 110/21, 116/3
	95/6, 97/6, 99/16, 103/22, 103/23, 104/2, 104/6,	bigger 63/9
4	106/9, 108/4, 108/6, 111/10, 114/11, 114/13	Bill 83/12, 92/7
4 118/11	airport's 112/18	bills 106/20
417 114/9	airports 63/8, 114/12	bit 62/25, 89/23, 114/20
438 114/18	alleviate 108/3	board 64/8, 67/15, 67/24, 73/12, 73/20, 77/8,
	allotted 79/11	87/6, 87/17, 91/19, 100/2, 103/20, 107/22, 112/10,
5	allow 63/2, 68/7, 88/1, 93/23, 96/23, 100/6,	112/21
5 91/25	100/16, 101/11, 107/12	board's 107/19
50 77/19, 84/13, 84/20, 86/10, 90/23	allowed 97/24, 102/25	boards 102/11, 102/17
50,000 84/11, 84/13, 90/14, 90/15	allowing 99/3, 99/23, 103/25	breaks 90/20
	allows 61/2	bring 65/8, 82/24, 82/25, 83/19, 86/21
6	amazed 70/13	brochure 70/20, 78/17
6:06 118/13	amend 88/18	brought 82/22, 106/21, 108/2
	amount 91/10, 99/13, 115/19, 116/9	Bryan 86/17
	amounts 99/20, 114/18	bud 93/19
7	ancillary 97/25	budget 108/15
7 98/4	Anderson 89/2	bugging 106/7
7.I 92/19, 92/21, 98/5	annual 84/21, 94/6, 107/24	build 79/20
7.J 98/21, 98/22, 101/18	annualized 115/4	buildings 65/20, 65/21
75 86/1	answer 78/10, 95/24, 107/11, 107/15, 114/22	bulk 89/16
75,000 84/21	answered 104/25	bunch 71/8
	answers 90/3, 104/11	Bunnell 75/1
8	anti-Aero 91/14	business 68/22, 76/7, 76/16, 76/25, 80/9, 93/15,
8 76/4, 77/21, 77/23, 77/24, 78/1, 81/14, 102/5	anxious 115/13	97/15, 102/3, 102/10, 102/14, 102/16, 107/1
80 86/1	appearances 63/18	buy 81/16
	applied 100/1	buying 73/4, 89/16
	Appreciate 71/9, 71/10, 117/15	buzzer 115/25
	approached 95/16, 103/5	by...so 95/16
	appropriate 93/25	
	appropriately 111/9	C
	approval 100/3, 116/18, 116/25	call 96/17, 111/12
	approve 86/25, 98/3, 101/18	came 64/13, 68/4
	approved 98/24	cap 81/2
9	approving 113/19	capacity 61/20
9 114/8	apron 96/24, 97/4, 117/25, 118/1	capital 62/23, 65/7, 65/15
9th 109/8	area 66/21, 81/23, 82/9, 82/11, 95/20, 96/4, 96/12,	capitalization 64/15, 66/1
A	96/16, 97/4, 98/25, 99/12, 99/15, 99/16, 99/20,	capitalize 64/21, 66/20, 69/3, 103/12, 103/15
ability 69/9, 88/15, 103/21, 104/5, 106/1	100/5, 101/5	capitalized 84/23
absence 81/25	areas 96/11, 96/21	capitalizing 84/5
absolute 107/25	arrangements 96/20	car 116/9
accept 69/10, 85/7, 112/22, 113/8	arriving 61/24	card 116/24, 118/2
acceptable 77/10	article 114/10, 114/14	cards 115/22, 115/25, 116/16, 117/6, 117/10
access 82/9, 92/20, 92/21, 92/23, 93/13, 96/1,	assess 96/7	care 81/20, 100/1, 101/12, 118/6
96/2, 97/4, 97/12, 115/14, 117/5, 117/7, 117/25,	Association 73/1, 89/16	carried 98/19, 102/2
	Association's 69/23	
	assure 108/25	

<p>cars 116/8 cart 79/10 case 61/22, 63/16, 80/20, 93/5, 99/5, 100/20 case-by-case 93/11 cases 79/20, 103/11, 109/10, 109/12 cash 65/2 center 69/3 cents 71/25, 75/2, 75/20, 75/23, 76/4, 77/21, 77/23, 77/24, 78/1, 81/14, 86/9, 86/10, 91/25, 92/1 CERTIFICATE 119/1 certified 110/22 certify 119/6 CHAIRMAN 67/19, 69/16, 69/21, 69/25, 70/3, 71/9, 71/12, 72/16, 73/17, 73/20, 73/23, 74/12, 78/5, 78/8, 79/7, 87/6, 87/17, 87/22, 88/24, 90/10, 92/6, 92/8, 92/17, 94/17, 94/22, 95/3, 95/9, 98/2, 98/8, 98/11, 98/14, 98/17, 98/19, 98/21, 100/2, 100/7, 100/9, 101/14, 101/17, 101/20, 101/22, 101/24, 102/2, 102/6, 103/2, 103/4, 104/14, 105/20, 106/3, 106/5, 113/23, 114/2, 114/5, 115/11, 118/7, 118/10 chance 66/18, 91/7 change 88/10, 98/24, 101/10, 110/3, 113/20 changed 113/21 charge 96/7 charges 62/7 Charles 104/14 Charlie 95/3 Charlie's 91/18 charter 99/7 cheap 78/21 cheaper 72/13, 75/2, 75/5, 75/20, 77/18, 77/19, 91/25, 92/1 checkbook 110/8 checked 99/19 checking 106/18, 109/4, 110/18 checks 106/20, 110/9, 110/17 Chieftains 91/11 choose 88/19 chose 115/8 Cindy 92/13, 105/13 Ciriello 113/4, 113/11 