

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, February 10, 2003

6 from 4:04 p.m. to 7:06 p.m.

7 \* \* \* \* \*

8 BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

12 \* \* \* \* \*

13 ALSO PRESENT:

- 14 GEORGE McCLURE, Esquire, and DOUGLAS BURNETT, Esquire,
- 15 Rogers, Towers, Bailey, Jones & Gay, P.A., 170 Malaga
- 16 Street, St. Augustine, FL, 32084, Attorney for Airport
- 17 Authority.
- 18 EDWARD WUELLNER, A.A.E., Executive Director.
- 19 BRYAN COOPER, Assistant Airport Director.

18 \* \* \* \* \*

19

20

21 St. Augustine Court Reporters  
 22 1510 N. Ponce de Leon Blvd., Suite A  
 23 St. Augustine, FL 32084  
 24 (904) 825-0570  
 25

1	I N D E X	
2		PAGE
3	2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	3
4	3. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES	3
5	4. ACCEPTANCE OF FINANCIAL REPORTS	4
6	5. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA	6
7	6. REPORTS:	
8	A. Mr. Bruce Maguire - County Commissioner	8
	B. Mr. Michael Slingluff - Aero Sport, Inc.	10
9	C. Mr. John Leslie - Grumman St. Augustine	10
	D. Mr. Robert Fleming - S.A.P.A.	11
10	E. Mr. Bjorn Otteson - F.A.C.T.	11
	F. Mr. George McClure - Attorney	11
11		
	7. ACTION ITEMS	
12		
	A. Master Plan Update	33
13	B. TVOR Relocation Project	53
	C. Ponce de Leon Property	98
14	D. Airport Attorney Contract Status	110
	E. General Aviation Airport Entitlement Grant	119
15	F. Exec. Director's Employment Contract Renewal	144
	G. AAAE Annual Meeting	156
16	H. Property Purchase Authorization	159
	I. Hangar Row I	168
17	J. Project Updates	175
18	8. AUTHORITY MEMBER REPORTS:	
19	A. Ms. Suzanne Green, Chairman	
	B. Mr. Joseph Ciriello	189
20	C. Mr. Wayne "Buzz" George, Secretary/Treasurer	
	D. Mr. Bob Cox	184
21	E. Mr. John "Jack" Gorman	181
22	9. PUBLIC COMMENT	186
23	10. NEXT BOARD MEETING	189
24	11. ADJOURNMENT	189

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Call the meeting of the  
3 Airport Authority to order. If we could stand,  
4 please, and pledge to the flag.

5 (Pledge of Allegiance.)

6 3. - Approval of Minutes

7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Apologize for the  
8 few-minute delay. We were just making sure all  
9 the handouts were handed out and everybody had  
10 their paperwork.

11 I have before us two sets of minutes, one  
12 from our workshop and one from our last meeting,  
13 and I need to know if people had -- if the board  
14 members have any comments, exceptions, additions,  
15 or deletions to those minutes.

16 (No comments or exceptions.)

17 CHAIRMAN GREEN: If not, then may I have a  
18 motion to approve them to be admitted as printed?

19 MR. CIRIELLO: I'll make the motion.

20 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Second the motion? Approve  
21 the --

22 MR. COX: I'll second the motion.

23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: -- motion? All in favor?

24 MR. CIRIELLO: Aye.

25 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Aye.

4

1 MR. GEORGE: Aye.

2 MR. COX: Aye.

3 MR. GORMAN: Aye.

4 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All opposed?

5 (No opposition.)

6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We'll have approval then of

7 the minutes for the Tuesday, January 7 meeting,

8 and our Friday, January 24, which was the

9 workshop.

10 4. - Acceptance of Financial Reports

11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Next agenda item, we have

12 the acceptance of the financial reports. I'll

13 refer to our treasurer, if he's had a chance to

14 go through this. I think so. I see initials on

15 there.

16 MR. WUELLNER: No, those are mine.

17 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Oh, those are yours? Okay.

18 MR. GEORGE: I have not had a chance to go

19 over the financial report and would like to

20 postpone the approval to the next meeting.

21 CHAIRMAN GREEN: This is our three-month

22 report.

23 MR. GEORGE: Ending December the 31st --

24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah.

25 MR. GEORGE: -- right.

5

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So, we wouldn't have  
2 another financial report for another quarter?

3 MR. WUELLNER: No, you'll have one next  
4 month. There -- it's actually a monthly  
5 compilation. That's just the -- it's covering  
6 what of the fiscal year has passed. And the  
7 reason you have not had any time with it is with  
8 the meeting being accelerated a week, they  
9 don't -- you don't even get them --

10 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is it possible then --

11 MR. WUELLNER: It requires a bank statement  
12 to show up, which puts it about the 7th, 8th, 9th  
13 of the month, somewhere around there usually.  
14 We're actually kind of lucky we got them before  
15 the meeting.

16 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is it possible to have both  
17 of them on the agenda for --

18 MR. WUELLNER: Sure.

19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: -- our next meeting so we  
20 can --

21 MR. WUELLNER: Actually, your next one will

22 include what was in this one, because it's a --  
23 MR. GEORGE: Okay.  
24 MR. WUELLNER: -- compilation.  
25 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is it -- I think I'd rather

6

1 have a motion on that, because we're passing off  
2 reviewing financials to the next meeting, but --  
3 I'd entertain a motion to pass to the next  
4 meeting so all of the members have adequate time  
5 to review the financial statement.

6 MR. GEORGE: I -- I make that motion, that  
7 we --

8 MR. GORMAN: I would second that.

9 MR. GEORGE: -- postpone judgment on it till  
10 the next meeting.

11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. Gorman, second?

12 MR. GORMAN: (Nods head.)

13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All in favor?

14 MR. CIRIELLO: Aye.

15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Aye.

16 MR. GEORGE: Ay.

17 MR. COX: Aye.

18 MR. GORMAN: Aye.

19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All opposed?

20 (No opposition.)

21 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. That motion will  
22 carry. We'll review both financial statements  
23 then next meeting.

24 5. - Approval of Meeting Agenda

25 CHAIRMAN GREEN: You have also -- our next

7

1 agenda item is approval of our agenda, which for  
2 lack of all the paper, it's the purple one --

3 MR. WUELLNER: I have one minor notation.

4 We have a -- have a scrivener's error. Item D.

5 is supposed to be Airport Attorney Contract

6 Status, not Airport Authority Contract Status.

7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. Do we have any

8 comment with regards to the agenda, acceptance of

9 the agenda as printed? Any comments from the

10 board?

11 (No comments.)

12 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Make a -- accept a motion,

13 entertain a motion to accept the agenda for

14 today's meeting.

15 MR. COX: I'll move to accept the agenda.

16 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Second?

17 MR. GEORGE: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All right. We'll approve

19 the agenda and go forward, then. All in favor?

20 MR. CIRIELLO: Aye.  
21 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Aye.  
22 MR. GEORGE: Aye.  
23 MR. COX: Aye.  
24 MR. GORMAN: Aye.  
25 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All opposed?

8

1 (No opposition.)

2 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. We'll go forward  
3 with this meeting agenda which, as I stated, is  
4 the purple one.

5 Now for reports. I think I saw Mr. Maguire?  
6 Yes, sir.

7 6.A. - County Commissioner

8 COMMISSIONER MAGUIRE: I want to thank you  
9 very much for hosting the joint meeting last  
10 week. It turned out very well. We had a lot of  
11 participation, a lot of good comments, and we got  
12 a lot of -- I know at the county commission  
13 level, we got a lot of response from people who  
14 are interested in what's going on. So, thank you  
15 very much. In particular for Mr. George for  
16 taking the finger and pointing it in the right  
17 direction, getting people moving instead of  
18 sitting there.



19 But other than that, of course, we haven't  
20 been able to discuss this issue among ourselves.

21 We will talk about it tomorrow. I'm not sure  
22 exactly where it's going to go from here.

23 I think all of you heard Commissioner  
24 Bryant, just to reiterate his position, that he  
25 will not vote or support any type of activity

9

1 that diverts money away from any specific item.

2 The real question is, can we bring in outside  
3 money? And that, hopefully, is what Ben Adams is  
4 helping coordinate, is all of these  
5 possibilities.