cleaning 94/9 clearly 96/14 close 109/9 closed 62/10 cohort 90/22 Columbiana 74/25, 75/4 comfortable 82/7 comment 71/10, 73/18, 73/19, 73/24, 98/3, 100/7, 100/8, 100/9, 102/8, 104/15, 105/3, 114/6, 114/8, 115/14 comments 74/15 commitment 63/12 common 96/16 community 64/4, 64/6, 71/2 companies 66/23, 103/9 compelling 82/16, 82/17 competence 108/23, 111/20 competition 62/25, 71/20, 83/17 competitive 64/3, 78/25 compilation 107/17 comply 108/1 comprehensive 67/20 comptroller 71/15 concept 78/9, 83/13 concern 105/11, 111/6, 113/18 concerned 102/20 concluded 118/13 concludes 102/3 conclusion 62/19 concur 116/20 concurrently 66/6, 87/5 condition 74/5 conduct 96/24, 97/11 conducting 93/15, 97/2, 97/15 consideration 71/16 consistent 99/15 consistently 109/25 construction 65/8, 86/25, 87/1, 87/2 consultation 93/24 contact 78/18 containment 83/23 continue 108/1 contract 68/12, 83/3, 87/1, 115/6 control 83/19, 93/17, 95/6, 100/12 controlled 93/1, 102/22 conversation 80/14 core 109/6 corporate 76/23, 98/25, 100/5, 101/4</p>	<p>correct 84/12, 84/20 cost 74/8, 84/4, 86/7, 89/7, 89/8 costs 72/23, 84/6, 85/5, 85/16, 85/17, 99/13, 108/20 counted 114/23, 114/24, 115/10 counting 114/21, 115/2 County 72/6, 74/24, 74/25, 119/4 couple 61/1, 67/9, 88/24, 109/15, 117/3 cover 85/4 covered 84/23, 94/5, 95/20, 98/1, 105/10, 116/6 CPA 109/14, 109/16, 111/15, 112/4, 113/17, 113/19 CPA-related 108/20 creating 93/14 CRR 119/6 currently 69/12, 99/9, 105/10 customer 104/4 customers 63/13 cut 61/11 cuts 82/9</p> <p align="center">D</p> <p>daily 110/25 Dan 70/4, 70/7, 71/9, 88/25, 92/6 data 115/5, 115/8 day 71/11, 90/22, 90/25, 91/1, 91/24, 102/12, 114/18, 114/19, 114/20 days 68/11, 109/11, 109/15 dead 69/2 dealings 108/4 decides 89/9 decision 64/7, 79/8, 91/22 decisions 68/1 delayed 109/1 demanded 80/23 demanding 83/15 Dennis 95/14 deny 112/22, 113/9 denying 72/5 departing 61/24 depends 67/14 described's 110/6 description 68/9 design 68/12 designed 62/13, 108/7 desire 116/20 detail 80/13, 87/8, 108/17, 113/6 detailed 78/6, 84/3 determination 63/4, 66/3 determinations 64/1, 87/4 determined 64/9, 85/4 determines 67/15 detriment 103/23 develop 65/5, 67/4, 87/2, 93/20, 93/23, 94/18, 94/21, 104/1, 105/8, 105/14 developed 83/9, 109/7 developer 64/20 developing 63/22, 71/17, 82/11 development 64/16, 65/15, 66/7, 67/8, 100/21 difference 76/15 difficult 66/19, 66/24, 95/25, 105/8, 111/4 dimension 83/1 direct 107/19 directed 112/10 direction 86/22, 87/13, 92/15, 93/20, 102/21, 106/2, 107/20, 108/12, 117/2 director 92/10 disappear 103/16 discussion 67/20, 73/21, 84/2, 101/14, 108/8, 118/8, 118/9 discussions 74/1 disparity 77/4 distribution 113/24 documents 68/6, 87/3 doesn't 62/3, 62/4, 68/18, 96/6, 97/1, 102/13, 103/17 dollars 64/16, 65/1, 65/5, 65/7, 86/11, 106/18, 110/18 door 112/9 DOT 65/7, 67/12 double 76/13 driving 90/6, 116/8 dumps 67/17 during 61/10, 62/4, 62/8, 71/17, 74/1</p>	<p align="center">E</p> <p>earned 72/2 easily 100/20 eastside 98/25, 100/5 easy 61/25, 78/21 Ed 67/19, 71/8, 73/23, 80/5, 83/20, 87/6, 87/21, 90/14, 92/12, 92/15, 100/11, 102/2, 107/15 Ed's 90/6 effect 71/21, 72/4 elected 108/14 Electric 99/5 eliminate 108/7 emergency 61/8, 61/12 employee 112/24 employees 89/8 end 72/13, 106/18, 112/5, 113/8, 117/4 ends 64/7, 93/14, 95/2 engineering 87/2 entered 111/9, 113/21 enterprise 102/23, 105/4 entertain 98/3, 101/17 enthusiastic 70/23 entrepreneur 102/15 entries 112/7 environment 66/19 EPA 83/24 equal 97/4 equally 96/10 equation 72/22 equipment 61/13, 116/7 erroneous 111/12 essence 80/24 establish 104/3 establishing 63/19, 76/24 establishment 107/16 estimates 64/22 event 64/9 exceed 64/23 exclusive 94/12, 96/13, 97/2, 97/17 excuse 71/24, 92/17 executed 68/6 exert 93/18 exhibit 70/14 existing 64/2, 64/3, 69/13, 71/4, 86/2, 105/11 exists 103/24 expansion 100/16 expect 62/15, 66/10, 79/2, 80/18 expecting 64/20 expeditiously 104/23 expend 68/7, 79/25 expenditures 111/1 expense 90/4 expenses 84/24 experiencing 73/2 explanation 87/9, 107/10 extend 72/20 extrapolated 115/4 eyes 61/6, 91/20</p> <p align="center">F</p> <p>FAA 115/8 facilitate 62/12, 64/12, 64/21 facilitated 64/9 facilitation 94/1 facilities 65/12, 66/21, 76/24, 81/10, 81/21, 92/23, 95/18, 99/4 facility 61/7, 61/10, 62/11, 62/13, 65/16, 66/5, 66/8, 70/12, 71/22, 73/8, 73/12, 74/20, 75/15, 75/19, 75/23, 76/10, 78/24, 80/19, 81/15, 84/6, 84/15, 84/17, 85/1, 85/7, 86/3, 87/24, 88/12, 89/21, 89/24, 91/7, 105/9, 105/16, 115/3 fact 96/4, 103/15 fair 66/12, 67/16, 99/13 falls 93/3 farm 71/5, 71/6, 72/1, 117/4 fashion 74/3, 109/25 fast 87/3 favor 82/14, 98/12, 101/22 FBO 62/9, 62/17, 62/19, 62/20, 63/9, 63/12, 63/19, 63/20, 63/25, 64/3, 64/8, 64/10, 64/20, 65/12, 65/16, 66/9, 66/10, 67/16, 67/18, 68/17, 69/5, 69/8, 69/12, 69/13, 71/17, 80/8, 80/21, 81/8, 81/19, 81/20, 81/22, 82/5, 82/15, 82/24, 88/2, 88/4, 91/5, 91/6, 94/5, 95/20, 96/3, 96/5, 96/20, 96/22, 96/23, 96/24, 97/3, 97/13, 97/17, 103/21, 104/17, 116/18 FBO-type 93/1 FBOs 66/20, 69/10, 103/5, 103/25</p>
---	--	---

<p>fee 71/24, 76/20, 77/3, 77/5, 81/5, 84/7 fenced 117/5 fifty 84/14 fill 77/16 filled 75/4 financed 66/24 finances 106/13 financial 74/11, 106/16, 106/25, 107/23, 108/4, 109/6, 112/19 financially 86/15 financials 106/10, 107/22 find 61/2, 61/25, 65/7, 75/18, 79/18, 79/19, 82/3, 86/23, 105/2, 117/17 fine 63/10, 87/16 fire 69/24 firefighting 61/12 firm 79/24, 109/16 fit 80/10, 94/8 five 65/6, 67/11, 68/19, 76/11, 79/17, 103/25 Fleming 72/24 Florida 70/8, 119/3 flow 65/3, 75/12 flowage 76/19, 77/3, 77/5, 81/5, 81/7, 84/6, 85/5 fly-ins 70/15 flying 77/15, 91/2 folks 105/17, 109/13, 114/24 follow 94/19 followed 77/20 follows 70/4 footage 96/19 foreseeable 68/17 form 70/15, 74/3 formal 96/20 formalizes 93/12 forth...related 95/17 found 86/17 frequent 108/17 front 91/3, 91/4 fuel 62/7, 68/22, 68/23, 71/4, 71/6, 71/19, 71/25, 72/1, 72/3, 72/14, 73/4, 74/3, 75/15, 76/19, 76/24, 77/3, 81/13, 82/17, 84/6, 84/21, 88/4, 89/16, 89/17, 89/20, 89/21, 90/25, 92/2, 97/21, 102/10, 117/4 fuel-flow 72/20 fuel-spill 83/22 fueling 81/19, 81/23, 83/21, 87/24, 102/21 function 67/3, 68/25, 77/8 fundamental 62/23 funded 67/14 funding 67/6 funds 68/7 future 67/24, 68/17, 69/5, 99/22</p>		
	H	K
	<p>half 70/21 hand 79/24, 95/7 handful 97/8 hands 91/16, 91/17 happy 78/13, 85/9 hard 111/2, 113/15 hard-pressed 82/3 Harvey 114/9 head 71/7 headed 102/20 healthy 63/23 heart 91/13 heavy 83/24 hell 78/14 Hi 71/14 high 99/8, 108/23, 111/20, 113/11, 114/20, 115/8 hire 111/18 hit 91/20, 116/5 hold 96/13 holding 117/22 Holiday 70/7 home 75/3, 112/17 honest 115/7 hope 95/25 horse 79/10 hot 83/24 hour 70/21 hours 61/10, 62/9, 66/11, 114/19 hundred 84/14 hybrid 65/10, 65/17</p>	L
	I	<p>lack 84/3, 105/15 land 77/15 landing 61/24 landings 114/15 lap 67/17 later 80/3 law 106/12 learned 114/12 lease 80/20, 93/4, 95/2, 96/5, 96/20, 97/7, 97/19, 97/22, 99/2, 99/11, 100/15, 105/11, 105/18 lease-related 93/3 leased 96/21 leasehold 65/13, 65/20, 95/21, 96/25, 97/16, 97/23, 100/21, 116/17, 117/22 leasing 65/1 leave 90/13, 115/13 legitimacy 116/19 level 103/20, 107/22, 108/17, 108/23, 111/19, 111/20 levels 85/5 liability 69/4, 73/16, 115/19, 116/4 lift 100/4 lifted 99/24 lifting 99/1 light 88/13 limitation 99/17 limited 82/8, 115/25 line 96/8 listening 87/9 literally 85/18, 114/25 little 62/25, 63/18, 64/18, 87/8, 89/23, 110/13, 114/20 lived 112/1 local 63/13, 64/4, 109/19, 109/23 location 61/3, 61/16, 65/17, 82/4, 82/5, 82/7 long-term 104/1, 104/5 Lord 91/5 lose 76/7, 76/16 losing 73/5, 75/10, 77/20, 77/21, 77/23, 81/14, 91/23 loss 81/12 low 80/10</p>