6 Other than that, I really don't have  
7 anything to report, because I haven't been able  
8 to get ahold of Mr. Adams. And, of course, I am  
9 not able to talk to the commissioners. Any  
10 questions?

11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I just have one comment. I  
12 was contacted by an independent businessman, and  
13 I directed him to Mr. Adams and Mr. Harriss --

14 COMMISSIONER MAGUIRE: Great.

15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: -- so that that information  
16 would get before your commission meeting. And  
17 that would be independent money that would be --

18 they're interested in purchasing the golf

19 course --

20 COMMISSIONER MAGUIRE: Terrific.

21 CHAIRMAN GREEN: -- or help with it.

22 COMMISSIONER MAGUIRE: And he's putting

23 together a package to present to us tomorrow, so

24 we'll find out tomorrow.

25 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Oh, good. Okay.

10

1 COMMISSIONER MAGUIRE: Okay? Thank you very

2 much.

3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Aero Sport?

4 6.B. - Aero Sport, Inc.

5 MR. SLINGLUFF: Well, this month, we do have

6 some good news. We're advancing slowly out there

7 on the -- on the ramp site. The -- a lot of the

8 construction material has been cleared away and

9 definitely making progress. We've got a ways to

10 go out there.

11 Of concern, just as a heads-up, I guess even

12 though everyone is aware that the fuel prices are

13 going up dramatically, last year -- last week, we

14 had eleven cents increase on avgas, four cents on

15 jet fuel. Jet fuel is hovering at \$3 a gallon,

16 which is record levels, and it's -- it's

17 absolutely crazy.  
18 We've heard from the wholesalers that this  
19 week, we can expect six to nine cents per gallon  
20 increase. So, hopefully we see the tensions in  
21 the Middle East relax or we'll all be hurting  
22 here soon. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Slingluff.

24 6.C. - Northrop Grumman

25 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Northrop Grumman?

11

1 (Representative absent.)

2 CHAIRMAN GREEN: There's nobody from  
3 Northrop here.

4 6.D. - Pilots Association

5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Pilots Association?

6 MR. FLEMING: No report.

7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you.

8 6.E. - Florida Aviation Career Training

9 CHAIRMAN GREEN: The Florida Aviation Career  
10 Training?

11 (Representative absent.)

12 MR. WUELLNER: Don't see him.

13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I don't see anybody. And  
14 our attorney.

15 6.F. - Airport Authority Attorney

16 MR. McCLURE: Not too much of a report.  
17 This time around, I assume that y'all have been  
18 getting the weekly reports with respect to the  
19 progress on the -- the terminal. And most of  
20 that's visible, I think, rather than anything I  
21 need to report on.

22 With respect to the litigation that we had  
23 filed, an answer was due on January 31st. We  
24 granted a short extension for the filing of a  
25 response. The insurance company has hired an

12

1 attorney out of Orlando to represent Earth Tech  
2 in this matter, and the good news is that we were  
3 impressed in our communications with that lawyer,  
4 that he was already very familiar with -- with  
5 the issues of the case, and that's a good sign,  
6 because you do want people who have taken the  
7 time to become aware of it.

8 The -- it's somewhat unusual at this stage,  
9 because usually it happens a little bit earlier,  
10 but they have asked to have a conference with  
11 respect to a settlement of the case. And I take  
12 it as a good sign that that comes so quickly.

13 They asked for a little bit of information,  
14 which was appropriate and available under public

15 records that we're giving to them. But we  
16 anticipate at least getting an idea of where they  
17 stand with respect to our claims. Within the  
18 next two or three weeks, I think we'll have an  
19 opportunity to sit down with them.

20 So, at the next meeting, I would hope to be  
21 able to report on whether it looks as though  
22 we're going to be able to have a prompt  
23 negotiated settlement of this matter or whether  
24 or not it looks like we're going to go on for  
25 some time with it.

13

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Comments? Mr. Gorman?

2 MR. GORMAN: Yes. From your correspondence  
3 previously, I understand that Earth Tech has a  
4 million dollar deductible on their errors and  
5 omissions insurance?

6 MR. McCLURE: That is correct.

7 MR. GORMAN: Wonder how deep their pockets  
8 are.

9 MR. McCLURE: Earth Tech is a subsidiary of  
10 Tyco, which is the company that's made a fair  
11 amount of news lately about executive  
12 compensation and paintings and things like that.  
13 But it trades well and is a -- I think that that

14 amount of a liability is probably a drop in the  
15 bucket.

16 MR. GORMAN: So, you feel the liability will  
17 carry directly to the parent company --

18 MR. McCLURE: Yes.

19 MR. GORMAN: -- and there may be some  
20 recourse.

21 MR. McCLURE: Yeah. Earth Tech itself is  
22 very large.

23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Anybody else? Mr. George?

24 MR. GEORGE: Let's talk about Phase 2 for a  
25 second. We are removing the buildings that are

14

1 left, the hangars, the other four hangars.

2 MR. McCLURE: Yes, sir.

3 MR. GEORGE: Ed, can you bring us up to date  
4 on what's happened about continuing with the  
5 project so that we -- we have not made this  
6 decision by the board, but a possibility of us  
7 funding it without waiting for settlement of the  
8 suit so we can get something going?

9 MR. WUELLNER: Well, you -- you have the  
10 ability to do that out of reserves, if you should  
11 desire to do that. We're not, from a Staff side,  
12 planning to present you with a recommend --

13 recommendation on development of what your  
14 alternatives might be with the site in terms of  
15 an actual project until next month.

16 We have just this morning in fact got fax  
17 information relative to some of the discussions  
18 we've had directly with Aero Sport about what a  
19 Phase 2 might look like. And we'll be meeting  
20 hopefully with them this week and see what  
21 they're thinking and refine the cost estimates  
22 that we've got and see where -- see whether that  
23 pans out and have something back to you in March.

24 MR. GEORGE: Okay. What -- what  
25 specifically will we get in March? You know, it

15

1 will be the results of your conceptual meetings  
2 and --

3 MR. WUELLNER: Correct.

4 MR. GEORGE: -- some idea of the cost?

5 MR. WUELLNER: Probably a unified Staff/FBO  
6 position on a direction to go for presentation to  
7 you folks.

8 MR. GEORGE: Is it unrealistic to assume  
9 that this board then would have enough  
10 information that we could bring up, discuss, and  
11 vote on us continuing this project out of our own

12 funds in lieu of waiting for it? Could we do

13 that --

14 MR. WUELLNER: I think it would be --

15 MR. GEORGE: -- with the information that

16 you'll give us next month?

17 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. I think you have

18 the -- the discussion at that point as to exactly

19 how you do wish to pay for it, whether you want

20 to move the project ahead immediately, based on

21 using reserve funds on the -- on the chance that

22 you will be reimbursed through the -- through the

23 litigation with the general consultant, or wait

24 until that materializes, then move the project

25 forward. Those will be, you know, your

16

1 discussions at that point.

2 What we're going to do is tell you what we

3 think the project Phase 2 should be or what we've

4 generally agreed to move to you guys, and see

5 what -- see what -- see what happens from that

6 point.

7 MR. GEORGE: Would it help you at all if we

8 gave you that direction today?

9 MR. WUELLNER: Relative to what?

10 MR. GEORGE: To what you're going to bring



11 to the next meeting, you know, a month from now.

12 MR. WUELLNER: Well, it would certainly  
13 cut -- cut the legs off any discussions. If  
14 you're going to tell us what you want us to do,  
15 we can certainly do that.

16 I mean, from our perspective, it certainly  
17 simplifies my life. I don't have to discuss  
18 alternatives; you just tell me what you're going.  
19 I mean, if you want to look at alternatives,  
20 they're going to take another month to get -- to  
21 get out on the table for you. That's all I'm  
22 saying.

23 MR. GEORGE: Madam Chairman, I would fully  
24 support discussion now, a new agenda item added  
25 at the end, but get some discussion going with

17

1 the board about how we feel about committing our  
2 funds to make this project happen as opposed to  
3 waiting until we get the suit settled. I don't  
4 know how it's best -- do it right now or do it at  
5 the end?

6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I guess what we need to  
7 discuss is what kind of information would we need  
8 or do we need to do that. Is it something that  
9 could be gotten in 30 days?