G	<p>idea 68/21, 75/12, 79/22, 80/11, 85/17, 86/17, 95/4, 95/8, 95/12, 115/23 identical 76/20 identified 97/7 identify 61/8 illustrious 103/4 immediate 101/5 implies 62/3, 64/17 impossible 66/20 impressive 70/16 increments 84/11 Indian 114/9 indicate 62/24 indicated 80/7 indicating 91/4, 91/24 indications 69/13 information 85/12, 107/2, 111/5, 111/6 infrastructure 82/12 infringe 95/19 initial 94/24 inspections 94/7 insurance 84/5, 89/12, 115/19, 116/11 insurance-related 85/16 intention 72/19 interest 63/18, 64/10, 104/18 interference 96/15 intermittent 97/10 internally 108/13 interposed 99/24 interval 108/17 invalidate 117/10 investment 64/23, 65/11, 65/15, 88/3 issue 92/10, 116/3, 116/15, 116/16, 117/1 issue's 74/13 issues 62/15, 76/19, 89/5 item 88/11, 92/19, 98/23, 101/18 itemized 113/1 items 93/6, 97/8, 97/19, 97/25</p>	M
<p>gallon 72/1, 75/2, 75/24, 75/25, 76/4, 76/10, 77/7, 77/19, 77/21, 77/24, 77/25, 78/2, 84/11, 85/15, 86/9, 86/11 gallons 75/12, 84/15, 84/21, 85/24, 86/12, 90/14, 90/15, 90/23, 91/1 gals 70/24 gang 112/24 gas 62/5, 62/12, 75/4, 75/20, 75/25, 77/17, 77/19, 78/1, 81/16, 91/9 gasoline 75/1 gate 100/24, 115/15, 115/16, 115/17, 115/21, 115/24, 116/16, 116/17, 116/21, 116/24, 117/7, 117/18 gate-by-gate 117/11 gatekeeper 95/5 generalities 80/7 generate 85/19, 86/3 generated 84/22 generic 94/24 generically 90/17 gentleman 78/16 Gentlemen 92/8 George 73/8 glass 75/9 glasses 90/13 grabbed 70/20 grant 67/12, 68/5, 68/8, 68/9 granted 97/3, 97/18 gross 71/25 group 80/23 guess 76/9, 86/22, 96/11 guidelines 93/4, 94/19 Gulfstream 116/4 guy 78/18, 79/1, 113/5, 113/6 guys 68/14, 70/24, 76/5, 91/24</p>	J	<p>maintain 100/13 maintained 108/25 maintenance 72/1 majority 96/18 man 88/6 manage 105/18 managed 102/21 management 83/2 manager 89/3 March 106/19, 110/19 margin 77/9, 80/11, 86/6, 86/8 market 62/24, 63/2, 65/1, 66/3, 74/5, 86/2, 103/24, 104/3 Marlene 71/14 master 82/1 meaningful 108/19 meet 85/7, 100/20, 118/11 meeting 68/4, 86/21, 87/13, 92/11, 103/14, 107/7, 112/19, 118/10, 118/13, 119/1 meeting's 107/6 member 72/25 members 73/9, 100/10, 102/5, 102/7, 112/22 memory 84/11 memory's 84/20 mentioned 87/23, 88/1 method 67/5, 108/6 methods 64/11, 64/13 microphone 107/13 million 64/23, 66/21, 88/3, 88/9, 116/4 mind 74/14, 74/19 minimum 64/23, 66/12, 85/6, 87/25, 88/10, 88/18, 93/7, 100/18, 103/10, 103/14</p>

<p> minimums 100/20 minor 94/2 minute 90/15 minutes 108/6 missing 85/12 model 84/9, 85/3, 85/10 MODIFICATION 98/22 modify 68/8 Monday 118/11 money 64/17, 66/4, 71/5, 71/8, 72/12, 79/11, 79/25, 91/23, 99/14, 106/21, 110/9, 110/10, 112/17, 113/2 monitor 61/7 month 86/25, 92/16, 92/17, 92/18, 104/16, 106/9, 106/13, 106/16, 106/17, 106/19, 107/1, 107/10, 107/18, 109/9, 110/22, 110/23, 111/1, 112/18, 112/20, 114/11 month-to-month 110/7 monthly 71/24, 106/24, 110/13, 110/21, 110/24, 111/25, 112/15, 113/14 months 115/2 motion 95/9, 98/3, 98/6, 101/17, 101/19, 102/2, 113/9 Motion's 98/11, 98/19 motive 105/5 move 68/13, 69/2, 84/25, 86/23, 92/18, 104/24, 109/22 moved 84/15, 84/16, 104/7 moving 99/16 Mr. Chairman 98/7 MR. CIRIELLO 74/17, 77/13, 78/4, 78/7, 78/11, 79/3, 79/6, 87/20, 87/23, 88/20, 92/16, 95/13, 98/13, 101/19, 101/23, 106/3, 106/4, 106/6, 107/14, 110/2, 110/5, 110/16, 111/17, 111/22, 112/12, 112/14, 114/3 MR. FLEMING 72/24, 74/22, 75/6 MR. HARVEY 114/7 MR. HOLIDAY 70/7, 71/11, 74/22, 78/16, 90/13, 90/20, 92/7 MR. LASSITER 80/5, 80/15, 81/2, 82/14, 83/4, 83/7, 83/10, 90/19, 95/4, 98/6, 98/15, 100/11, 100/23, 101/25, 104/15, 105/13, 105/25 MR. WATTS 83/20, 98/10, 98/16, 101/21, 102/1, 102/24, 102/25, 103/3, 104/10, 104/13 MR. WUELLNER 68/3, 69/18, 69/23, 70/1, 72/18, 73/22, 73/25, 76/18, 77/23, 78/23, 79/5, 80/13, 81/1, 81/25, 83/2, 83/5, 83/8, 84/1, 87/16, 88/15, 90/17, 92/22, 94/20, 94/23, 95/11, 95/23, 98/20, 98/23, 100/4, 100/14, 100/25, 101/15, 102/4, 103/1, 103/8, 104/11, 105/7, 105/14, 105/23, 107/12, 107/16, 110/4, 110/15, 111/4, 111/18, 111/23, 112/13, 113/18, 113/25, 114/4, 114/17, 114/22, 116/12, 117/15, 117/19 MS. ANDERSON 89/2, 90/11, 115/12, 117/13, 117/17 MS. HARVEY 114/9, 114/18 MS. UPSON 71/14, 72/17 multitude 81/10 </p>	<p align="center">O</p> <p> objection 99/25 obligation 107/23 offer 73/25, 74/7, 89/18 on-site 62/4 one-time 97/10 op 100/18 open 70/3, 73/20, 76/25, 90/8 opening 80/8, 100/24 openly 96/9 operate 69/11, 79/16, 79/18, 80/19 operated 79/25, 102/22 operating 66/10, 71/19, 84/6, 84/23, 88/18, 96/4, 99/21, 100/19, 103/10 operation 61/10, 62/5, 62/15, 66/11, 70/16, 72/21, 102/11, 102/21 operational 89/7, 90/5 operations 63/3, 63/10, 69/5, 82/25, 96/3, 96/24 operator 80/8, 80/22, 81/8, 104/17, 105/9 operators 76/24 opportunities 65/3 opportunity 87/7, 102/7 opposed 89/4, 89/22, 89/24, 90/8, 98/17 opposition 98/18 option 69/6 options 64/25 order 84/17, 86/3 organization 106/15 originally 108/2 oversight 73/11, 73/15 overview 67/21, 87/15 owned 65/20, 65/22 </p>	<p> pretty 64/13, 66/24, 70/8, 70/15, 83/24, 113/11 prevent 77/2, 83/6 price 77/9, 85/2, 85/6, 85/13, 89/18 prices 84/7 pricing 83/18, 84/8 private 66/25, 102/13, 102/14, 102/22, 105/3 privilege 94/13, 94/14, 97/3, 97/6, 97/21 privileges 97/18 pro 91/14, 91/15 problem 61/9, 93/14, 93/18, 99/23, 107/19, 109/3, 109/14, 110/1 problems 73/1 proceedings 119/8 process 63/24, 65/14, 67/12, 104/9, 108/15 profess 111/15 profit 77/6, 77/9, 80/11, 80/18, 80/25, 81/4, 84/22, 85/1, 85/19, 86/4, 105/5 profitable 104/5 programmed 67/13, 103/12 progress 91/14 project 64/22, 65/5, 67/14, 69/2 promised 112/9 promises 101/2 property 96/14, 99/18 proposal 62/11, 66/14, 78/20, 79/11, 105/18 proposing 94/17 prove 103/19, 103/24, 104/4 provide 68/9, 80/22, 80/25, 81/9, 82/21, 92/14, 103/10, 104/21, 107/21, 108/20, 111/5 provider 82/20 provides 61/6 provisions 99/9 proximate 61/22 public 64/14, 65/1, 65/11, 66/1, 67/10, 70/4, 72/6, 73/19, 92/23, 93/8, 96/1, 96/2, 96/6, 96/9, 96/14, 100/7, 100/8, 102/12, 110/22, 111/12, 114/6, 114/8 public-funded 66/16 pump 77/25, 91/3, 91/4, 91/9 pumped 76/21, 85/24, 86/12 pumps 78/1, 90/22 purchased 92/2 pure 82/25 purposes 92/24 pursue 68/15 purview 106/1 pushed 116/1 put 66/4, 66/5, 70/6, 75/15, 78/24, 81/19, 88/7, 88/13, 92/10, 105/16, 109/12 puts 109/9 putting 79/10 </p>
<p align="center">N</p> <p> name 62/3 nature 83/23, 93/25, 94/13, 94/15, 94/24, 97/25, 101/4 Navahos 91/11 necessary 61/14, 62/19, 67/18 necessity 63/25, 67/15 need 70/25, 73/11, 74/14, 78/10, 79/19, 81/10, 81/17, 83/19, 84/16, 91/22, 92/12, 94/22, 100/2, 102/19, 103/19, 104/21, 104/22, 105/1, 105/14, 110/21, 116/19, 117/24, 118/5 needed 65/5, 86/12, 90/1, 93/9 needs 63/13, 63/15, 111/13 negotiate 93/11, 100/15 Neither 111/16 new 66/23, 82/11, 91/25 newspaper 114/10 nice 71/11, 85/22 nip 93/19 nitpick 91/18, 91/19 nonetheless 63/23 normally 62/9 north 74/23 notes 119/9 number 71/7, 73/9, 75/20, 84/15, 84/19, 86/12, 90/15, 90/21, 94/3, 94/11, 106/17 numbers 75/13, 81/6, 85/8, 85/11, 85/19, 86/10, 86/20, 