10 MR. GEORGE: It's my opinion that this  
11 project has rocked on so long, that if we get the  
12 funds, that's great, you know, from the suit, but  
13 if we don't get the funds, we need to have this  
14 project proceed for the benefit of the airport.

15 The government -- we were talking in our  
16 workshop about different restrictions on grants  
17 and things. The government put funds out for us  
18 to make this happen. And I'm saying for us, it  
19 is my opinion, that if we do nothing until we  
20 find out what's happening with the suit, then we  
21 could just be forestalling off -- we're going to  
22 spend the money anyway, so let's get it going.

23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, why --

24 MR. CIRIELLO: Madam Chair?

25 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yes, Mr. Ciriello?

18

1 MR. CIRIELLO: Shouldn't this be an agenda  
2 item at the end, like Mr. George suggested,  
3 rather than discussing this right now at this  
4 particular time under reports?

5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We can --

6 MR. CIRIELLO: That would be my opinion. I  
7 would --

8 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We can make it an agenda

9 item --

10 MR. CIRIELLO: -- suggest that we do that.

11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: -- at the end, if you'd

12 like.

13 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Can we amend the agenda and

15 add --

16 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

17 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I know we asked before to

18 do that, but we've approved it already.

19 MR. COX: We can reapprove it.

20 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We could probably put it

21 under project updates.

22 MR. WUELLNER: That's fine.

23 MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah.

24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is that okay?

25 MR. WUELLNER: Fine.

19

1 MR. GEORGE: Fine with me.

2 CHAIRMAN GREEN: And I just asked. I mean,

3 we're not here to come up with ideas today, but

4 to tell our director what we need to have it --

5 make a decision --

6 MR. GEORGE: Absolutely.

7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: -- as to which way we're

8 going for next month. And that -- I think that  
9 would also give our attorney some time to give us  
10 as solid as you can -- a responsive pleading  
11 would have been filed by then; is that correct?

12 MR. McCLURE: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay.

14 MR. McCLURE: As a matter of fact, I think  
15 it's due today.

16 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So, we'll know what  
17 direction they're really headed in the litigation  
18 end of things, depending on what's been filed.

19 Okay. We'll add it to the project update, then,  
20 to make sure exactly -- that way, we can think  
21 during the meeting what we really want to have  
22 before us.

23 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

24 MR. McCLURE: There's only one other item  
25 under my report, and I -- and that is that the --

20

1 you'll recall before that a previous board had  
2 conceptually discussed a modification of the  
3 Grumman leases. And the Grumman leases were  
4 arranged such that they have an option on certain  
5 of our property, which therefore precludes us  
6 from doing with it -- doing anything with it for

7 a period of time. And, also, there is a parking  
8 area just north of the new terminal, which we had  
9 wanted to get back for our purposes.

10 And I received correspondence dated Friday  
11 from Northrop that they agreed with the  
12 modifications that we made to their suggested  
13 form of lease and have suggested executing those  
14 leases.

15 However, if this board determines that the  
16 need for the option property does not justify the  
17 extension of the -- of the initial term of the  
18 lease, which is essentially it was paid for by  
19 their repaying the bond issue before, then you  
20 need to let me know, because we're -- we're at a  
21 point where all the documentation's done and we  
22 need to get some instruction from the Authority  
23 about whether or not we want to go ahead and  
24 modify that lease term.

25 It probably doesn't have to be done right

21

1 now, but they certainly said they're ready to go,  
2 and they'll be looking for an answer from me  
3 about whether we're ready to sign these changes.

4 MR. WUELLNER: I think realistically you may  
5 want to delay this 30 to 60 days, pending the

6 outcome of what -- what's out there with U.S.  
7 Customs, because I believe if that is not even a  
8 probability as we move over the next 60 days,  
9 then I think a there's a high probability that  
10 you may not want to consider going ahead with  
11 that transaction and just forgetting it.

12 MR. McCLURE: And that's fine by me. I'm --  
13 we can -- we can put them off for that long. I  
14 think -- I mean, there's nothing that requires us  
15 to enter into this, so it -- certainly we can put  
16 them off and explain that we've got to evaluate  
17 this.

18 But if Customs is not coming, what -- what  
19 Mr. Wuellner is going to have to help you  
20 evaluate is whether or not the current fair  
21 market value of getting that property back and  
22 re-leasing it or developing it exceeds the -- the  
23 diminution in your rental income that you would  
24 receive from Northrop Grumman in the future.

25 So, that's -- that's the kind of evaluation

22

1 that you'll have to go through next month. And,  
2 I agree, that'd be kind of silly, to try and do  
3 that today, but that is on the table.

4 The last thing is that I'm going to -- I

5 started vacation Friday, but I wanted to cover  
6 the workshop today. So, I'm going to go and I'm  
7 going to let Doug Burnett of our office --  
8 Ms. Bloodworth was out of town today, so she  
9 couldn't be here, and he's going to cover the  
10 rest of the meeting.

11 The only thing that's come up that I can  
12 think of that might be germane, to my knowledge,  
13 that Doug may not know is just for your  
14 discussion on the terminal update, the number  
15 that we have is \$200,000 negotiated from Liberty  
16 Mutual, the bonding agent for the contractor.  
17 Plus, there was about \$160,000 in the original  
18 contract which had not yet been disbursed. So,  
19 it's not just their \$200-. We essentially have a  
20 pool of about \$360- that represents funds,  
21 without dipping into an expectation of getting  
22 money from any other source.

23 So, in your discussions, I wanted to let you  
24 know that that's probably the number you need to  
25 think about, rather than just \$200-, because we

23

1 sometimes neglect the fact that we didn't  
2 disburse the whole contract. So, it's about  
3 \$360- that we've got in the kitty. Any questions

4 about my report?

5 MR. CIRIELLO: Could I ask George something?

6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yes.

7 MR. CIRIELLO: About this Grumman lease,  
8 there's some 70-some acres in there that they  
9 have their clutches on, right --

10 MR. McCLURE: I think that's right.

11 MR. CIRIELLO: -- that's ours? And they  
12 want about 20 of it to do another building, and  
13 they're proposing to release all of that  
14 property, except that 20 acres they want in lieu  
15 of a couple more years of -- extended on their  
16 contract to where they won't be paying us  
17 anything for the property when it reverts to us,  
18 which is probably, what, a million a year, or a  
19 hundred thousand a year, or what is it, Ed?

20 MR. WUELLNER: It's close to a million.

21 MR. CIRIELLO: Okay. So, if we give them  
22 that, they'll release the property to us -- I  
23 mean, the rest of it, so we can go ahead and do  
24 something with it.

25 So, is there anything that says that we

24

1 can't tell them, hey, if you want to build that

2 building so bad, go ahead and do it; you release



3 the rest of the property that's rightly ours in  
4 the first place, because they got it -- I don't  
5 know why it was given to them back -- I think it  
6 was a mistake. And then at the end of the two  
7 years, put a -- something in the contract that we  
8 will then decide whether it's practical for us to  
9 give them that extra couple of years they want.  
10 Because if we don't use that property between now  
11 and when their lease is really up, and we have  
12 gained nothing from it, why would we want to give  
13 them a million a year for nothing?

14 So, we'll -- go ahead and release that  
15 property so we can use it as soon as we need to.  
16 You can go ahead and build your building on the  
17 20 acres you want. At the end of the contract,  
18 we will then decide whether it was feasibly  
19 financially for us to go ahead and give you the  
20 extension or not. Could we do that?

21 MR. McCLURE: This is a contractual  
22 arrangement with Grumman, which to make any  
23 change to is going to require mutual consent.  
24 But you can structure anything that you feel is  
25 in the -- as a proposal, anything that you feel

25

1 that is in the Authority's benefit. Now, let

2 me -- I'm not sure I completely understand the  
3 question, but let me mention a couple of things.

4 First of all, Grumman wasn't given the land.  
5 What happened was in exchange for their building  
6 the improvements -- or rather we built the  
7 improvements under the bond, then they agreed to  
8 pay the bond back a hundred percent, which they  
9 just happen to have redeemed the bond somewhat  
10 early because interest rates were -- were better  
11 now for them to do that.

12 The area that they're proposed to relinquish  
13 is -- is the area between the run-up facility and  
14 the two hangars that you see just to the bottom  
15 of the Northrop Grumman North 40 complex.