113/21, 115/3 nut 66/24 </p>	<p align="center">P</p> <p> p.m 118/13 package 109/20 packets 106/8 paid 106/21 parking 96/17 part 71/23, 89/7, 90/6, 108/14 partial 66/15, 67/6 Pat 110/15, 111/16 Patty 110/16, 111/2 pay 76/14, 84/18, 112/23, 112/25, 113/1, 113/4, 113/11, 116/9 paying 64/25, 115/18 pays 71/23 percentage 85/20 period 71/17 permission 95/22 permits 83/21, 83/22 personal 109/4 personally 78/18 personnel 89/11, 116/8 physically 115/10 pick 99/12 picture 72/15 pieces 85/11 pilot 72/25 Pilots 69/23, 71/21, 72/5, 72/7, 73/1, 73/3, 73/14, 75/7, 75/16, 76/1, 82/17, 83/15, 89/15, 104/19 place 66/5, 69/3, 86/24 placed 81/22, 99/2, 99/17 places 75/8 plan 80/10, 82/1 plane 75/3 planes 81/13 plug 85/10, 85/18 plugged 84/7, 84/8, 86/18 point 61/14, 62/14, 69/9, 71/16, 72/7, 73/4, 74/1, 75/6, 80/4, 83/6, 103/22, 108/16, 108/22, 109/17, 116/12 points 78/12 policy 72/20, 93/3, 94/18 polishing 94/9 popular 88/17 position 68/5, 68/11, 73/14, 74/12, 87/12, 103/11, 109/22, 112/4 possible 70/10, 82/24, 101/10, 104/23 potential 83/10, 85/2 prebought 89/17 predated 108/10 preferential 104/24 prejudice 64/1 presentation 109/1 presented 111/7 presents 65/2 </p>	<p align="center">Q</p> <p> qualifications 67/2 question 62/17, 62/18, 81/18, 81/21, 83/11, 83/20, 87/21, 95/13, 95/19, 103/1, 104/12, 113/10, 115/15, 116/11, 116/13 questions 76/8, 87/10, 89/13, 100/9, 104/25, 108/3 quick 64/13, 81/18, 115/12 </p> <p align="center">R</p> <p> raised 74/13 ramp 90/7, 115/18, 115/20, 116/2, 116/5, 116/7, 116/10 ran 84/9 range 94/5 rate 81/3 raw 111/5 reach 102/7 read 112/19, 112/23 reason 78/17, 79/1, 82/16, 82/18 reasonable 79/1 reasons 116/22, 117/21 receive 107/18 received 116/18 receives 65/23 recommendation 68/16, 93/22, 98/4 record 119/9 recount 115/9 recoup 70/11 redress 85/10 reduced 108/18 reflection 85/13 reflective 111/7 REGENCY 98/22, 99/5, 101/2 registers 111/10 regulate 77/2 related 66/14, 68/8, 73/7, 73/12, 93/21, 100/15, </p>

<p>107/24 relationship 93/13 relative 67/16 reliability 115/7 remain 61/19, 101/4 remains 64/3, 68/16 remember 85/25 rent 66/12, 71/24 rent's 66/8 report 87/8, 110/13, 113/14, 119/7 REPORTER'S 119/1 reporting 107/23 reports 106/16, 106/25 represents 61/16 request 74/9, 94/1, 97/10, 98/24 requested 74/2 requests 74/1, 76/23, 92/22, 95/1 require 62/4, 64/14, 65/14 required 100/21 requirement 62/21, 96/1, 96/2, 99/2, 99/11, 99/24, 101/1, 101/11, 103/18, 107/21 requirements 66/11, 93/21 requires 63/11, 64/14, 99/11 requoted 85/15 resolution 101/18 resource 73/13 respects 117/24 responding 72/18 response 61/12, 109/24 responsibility 116/3 responsible 115/16 responsive 63/14, 64/4 restriction 100/5 result 64/19, 65/13, 66/15, 100/21, 101/6, 107/19 retail 77/9, 84/7, 85/2, 85/6, 102/14 retailer 68/23 Retired 114/24 revenue 64/18, 65/24, 66/17, 72/6, 106/22, 110/18 revenues 73/6 review 108/14, 108/16, 111/25, 113/17 reviewing 111/23, 113/16 revise 84/2, 85/15 revising 81/25 RFP 65/14, 67/3, 105/15 Richard 116/14 rid 76/12 rightfully 83/16 RMR 119/6 road 68/20, 114/10 Robert 72/24 roll 69/8, 72/12 rolled 68/16 ROSE 67/19, 69/16, 69/21, 69/25, 70/3, 71/9, 71/12, 72/16, 73/17, 73/20, 73/23, 74/12, 78/5, 78/8, 87/6, 87/17, 87/22, 88/24, 90/10, 92/6, 92/8, 92/17, 94/17, 94/22, 95/3, 95/9, 98/2, 98/8, 98/11, 98/14, 98/17, 98/19, 98/21, 100/2, 100/7, 100/9, 101/14, 101/17, 101/20, 101/22, 101/24, 102/2, 102/6, 103/2, 104/14, 105/20, 106/3, 106/5, 113/23, 114/2, 114/5, 115/11, 118/7, 118/10 round 75/13 routinely 97/12 RPR-CP 119/6 RSVP 114/24 ruling 106/11 run 80/18, 82/21, 88/22, 91/5, 91/9, 93/9, 102/15, 105/2, 110/14 running 89/4, 91/10 runs 84/9 