16 MR. CIRIELLO: In here (indicating).

17 MR. McCLURE: Yes, sir. And we've done an  
18 evaluation of the ratio of uplands and wetlands  
19 in that area to try and figure out what the net  
20 amount of property is that's available there for  
21 development. So, I think that -- that your staff  
22 is prepared to discuss with you what amount of  
23 use could be put -- that property could be put to  
24 and what kind of revenue they might generate.

25 Now, if -- just to try and think creatively

1 for a minute, you could, for example, structure  
2 something with Grumman where you said, "Look,  
3 what we want to negotiate is -- you call it a  
4 put. And that is that at some point we can tell  
5 you that you either have to exercise your option  
6 or get out of the way, and you have so long to  
7 evaluate that and here's -- and if we do that and  
8 you don't exercise it, here's what you get for  
9 giving up your options.

10 So that you might be able to structure  
11 something where you don't have to leave it  
12 completely open-ended; you say it stays the way  
13 it is for now, but if we get a tenant that shows  
14 up, we can -- we can tell you that you're either  
15 going to exercise your option and pay us rent or  
16 give up the property and let us give it to  
17 somebody else. That might be a way to do that.

18 If you're thinking that at the end of the  
19 lease, you look backwards and decide, I think  
20 that you ought to pay rent for some period of  
21 time because we didn't use it, I think that most  
22 business people would not get into something that  
23 would be quite so open-ended.

24 MR. CIRIELLO: Now, that's not what I meant,  
25 I don't think. It sounds to me as though Grumman

1 has a plan in mind that they're anxious to do  
2 something in there, like right now.

3 MR. McCLURE: Well, not the option  
4 property --

5 MR. CIRIELLO: And we --

6 MR. McCLURE: -- but somewhere else.

7 MR. CIRIELLO: Okay. And so, if we go ahead  
8 and agree with that and give them the extension  
9 on the rent and such, and they go ahead and build  
10 their building, and it comes to where we can't  
11 use it -- like Ed says that there's a possibility  
12 that Customs will want it, maybe, maybe not, and  
13 if they don't, then these years that we've given  
14 them some free money, we're not going to get  
15 anything out of it.

16 So, I'm just saying if they want to go ahead  
17 and build in there right now, go ahead and let  
18 them build, and they release the rest of the  
19 property to us so we can use it, and if we don't,  
20 at the end of the normal contract time, if we  
21 haven't gotten anything out of it, we can say,  
22 well, we're not going to give you this free rent  
23 for a couple of years; you're going to have to  
24 start paying us rent that originally is in the  
25 contract at the end of the 20 years.

1 In other words, I don't want to give -- give  
2 them an option with the idea that we may not get  
3 anything out of it at all.

4 MR. McCLURE: So, what you'd like to do is  
5 for the Airport Authority to covenant that it  
6 will use its best efforts to lease that property  
7 to somebody else, and if we're successful at  
8 doing that, we'll credit their income versus --  
9 against what the -- Grumman ought to pay for it.

10 MR. CIRIELLO: You can put it that way. But  
11 I don't want to give up that million dollars a  
12 year for a couple of years as a risk that we may  
13 or may not get anything out of it and they go  
14 ahead and do what they want. I don't -- it's --  
15 it's not a win-win situation in that -- that  
16 light.

17 MR. McCLURE: Well, I think what I could do  
18 is, given the fact that we're coming back next  
19 month anyway to kind of discuss how eminent any  
20 other user is, if it turns out that it doesn't  
21 make sense for us to do it right now and we don't  
22 have a user right away that makes sense  
23 financially for us, maybe I can -- can be  
24 prepared to discuss a few alternatives on what we  
25 might negotiate with Northrop Grumman at the

1 March meeting.

2 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah, that, I think, would  
3 be good for all of us.

4 MR. CIRIELLO: See, I don't want to be  
5 completely negative here. I don't want to stop  
6 them from doing something to go ahead and improve  
7 themselves.

8 MR. WUELLNER: Well, you're -- well, you're  
9 not, because they currently have that right to do  
10 that.

11 MR. CIRIELLO: Okay.

12 MR. WUELLNER: You're not stopping them at  
13 all.

14 MR. CIRIELLO: You mean they can go ahead  
15 and build on there whether we say yes or no?

16 MR. WUELLNER: Correct. You gave them that  
17 right when you granted them an option.

18 MR. McCLURE: "You" being the board.

19 MR. WUELLNER: The board, yeah,  
20 collectively.

21 MR. McCLURE: And -- but what they've got  
22 is -- I mean, they've got an option to exercise,  
23 and that means that they would need to -- they  
24 would begin paying rent on it if they exercise

25 the option.

30

1 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah.

2 MR. CIRIELLO: So, really what they're after  
3 is they're just looking for a couple of years  
4 that they don't have to pay us rent that they  
5 should, at the end of the 20 years, because they  
6 can go ahead and build --

7 MR. McCLURE: Well, they've got something  
8 that they think we want and they want to know  
9 what we'll pay them for it.

10 MR. WUELLNER: You're exactly right.

11 MR. CIRIELLO: Now I'm starting to get a  
12 little ticked. They can go ahead and build  
13 without us saying anything, go ahead and do it,  
14 but we're not going to give you \$2 million for  
15 nothing.

16 MR. WUELLNER: Well, the -- they're in a  
17 difficult position to build on a piece of  
18 property that they only have approximately four  
19 years left on their lease. So, it doesn't make  
20 financial sense for them to invest in a  
21 multimillion dollar facility for four years.

22 MR. CIRIELLO: But on the new property they  
23 built, couldn't they get a -- a contract for that

24 or whatever? The life of that is 20 years, not  
25 both together.

31

1 MR. WUELLNER: Well, if they wanted to get a  
2 20-year life, then they're back here to negotiate  
3 the additional 16 years, because that is not  
4 covered.

5 None -- all of that property on the east  
6 side, north side, whatever you want to call it  
7 there, has a current expiration date of 2007, I  
8 believe it is, at which time, based on the  
9 original lease agreement, they have the ability  
10 to extend the lease with us at fair market value.  
11 The base lease, not the option.

12 So, we get the option back in 2007, unless  
13 they build something on it before 2007. But then  
14 at 2007, regardless, they're going to have to  
15 negotiate a lease agreement with us at market  
16 value versus it being wrapped into the bond deal  
17 that was done in the 19- -- late 1980s.

18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. George, did you have a  
19 question?

20 MR. GEORGE: I have a request of Staff.

21 MR. WUELLNER: We don't do requests.

22 MR. GEORGE: Before you --



23 MR. WUELLNER: Just kidding.

24 MR. GEORGE: I don't have a --

25 MR. WUELLNER: I come from a music

32

1 background. We don't do requests.

2 CHAIRMAN GREEN: No, he said they don't do  
3 requests.

4 MR. GEORGE: Please do. We've discussed  
5 this subject at a couple of meetings, and I don't  
6 know if we're referring back to some document  
7 that actually explained in black and white the  
8 entire circumstances. If so, I would like that  
9 document brought up to date and presented to us  
10 as an attachment for the next meeting. And if  
11 not, I'd like it put down, just a page and a half  
12 of, you know, here are these numbers we've been  
13 floating around, you know, and this, that, and  
14 the other.

15 For instance, another thing I'd like is,  
16 what do you anticipate the fair market value of  
17 that existing North 40 property is going to be?  
18 Is it going to be another million dollars a year?

19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: That's why I think we need  
20 it on our March agenda, so we have that  
21 information.

22 MR. GEORGE: Exactly. But with the details  
23 spelled out in black and white to us.

24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We've had the lease. I  
25 know I've read it.

33

1 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

2 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I -- this board probably  
3 hasn't had a chance. But the numbers have been  
4 out -- that would help us --

5 MR. WUELLNER: Sure.

6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: -- definitely next meeting.

7 MR. WUELLNER: Happy to do it.

8 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay.

9 MR. GEORGE: So, you do do requests.

10 MR. McCLURE: He just doesn't hum them.

11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. With that, we have  
12 action items, Mr. Wuellner?

13 (Mr. McClure exits and Mr. Burnett takes over.)