runway 61/18 runways 61/19</p>	<p>self 91/8 self-fuel 73/8, 75/23, 88/12 self-fueling 62/3, 68/10, 70/12, 89/10, 104/18 self-funded 66/16 self-serve 71/22, 72/3, 72/5, 89/5, 89/24 self-service 71/17, 74/20, 75/15, 75/19, 86/7, 102/10 selling 71/19, 75/20 send 107/2, 110/11, 116/22 Senior 114/25 sense 66/17, 74/6, 74/11, 84/10, 86/15, 103/17, 104/2 sent 106/19, 110/17 separate 76/19 separation 77/4 service 71/24, 80/22, 81/8, 86/7, 91/12, 92/20, 95/5, 115/14 services 82/20, 92/20, 92/21, 92/24, 93/8, 94/2, 94/11, 94/22, 95/17, 104/21, 108/21 set 61/6, 94/18 sets 77/8 Shirley 114/9 shop 112/25 short 64/7, 70/10, 82/10, 104/8 side 61/1, 65/4, 65/8, 66/17, 67/1, 117/20 signoffs 94/6 silly 86/5 simple 91/21, 95/24, 106/23, 110/12, 110/20, 112/15, 113/14 single 83/1 single-dimension 82/20 sit 91/16, 91/17, 91/18 site 61/13, 62/14, 82/8, 82/13 sites 63/6 sitting 95/15, 116/5 situation 65/18, 74/23 SK 99/10, 99/15 skilled 105/21 small 86/6 smaller 61/21 Smyrna 91/25 snapshot 85/22 snapshots 84/10 sold 74/4, 75/1 soliciting 103/7 someplace 106/14, 109/17 sort 61/9, 65/14, 86/3, 93/11, 93/19, 93/24, 94/23 spent 71/4, 71/6, 110/10, 110/17 spinoff 62/2 Sport 65/19, 65/21, 71/15, 71/20, 71/23, 73/2, 75/11, 75/18, 76/1, 76/13, 76/20, 77/16, 91/3, 91/14, 97/14, 97/23 Sport's 75/10, 77/20, 91/4, 95/15 spreadsheet 84/4 square 96/18 stack 98/4 Staff 93/21, 94/19, 98/4, 103/20, 105/21 stages 66/6, 67/8 stamp 116/25 stand 70/6 standards 87/25, 88/11, 88/18, 93/7, 100/19, 103/10, 103/14 standpoint 73/15, 73/16 start 67/19, 74/16 started 76/12, 90/24, 91/2 starting 82/2, 84/12 startup-type 66/23 state 89/25, 119/3 statement 80/8, 110/8, 110/22, 112/15 statement's 110/24 statements 109/1, 109/6, 109/7 station 81/19 statute 107/25 statutory 107/21 stenographic 119/9 stenographically 119/7 stewards 112/25 stick 91/23 stop 104/8 storage-only 99/1, 101/1, 101/10 storing 89/16 straighten 112/6 street 109/12 strong 63/11, 105/6 study 87/8 stuff 91/21 subject 77/3, 93/7, 100/18, 101/5 submit 66/13, 105/18 subsidize 72/7, 72/13</p>	<p>subsidized 74/3 subsidizing 71/21, 72/4 success 66/18 successful 63/3 supply 82/17 support 115/5 supporting 75/3 surrounded 108/3 surrounding 108/8 sweet 91/20 syphon 75/25 syphoning 76/16 system 117/9, 117/11</p> <p align="center">T</p> <p>takeoff 114/15 talk 80/6, 87/10, 89/1, 92/12, 92/13 talked 70/20, 72/10, 89/15 talking 70/5, 75/14, 78/8, 81/7, 81/18, 81/24, 89/1, 90/14, 97/20, 109/19 tanks 89/17 tax 72/12 taxes 84/7, 85/14 taxi 75/17, 77/16 taxiing 61/25 taxpayers 72/10 technicalities 113/16 tenant 96/16, 104/6 tend 62/24 term 65/2, 68/22, 68/25, 93/14, 93/19 terminal 95/17, 96/12, 96/19, 99/12 terms 63/10, 77/5, 84/4, 105/15, 108/19 Thank 71/9, 71/12, 72/16, 73/16, 73/17, 90/10, 92/6, 92/7, 92/18, 104/10, 118/12 Thanks 72/17 Thereupon 118/13 they've 101/7, 103/15 thin 86/8 thousand 90/22, 110/17 three 64/12, 90/22, 107/5, 115/1 threshold 100/12 thrilled 68/21 till 107/6 Timbuktu 106/14 time 61/11, 61/12, 63/24, 63/25, 67/4, 67/11, 68/4, 70/11, 70/14, 70/18, 71/18, 74/18, 75/17, 82/15, 86/6, 88/17, 88/19, 101/7, 104/24, 106/10, 107/6, 107/11, 109/25, 110/23, 112/4 timely 109/24 times 97/11, 109/9, 112/2 top 71/7 totaling 106/20 touches 80/16 tower 61/4, 61/11, 115/6 Tracine 89/2 traffic 101/5 transactions 112/6, 112/20 transcript 119/8 transferred 69/5 transient 75/12, 75/21, 75/22, 76/1 treasurer 106/16, 112/18, 113/3 trouble 63/21 trucks 89/11, 90/4 true 119/8 turn 80/5, 105/9 turned 112/25, 113/3 turning 113/2 two 61/19, 67/6, 68/19, 69/10, 76/19, 79/17 two-fold 62/20 types 63/15, 93/21, 94/4, 97/8, 107/22</p> <p align="center">U</p> <p>ugly 108/9 undo 110/3 unhappy 79/22 uniformly 100/1 union 112/16, 112/22, 112/24 update 86/19, 86/20 Upon 71/14 users 61/22, 63/2, 72/13, 94/2</p>
<p align="center">S</p> <p>safely 101/16 sales 71/25, 75/21, 75/22 sandwich 74/18 sat 114/25 save 75/23 savings 108/19 scenario 72/3, 85/21, 86/13, 89/12, 97/14 scenarios 94/4 se 82/24 second 62/17, 62/18, 62/20, 63/19, 63/25, 64/8, 64/10, 67/16, 67/18, 68/17, 69/8, 69/12, 81/22, 82/5, 82/15, 88/2, 97/13, 98/8, 98/9, 98/10, 101/20, 101/21, 103/21, 109/10, 113/2 seconded 98/12 secured 117/5</p>	<p>self 91/8 self-fuel 73/8, 75/23, 88/12 self-fueling 62/3, 68/10, 70/12, 89/10, 104/18 self-funded 66/16 self-serve 71/22, 72/3, 72/5, 89/5, 89/24 self-service 71/17, 74/20, 75/15, 75/19, 86/7, 102/10 selling 71/19, 75/20 send 107/2, 110/11, 116/22 Senior 114/25 sense 66/17, 74/6, 74/11, 84/10, 86/15, 103/17, 104/2 sent 106/19, 110/17 separate 76/19 separation 77/4 service 71/24, 80/22, 81/8, 86/7, 91/12, 92/20, 95/5, 115/14 services 82/20, 92/20, 92/21, 92/24, 93/8, 94/2, 94/11, 94/22, 95/17, 104/21, 108/21 set 61/6, 94/18 sets 77/8 Shirley 114/9 shop 112/25 short 64/7, 70/10, 82/10, 104/8 side 61/1, 65/4, 65/8, 66/17, 67/1, 117/20 signoffs 94/6 silly 86/5 simple 91/21, 95/24, 106/23, 110/12, 110/20, 112/15, 113/14 single 83/1 single-dimension 82/20 sit 91/16, 91/17, 91/18 site 61/13, 62/14, 82/8, 82/13 sites 63/6 sitting 95/15, 116/5 situation 65/18, 74/23 SK 99/10, 99/15 skilled 105/21 small 86/6 smaller 61/21 Smyrna 91/25 snapshot 85/22 snapshots 84/10 sold 74/4, 75/1 soliciting 103/7 someplace 106/14, 109/17 sort 61/9, 65/14, 86/3, 93/11, 93/19, 93/24, 94/23 spent 71/4, 71/6, 110/10, 110/17 spinoff 62/2 Sport 65/19, 65/21, 71/15, 71/20, 71/23, 73/2, 75/11, 75/18, 76/1, 76/13, 76/20, 77/16, 91/3, 91/14, 97/14, 97/23 Sport's 75/10, 77/20, 91/4, 95/15 spreadsheet 84/4 square 96/18 stack 98/4 Staff 93/21, 94/19, 98/4, 103/20, 105/21 stages 66/6, 67/8 stamp 116/25 stand 70/6 standards 87/25, 88/11, 88/18, 93/7, 100/19, 103/10, 103/14 standpoint 73/15, 73/16 start 67/19, 74/16 started 76/12, 90/24, 91/2 starting 82/2, 84/12 startup-type 66/23 state 89/25, 119/3 statement 80/8, 110/8, 110/22, 112/15 statement's 110/24 statements 109/1, 109/6, 109/7 station 81/19 statute 107/25 statutory 107/21 stenographic 119/9 stenographically 119/7 stewards 112/25 stick 91/23 stop 104/8 storage-only 99/1, 101/1, 101/10 storing 89/16 straighten 112/6 street 109/12 strong 63/11, 105/6 study 87/8 stuff 91/21 subject 77/3, 93/7, 100/18, 101/5 submit 66/13, 105/18 subsidize 72/7, 72/13</p>	<p align="center">U</p> <p>ugly 108/9 undo 110/3 unhappy 79/22 uniformly 100/1 union 112/16, 112/22, 112/24 update 86/19, 86/20 Upon 71/14 users 61/22, 63/2, 72/13, 94/2</p>

V

valuation 72/22
 value 65/2
 vendor 94/14
 vendors 94/22
 verification 110/11
 verify 85/14
 viable 68/23, 104/6
 visible 61/4, 61/23
 volume 99/8
 Volunteers 114/25
 vote 88/23
 voted 112/22
 voucher 113/1, 113/4, 113/11
 vouchers 112/23, 113/1

W

wait 69/19, 87/4, 107/4
 waiting 107/11, 109/11, 110/11
 waiver 99/21
 walked 112/9
 wander 94/8
 watching 114/13
 Wayne 73/8
 week 92/15, 109/10
 weeks 107/5
 weighed 72/15
 whack 83/18
 where'd 110/14
 wherever 107/3
 wholesale 84/8, 85/13
 wild 76/9
 willing 66/4, 69/19, 88/21
 window 114/14
 wish 93/17, 95/23
 wonder 75/11
 work 64/24, 73/14, 102/13, 105/22, 117/11
 working 117/2
 works 67/12
 workshop 78/19
 worth 63/21, 112/6, 112/17, 112/18
 written 110/10

X

X 75/20, 106/17

Y

year 67/6, 68/19, 81/4, 82/2, 109/21, 112/5, 114/16
 year's 108/14, 112/6
 years 65/6, 67/9, 67/11, 68/19, 76/11, 79/18,
 103/8, 106/7, 117/3