14 7.A. - Master Plan Update

15 MR. WUELLNER: First item I have is,  
16 following the workshop on the master plan, we --  
17 we provided you a copy of the supplemental  
18 agreement dated 02-01 related to the Airport  
19 Master Plan Update. And this would be a  
20 contract, if executed or authorized, with Earth

21 Tech for the Airport Master Plan itself.  
22 There were no modifications that I'm aware  
23 of, other than bringing that document in terms of  
24 the number of reports or printed documents back  
25 to us at the end, in closer to what we had

34

1 originally requested.

2 But other than that, the work basically is  
3 the same as what it was originally envisioned  
4 prior to the workshop. And there's a -- find it  
5 here. The proposed fees or estimated fees for  
6 cost structure is a lump sum of \$200,000 to  
7 conduct the master plan.

8 Now, a reminder that this is -- just in  
9 terms of a revenue side, this is an FAA grant  
10 project and is paid for at 90 percent federal;  
11 the remaining 10 percent is split evenly between  
12 the Airport Authority and FDOT. So, the bottom  
13 line is you're -- the Authority's contribution  
14 directly is about five cents on the dollar, to --  
15 just to give you an idea of how it's facilitated.

16 We have done, just -- just for additional  
17 background, as required by the federal grants,  
18 done a comparative cost estimate, and this is  
19 certainly within the tolerances of a independent

20 company providing an estimate of what this work  
21 ought to cost.

22 And it's at your -- at your point, you know,  
23 whether you wish to award the master plan to  
24 Earth Tech, or the alternative, as we discussed  
25 at the workshop, is to solicit additional firms

35

1 or solicit another firm either for strictly the  
2 Airport Master Plan, or look at them as an  
3 additional firm, as a planning and engineering  
4 firm, put them under a master agreement where you  
5 can award projects as you see fit.

6 You can have two firms. There's nothing  
7 prohibiting two firms from being under contract  
8 at the same time for general consultant work, and  
9 then use the cost comparison or what other  
10 tangible method you might come up with to  
11 differentiate who gets what work.

12 The other alternative is you can simply  
13 elect to move past this contract, general  
14 contract with Earth Tech, and solicit another  
15 firm. You have all those options out in front of  
16 you. Or, simply award the contract as it's been  
17 presented now. So...

18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. Any public comment?

19 (No public comment.)

20 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Close the public comment.

21 Board discussion?

22 MR. COX: Madam Chair?

23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yes.

24 MR. COX: What kind of time constraints are

25 we under, Ed, as far as looking at rebid options

36

1 that you just explained?

2 MR. WUELLNER: Okay. Redoing it, on a  
3 conservative basis, you would be looking at  
4 probably your May meeting to put the whole thing  
5 under contract with an alternative firm that you  
6 selected. It would take that kind of time line  
7 to go through those motions to -- to keep that  
8 process in compliance with Florida Statutes on  
9 the CCNA requirements, as well as the federal  
10 grant requirements of how you do it, which are  
11 basically the same.

12 But that process takes a little bit of time.  
13 You've got an advertisement period and response  
14 period of about a month in there. Evaluate those  
15 proposals, rank those individual firms in some  
16 method, ultimately decide to award to the  
17 number-one ranked firm.

18 MR. COX: What about the time constraints of  
19 a FAA requirement having the master plan to them  
20 for their approval?

21 MR. WUELLNER: You have a three-year window  
22 as it applies to the DOT portion. You have  
23 approximately the same with FAA. You have to --  
24 FAA get squirrely if you have not made any  
25 billings on this within the first 15 months of

37

1 the grant, which if my memory's correct, the  
2 grant is dated July -- June or July of last year.  
3 So, you would certainly be within that time frame  
4 developing, you know, invoices, if you will, or,  
5 you know, the project's been begun.

6 You would have to get concurrence of any new  
7 contractor or consultant to do the work from FAA  
8 and FDOT, which I don't -- wouldn't expect  
9 there'd be a problem to do if you chose that  
10 route, because you follow the CCNA process. It's  
11 really your call.

12 You solicited the last firm with the  
13 understanding that you could award the Airport  
14 Master Plan to that firm. So, it's certainly  
15 acceptable to award as you have it now, or you  
16 can go through the process. That's always up to

17 you.

18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. Gorman?

19 MR. GORMAN: Do you have -- are you in  
20 receipt of now enough plans and documents that  
21 you feel that if we did solicit another firm,  
22 there would be some continuity between the two  
23 firms? Obviously -- since we've obviously paid  
24 along the way, we don't want to be starting  
25 from --

38

1 MR. WUELLNER: Well, you really have --

2 MR. GORMAN: -- point of zero.

3 MR. WUELLNER: You really have no financial  
4 out -- no cash outflow at this point on the  
5 project, other than the required -- the  
6 requirement to solicit an independent cost  
7 estimate, which was just a couple of thousand  
8 dollar work item. But the lion's share, you have  
9 not expended funds toward. It's -- consultants  
10 typically do this work up front in hopes of  
11 getting the contract.

12 MR. GORMAN: I'm just worried about  
13 continuity --

14 MR. WUELLNER: Right.

15 MR. GORMAN: -- which for your purposes and

16 for the purposes of --

17 MR. WUELLNER: Well, you've got -- you've  
18 got a firm that you have a seven- or eight-year  
19 contractual history; however, they have not done  
20 a master plan for us, so they're -- the last  
21 master plan being completed in '96, the selection  
22 was with -- although they have about a year  
23 overlap from the previous consultant to this  
24 consultant, they were not the consultant that did  
25 the plan.

39

1 MR. GORMAN: So, the continuity issue is not  
2 a paramount issue --

3 MR. WUELLNER: Other than eight years of  
4 other project development, but not a planning  
5 project of that type.

6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. George?

7 MR. GEORGE: I think we would be fiscally  
8 responsible if we asked for two other bids.

9 MR. WUELLNER: Well, I mean, that's not how  
10 it works. This is one of those times --

11 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

12 MR. WUELLNER: -- I get to explain the  
13 rules. You cannot --

14 MR. GEORGE: Nobody explained it that way.



15 MR. WUELLNER: It comes under the  
16 Consultants Competitive Negotiation Act of the  
17 State of Florida. You cannot award professional  
18 service contracts based on price.

19 You are required to solicit qualifications  
20 and experience from those firms, statements of  
21 qualifications and letters in interest, however  
22 you want to structure the arrangement; then you  
23 go through a ranking based on that firm you  
24 believe to be best qualified or best meets the  
25 needs of your solicitation, at which point, once

40

1 that selection and ranking has been made, you are  
2 allowed to enter into substantive negotiations  
3 relative to price.

4 If you cannot reach a contract with this  
5 firm, you may move on to the number-two firm that  
6 is ranked, or three, respectively, if it should  
7 take that long. But you are not allowed to  
8 negotiate this kind of contract based on price  
9 alone or make the selection based on price alone.

10 This is not a construction contract, where  
11 it is required that you take the low bid if  
12 they're qualified. So, you've got a little  
13 different set of rules when you deal with

14 professional services.

15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I have a question I think  
16 along the lines of what Mr. Cox said. What time  
17 frame or pressures are put on us and then through  
18 the concurrence, but what kind of time pressures  
19 if we don't -- we go through this secondary  
20 process and come up with another company, what  
21 kind of time pressures are we putting on them,  
22 May, June, July, to now condense this master plan  
23 to us?

24 MR. WUELLNER: No, it does not have to be  
25 completed, in case I've been misunderstood. You

41

1 do not have to complete this study within 15  
2 months. What you must do is begin billing  
3 activity relative to the project.

4 In other words, you need to have kicked it  
5 off and begun in earnest to complete the project  
6 within 15 months. The grant term allows three  
7 years, and you can request extensions as  
8 necessary, but normally you'd complete the  
9 project within a three-year -- from grant opening  
10 to grant conclusion and bill-out, within a  
11 three-year time frame. You shouldn't have -- I  
12 wouldn't expect you to have any issues relative

13 to being able to complete it within the

14 three-year time line.

15 The project itself is a nine-month to

16 twelve-month effort. It just takes that long to

17 go through all of the motions to complete a

18 master plan. So, if you waited till May to award

19 it, you could expect it sometime in May next year

20 or thereabouts. You would be in a position to

21 send in a completed master plan and move along.

22 If you did that in February, the expectation

23 would be February of next year to be at this

24 point. So, you've got a -- you know,

25 approximately a contractual year that you would

42

1 give any consultant to do the master plan work.

2 And you should have something going by this

3 summer.

4 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Another question, maybe for

5 Mr. Burnett, and I'm not sure, since this is kind

6 of -- you just got dumped on this today. We

7 have -- well, they're not all our funds. I was

8 just thinking we had some hundreds of thousands

9 of dollars held there and we're in litigation

10 with Earth Tech, if we could hold that -- but

11 they're not all our funds. I just remembered,

12 those are grant funds. We only have control over  
13 5 percent of it then.

14 MR. WUELLNER: Correct. Well, yeah, your 5  
15 percent relative to this project. Relative to  
16 the -- as an example, the terminal project, you  
17 have 50 percent of the money. I mean, you're in  
18 a position where you have half the money  
19 involved.

20 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Right.

21 MR. WUELLNER: There's no federal agency  
22 involved.

23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: But I meant versus paying.  
24 We're concerned about Earth Tech, I think, coming  
25 in as a consultant again when we just had

43

1 concerns with them in the terminal project.

2 MR. WUELLNER: Right.

3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: And if we go ahead and  
4 award this down the road or now or whatever and  
5 we hand them over their first installment or  
6 whatever it is, we've lost some leverage with  
7 regards to making sure Phase 2 is done. But I  
8 forgot that wasn't all our -- those were not all  
9 our funds, so we can't hold onto those grant --

10 MR. WUELLNER: Well, you know, as a side

11 note, you have the ability to just put this on  
12 hold with Earth Tech and not do anything for, you  
13 know, a similar period of time. As long as  
14 you're -- again, got the thing kicked off and  
15 running in late spring, May-June time line,  
16 you're still going to meet all of your conditions  
17 of the granting agencies. You know, that's an  
18 alternative, but if you change your mind or elect  
19 not to do it in May, now you've really cut the  
20 time to respond.

21 CHAIRMAN GREEN: What cost would the  
22 Authority have with regards to if we went out and  
23 tried to go out and look at a couple of other  
24 firms?

25 MR. WUELLNER: It's a fairly simple matter

44

1 of putting the -- the RFQ onto the street.

2 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Right.

3 MR. WUELLNER: The process of selecting is a  
4 combination of some internal effort, and then  
5 it's back to the board here for actual ranking of  
6 the firms themselves.

7 So, we both have some obligations in terms  
8 of time and effort to put into it. But you can  
9 do that independently of awarding the contract.

10 You can make that decision -- frankly, you could  
11 make that decision in May. You can select  
12 another firm that you may want to use and make  
13 that decision in May.

14 Of course, you know, the -- in fairness,  
15 you're soliciting another firm, and there again,  
16 you'd have to discuss the scope of what you're  
17 going to ask them to do, whether it's perform in  
18 a similar fashion to Earth Tech and then use your  
19 judgment as you move through other projects,  
20 including the master plan, as to which firm you  
21 use. You can certainly do that. There's nothing  
22 prohibitive of having more than one consultant on  
23 board.

24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. Cox, anything?

25 MR. COX: Yeah, I have some discomfort

45

1 with -- with entering into a contract with a  
2 company which we're in -- in active litigation  
3 with at this time.

4 Not -- and I know there's probably a  
5 difference here -- from a legalese point of view,  
6 it's maybe apples and oranges, but as -- as far  
7 as entering into this kind of a contract for the  
8 Airport Master Plan and what has happened in the

9 past with Earth Tech. But I'd feel more  
10 comfortable exploring this at least a little more  
11 in depth.

12 And I guess another question I would have  
13 is, you said there was a rating process that goes  
14 on to explore what one's -- was that rating  
15 process from the previous board --

16 MR. WUELLNER: The ranking?

17 MR. COX: -- that decided on Earth Tech?

18 MR. WUELLNER: The ranking?

19 MR. COX: Yeah.

20 MR. WUELLNER: Well, the ranking's a  
21 function of the act, the competitive negotiation.  
22 You have to come to some ranking. It's kind of  
23 up to you how you get there in a sense, I mean,  
24 reasonably. But you literally determine which of  
25 the firms that's submitted, you know, in a

46

1 reasonable rank order. It usually goes through  
2 the first three or four firms where you determine  
3 first through fourth place, if you will,  
4 beginning negotiations with one.

5 MR. COX: That's my -- I've only seen Earth  
6 Tech. I didn't -- we didn't get a chance to rank  
7 anybody.

8 MR. WUELLNER: Correct. That was done,  
9 what, two years ago?

10 MR. COX: Okay. That's what I --

11 MR. WUELLNER: I'm trying to think, was it  
12 right before you got on the board or right after?  
13 I'm trying to remember.

14 MR. CIRIELLO: Right before.

15 MR. WUELLNER: Year before. So, I was  
16 thinking it was about two years ago when that  
17 effort was done the last time.

18 MR. COX: I'd just like to see a little more  
19 background on what we have to work with as --

20 MR. WUELLNER: Well, you know, as a -- you  
21 know, I understand the apprehension, and I --  
22 that's not hard to understand at all.

23 But my thoughts here are if there's even an  
24 inkling that you want to explore other firms,  
25 which I sense there is, then perhaps the thing --

47

1 the prudent thing to do is go through the motions  
2 at this point in soliciting other firms and  
3 proposals, put this on hold with Earth Tech. You  
4 have not shut the door on this with Earth Tech  
5 completely. What you've done is explore other  
6 options.



7 And then, come May, when you've ranked firms  
8 for this work -- and you can even put them under  
9 a general consultant agreement at that point and  
10 award the master plan to whichever firm you  
11 believe will be in the best interest of the  
12 Airport Authority. And that -- that actual award  
13 wouldn't occur until May instead of February.  
14 And that's certainly an acceptable way to go if  
15 you'd like.

16 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any other discussions from  
17 the board?

18 MR. GORMAN: I would certainly hope and  
19 concur with Mr. George and Mr. Cox that we need  
20 to -- to explore the matter further and we need  
21 to probably put out an RFQ, and that would be  
22 prepared when the time is right to make the  
23 motion to do that.

24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, I think what I'm  
25 hearing from Mr. Wuellner for direction for us,

48

1 if we are going to entertain that, I think now is  
2 the time, once we close discussion, to maybe make  
3 a motion and see if the board carries it.

4 MR. GORMAN: Are you looking for public  
5 comment or --

6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I already closed public  
7 comment.

8 MR. GORMAN: That would be fine. I would  
9 make that motion, that we --

10 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any --

11 MR. WUELLNER: I've got one other comment,  
12 because you do need to clarify whether it's in  
13 this motion or a separate motion, exactly what  
14 you're going to ask us to solicit for, because I  
15 just want to be sure we're not just -- you can  
16 look just for a planning firm or you can look for  
17 a firm that does planning and engineering and use  
18 that same process moving other types of projects,  
19 capital projects forward, too, in their  
20 development. So, make sure that's included in --

21 MR. GORMAN: I would certainly want a firm  
22 that would -- could encompass the entire scope of  
23 plan.

24 MR. WUELLNER: Okay.

25 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any more discussion from

49

1 the panel?

2 MR. GEORGE: I think that we would be wise  
3 to postpone acting on Earth Tech's position here,  
4 rather than closing it off; in other words,

5 postpone it while we look at other ones --

6 MR. GORMAN: Exactly.

7 MR. GEORGE: -- because Earth Tech has had  
8 an excellent relationship with us for six or  
9 seven years, and I would love to see that  
10 relationship get back to a good standing. And my  
11 definition of good standing is a rapid close on  
12 the suit problem that we have.

13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any further from the board?  
14 If there's no further discussion from the board,  
15 then we'll entertain a motion with regards to our  
16 Master Plan Update.

17 MR. GORMAN: I would make a motion to  
18 explore an RFQ for a full scope of firms to be  
19 able to -- be able to look at the costs incurred,  
20 without discounting using Earth Tech. In other  
21 words, we need to look at the whole scope of  
22 things. So, an RFQ for a firm that could --

23 MR. WUELLNER: That's fine.

24 MR. GORMAN: -- do that.

25 CHAIRMAN GREEN: That's enough direction --

50

1 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah.

2 CHAIRMAN GREEN: -- Mr. Wuellner?

3 MR. COX: I'll second the motion.

4 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any further discussion?

5 (No discussion.)

6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All in favor?

7 MR. CIRIELLO: Aye.

8 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Aye.

9 MR. GORMAN: Aye.

10 MR. GEORGE: Aye.

11 MR. COX: Aye.

12 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All opposed?

13 (No opposition.)

14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. Then that motion

15 will be carried, Mr. Wuellner, for you -- I think

16 it's planning and engineering.

17 MR. GEORGE: Full scope.

18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Full scope.

19 MR. WUELLNER: Okay. Now, one last question

20 that's more procedural for you. Your -- your

21 purchasing policy currently, you create a -- kind

22 of an ad hoc, on-the-side, committee that would

23 review the submittals of however many firms. And

24 typically that's a dozen or more proposals that

25 will come in in response to this. They'll --

51

1 typically would review those and come up with a

2 ranking or a suggested short list of firms for

3 further consideration by the full Authority.

4 My suggestion here is that if we -- if we in  
5 our RFQ limit the amount of pages to the specific  
6 information you're looking for, versus getting  
7 the whole big document of stuff nobody's going to  
8 read anyway and having firms jump through hoops  
9 unnecessarily, but if we narrow that to, say, 20  
10 or 25 pages per submittal in total, which would  
11 include references and similar projects and  
12 specifics about project management team and the  
13 people that are going to do the work, those kind  
14 of details, if we were to narrow it to that, you  
15 know, I personally would rather see this board go  
16 through that process and be very, very involved,  
17 even if it's at a workshop, come to the general  
18 understanding of those firms or a special meeting  
19 at the appropriate time, which would probably be  
20 in the April time frame, in advance of  
21 negotiating a contract and having that back to  
22 you for consideration in the May meeting. Rather  
23 than form that committee, although there's some  
24 great input, you could do that. You'd have to do  
25 it at the public meeting, anyway, and you could

52

1 solicit input from the public relative to those

2 proposals at that time.

3 Kind of skip that side committee, keep it at  
4 the board, and let you folks get intimately  
5 familiar with the dozen or more proposals. If we  
6 keep them short enough, I think that task won't  
7 be too -- too horrible. It is horrible when you  
8 get the 200-pagers that you're not even sure what  
9 you're looking for.

10 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I think if we kept it  
11 concise to what all of us could look at, it might  
12 even help the meeting so we're not saying, "What  
13 did you do in your ad hoc meeting?"

14 MR. GEORGE: Exactly.

15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So we're all in --

16 MR. WUELLNER: Then if you could just kind  
17 of tell me that via a motion, only because it  
18 would be different than your purchasing policy as  
19 you have it today. So, if you want to change  
20 that direction for this solicitation, then I  
21 think you'd need to do that by a motion so that  
22 we have that -- that direction on --

23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay.

24 MR. GEORGE: I make an amended motion that  
25 you keep it as concise as possible and short and

1 sweet, to the point.

2 MR. WUELLNER: And eliminate the selection  
3 committee and keep that selection at the board.

4 MR. GEORGE: And eliminate the election  
5 committee and let the board handle it.

6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Second on the motion?

7 MR. COX: Second.

8 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any discussion?

9 (No discussion.)

10 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All in favor?

11 MR. CIRIELLO: Aye.

12 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Aye.

13 MR. GEORGE: Ay.

14 MR. COX: Aye.

15 MR. GORMAN: Aye.

16 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Opposed?

17 (No opposition.)

18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: The amended motion would be  
19 carried as amended, the first motion as amended  
20 by the second.

21 7.B. - TVOR Relocation Project

22 MR. WUELLNER: Okay. Next item I've got,  
23 Madam Chairman, is the TVOR project. As  
24 promised, we forwarded a copy of the -- of the  
25 VOR -- TVOR -- I blanked there for a second --

1 TVOR relocation report done by THALES at our  
2 request. And I hope you've had a chance to look  
3 it over, but let me kind of just summarize it  
4 here.

5 There are some -- some interesting pieces of  
6 the radial signal that would come off the  
7 proposed site that creates some areas that would  
8 be restricted or likely result in restrictions  
9 after doing the modeling.

10 There are, I don't know, maybe six or eight  
11 of these specific areas that have -- they've  
12 called our attention to might create a problem  
13 with the overall broadcast. In other words, it's  
14 not going to have a 360-degree area that's  
15 completely usable in all quadrants and in all  
16 degrees around this facility.

17 That being said, that's not terribly unusual  
18 of itself. But there are a number of them, most  
19 of which are to the west side of the VOR and  
20 northwest side. The majority of them are. So,  
21 there are going to be significant pie pieces, if  
22 you will, of airspace that won't be usable with  
23 the VOR; that is, you can't use the VOR in those  
24 segments. They would be NOTAM'd out permanently  
25 and just not allowed to be used. Not a big deal.



1       Based on the review of the actual  
2       approaches, they could be -- look like they could  
3       be reestablished; that is, a runway 13 and a  
4       runway 31 approach re-established at the new site  
5       without a whole lot of trouble.

6       But given that there are these segments of  
7       area that would end up restricted, the suggestion  
8       of the consultant, or THALES here, is that we  
9       submit this report along with a request to FAA  
10      southern region, since they will be responsible  
11      for certifying the navaid, that is, accepting it  
12      into the national airspace system, which is a  
13      requirement of being able to be used, for their  
14      evaluation and a determination from them as to  
15      the cert -- the ability to certify this navaid in  
16      that location.

17      It's just they'll give you kind of an  
18      overview. They're going to take the technical  
19      data that's provided in this report and give us  
20      some idea as to whether they will indeed certify  
21      the navaid and accept it for use based on the  
22      conclusions that are coming out of the modeling.

23      I think the fact that you had a VOR, you  
24      already have the frequency, you had instrument  
25      approaches established at the other location, I

1 think all of those things are very positive in  
2 their evaluation of it. If you were just looking  
3 at it, perhaps as a new site, it's hard to guess  
4 what they'd say.

5 But I think there's enough question that it  
6 warrants going ahead and asking FAA at this point  
7 before the Authority commits to spending any  
8 significant amount of money in reestablishing it.

9 The frequencies are on hold. All of the  
10 typically long-lead items are -- are in place,  
11 which is frequency related. And our  
12 recommendation is we do that.

13 And then -- and on the side, the other thing  
14 I just need to call your attention to is it may  
15 create longer term some -- some constructibility  
16 issues relative to future buildings, especially  
17 in the area of Araquay Park, extreme east end of  
18 it, when you start looking at putting buildings  
19 up and the like.

20 The conclusion here is if you avoid putting  
21 high-profile metal buildings and certain angle  
22 structures, you'll be fine long term. If you  
23 don't take that consideration, just stick  
24 buildings up there, you may create the same

25 problem that may render the navaid useless later.

57

1 But I just -- I want to make sure you understand  
2 that going into it.

3 You're not at a point where you're spending  
4 money anyway on it, but -- at this point, but at  
5 least you know that's on the -- one of the things  
6 that was identified here. If you watch your  
7 building materials and orientation, you can  
8 probably avoid future problems.

9 The other is, I've asked as a part of the  
10 memo that -- that Mr. Gorman be authorized to  
11 work directly with us as necessary and be a party  
12 to most of the conversations and discussions we  
13 have so that we have at least one -- I know he's  
14 very interested in this. He's spoken to me  
15 multiple times, and that way keep at least one  
16 Airport Authority member 100 percent up to speed  
17 on this topic.

18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any public comment? Yes,  
19 sir.

20 MR. MESMER: Well, first of all, I'm Fred  
21 Mesmer.

22 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yes, sir.

23 MR. WUELLNER: You're going to have to come

24 up and -- the record's --

25 MR. MESMER: I'm Fred Mesmer. I'm a St.

58

1 Augustine resident, and I'm delighted to hear  
2 that you people are considering keeping this  
3 unit. It's -- it makes the airport more user  
4 friendly. To have a backup unit like this, I  
5 think is very good.

6 Having been in the system a long time and  
7 having used these -- this type of an approach,  
8 it's a very flexible unit, and I think to do away  
9 with the unit would be a mistake.

10 In keeping with the buildings that you have  
11 planned to put up as far as causing interference,  
12 I -- and you're going to have an ILS, I -- it's  
13 probably going to interfere with the ILS, too. I  
14 mean, maybe yes, maybe no.

15 As a pilot, I find the unit, especially from  
16 an instructor standpoint, very useful. It's very  
17 flexible. You can take the unit and you can  
18 teach a student all sorts of things, DME arcs.  
19 You can teach them -- you can fake a localizer  
20 approach, can take the airplane up, reset the  
21 altimeter. You can do all sorts of things with  
22 the unit. Plus, you have a secondary backup in

23 case your ILS goes down.

24 And I've got a lot of input from

25 professional pilots and pilots on the airport who

59

1 want this unit to remain, and I hope that you

2 will consider really keeping this unit, even if

3 you have to relocate it or build the tower --

4 excuse me. Am I supposed to speak into this

5 thing?

6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We can hear you.

7 MR. WUELLNER: It's picking you up.

8 MR. MESMER: Okay. Build a tower or

9 something so that you can put this unit in a

10 position where it can be user friendly and pilots

11 can use it.

12 Just a comment, if I may. My son used to be

13 a corporate pilot, and I asked him for his input

14 on this, because he used to come down, and one of

15 his fuel stops was St. Augustine on the way to

16 Miami. Why he would do that, I don't know, but

17 his comment was, you know, the little

18 user-friendly VOR, we could get readings and we

19 could -- it was a very time consuming -- a

20 time-saving navigational aid, and they would get

21 a DME and (indicating) they would come in, do

22 what they had to do, and get out. And he found  
23 that losing this navigation facility would be a  
24 mistake.

25 If any of you folks have any comment to me,

60

1 I'd love an input, because first of all, I've  
2 been trying to follow you on your Master Plan  
3 Update. And I'm really very much interested in  
4 this. I want to stay in the system. You have a  
5 date here of 1995.

6 I love your airport design. I mean, this  
7 is -- this is a wow. If you can put in dual  
8 runways out there, great. But I am going to stay  
9 with it and follow the thing because I am  
10 interested. So, if anybody here has something  
11 they'd like to say before I give up the mike.  
12 People?

13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Appreciate your -- yeah,  
14 I'm just going to go on to the next public  
15 comment. I appreciate it. Thank you very much.

16 MR. MESMER: All right.

17 MR. MARSH: Madam Chairman, I think I was on  
18 the board, I can't remember which one, but we  
19 bought property way out left of the one issue,  
20 right up here, one, to put a future VOR, didn't

21 we?

22 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, or you got real close

23 to buying it. I'm trying to think of the name of

24 the --

25 MR. MARSH: The Maguire family owned it.

61

1 MR. WUELLNER: Maguire something.

2 MR. MARSH: Right. Didn't we buy that?

3 MR. WUELLNER: No, we did not.

4 MR. MARSH: So, we don't have any property

5 out there --

6 MR. WUELLNER: Other than the industrial

7 park property. And the issue there is you've got

8 to create -- you've literally got to clear an

9 800-foot radius all around it in order to site

10 it.

11 MR. MARSH: I thought we bought that. Sorry

12 about that.

13 MR. WUELLNER: No, we -- you guys were in

14 discussion on it when I came on board, and it

15 never --

16 MR. MARSH: So, it's got to go somewhere in

17 the future industrial park because that's the

18 only piece of property now we can put it on. Is

19 that where it's slated to --

20 MR. WUELLNER: It's probably the only one  
21 you would have enough radius that you own at this  
22 point. That's a big piece of it.

23 MR. MARSH: If I remember, there's -- a lot  
24 of that property is wetlands out there anyway,  
25 isn't it?

62

1 MR. WUELLNER: Uh-huh.

2 MR. MARSH: Is that -- can we build that in  
3 part of that wetlands?

4 MR. WUELLNER: Yes.

5 MR. MARSH: Would it give us the 800-foot  
6 radius?

7 MR. WUELLNER: You're referring to the  
8 industrial park property?

9 MR. MARSH: On the far north end of the  
10 industrial park property.

11 MR. WUELLNER: No, I don't think you have  
12 800 feet now in diameter there. Not -- just not  
13 that --

14 MR. MARSH: Because I remember when we  
15 looked at that -- developing that north end at  
16 one time, there was only, if I -- and I'm just  
17 going by memory, and it's a long -- and I've got  
18 a fuzzy memory. There was only some 12 acres up



19 in there that we could actually use, and we were  
20 going to use some of that for wetland relocation  
21 on that at one time.

22 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. In fact, the  
23 conservation -- there is a conservation area in  
24 there. That would kind of prevent part of that  
25 from being relocated in there.

63

1 MR. MARSH: What I'm saying is, if that's  
2 going to be a wetland and we've only got a small  
3 amount of land we can develop anyway, wouldn't it  
4 be smarter to move it as far to the north -- west  
5 as we can on property we own, that's really not  
6 that developable anyway, and use that property.

7 MR. WUELLNER: Well, I think the only -- the  
8 only trade-off is you've got to -- you've got to  
9 look at this from the -- from the standpoint of  
10 FAA in this perspective only. The item is  
11 designed to facilitate instrument approaches into  
12 a runway. And when you --

13 MR. MARSH: Right.

14 MR. WUELLNER: It's not area navigation like  
15 everybody wants to focus on, although that's a  
16 nice spinoff benefit of it.

17 The core focus in terms of getting it into

18 the airspace system is development of instrument  
19 approaches. So, if we get very far off the  
20 center line or very far away from the runway  
21 environment, the utility of it, not only do your  
22 minimums go up, but they start looking at going,  
23 well, it's not really integral.

24 MR. MARSH: But don't we own property almost  
25 up to 13 in the clear zone area, up in that area?

64

1 MR. WUELLNER: Up to 1 --

2 MR. MARSH: All the way to the end of 13? I  
3 thought we bought most of that property.

4 MR. WUELLNER: I would have to look.

5 MR. MARSH: I'm looking at right at the end  
6 of the runway on the far end, right up to this  
7 area.

8 MR. WUELLNER: Here (indicating)?

9 MR. MARSH: Yeah, up on -- to the left of  
10 that area there.

11 MR. WUELLNER: Up in here (indicating).

12 MR. MARSH: Yes.

13 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, we have, round numbers,  
14 75 percent of the --

15 MR. MARSH: And that's not 800 feet clear?

16 MR. WUELLNER: -- of this plat -- this plat

17 here (indicating)?

18 MR. MARSH: Right. That in there. That's  
19 what I'm talking about.

20 MR. WUELLNER: Well, with an 800-foot  
21 radius, you're going around, you've got an area  
22 something -- this is about a thousand foot  
23 (indicating) here. And start --

24 MR. MARSH: Right. But aren't we talking  
25 about that is not very developable anyway?

65

1 MR. WUELLNER: Well, you've got a big chunk  
2 of this that's in a conservation area, where  
3 you're short of the Water Management saying you  
4 can do that. You're not going to be able to  
5 clear-cut. So, you're literally talking about  
6 creating a totally clear area. So, I mean, it's  
7 like no trees --

8 MR. MARSH: You've got to take everything  
9 out.

10 MR. WUELLNER: Literally.

11 MR. MARSH: Okay. I understand.

12 MR. WUELLNER: That's what makes it so  
13 difficult.

14 MR. GEORGE: It couldn't be put on a  
15 35-foot-high building?

16 MR. WUELLNER: At that location, I don't  
17 know. I know you can't do that at this close-end  
18 site because you've got the side slope coming off  
19 the runway. It's too close into the runway  
20 environment to do that.

21 With the antenna height and all that, you're  
22 already over 20 -- 22 feet or something. I  
23 know -- I think they address it in your report.

24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any other public comment?

25 (No public comment.)

66

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We'll close public comment.  
2 Board, Mr. George, did you have anything else?

3 MR. GEORGE: No.

4 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. Gorman?

5 MR. GORMAN: Most certainly I have a  
6 comment.

7 MR. CIRIELLO: Ed, when you was talking  
8 about the -- the west and northwest and whatnot,  
9 was you saying that some of the radials would be  
10 unusable? In other words, we're not going to  
11 have 360 degrees use of this thing?

12 MR. WUELLNER: Correct. That's not unusual.

13 MR. CIRIELLO: Huh?

14 MR. WUELLNER: Yes, that is correct.

15 MR. GORMAN: That is at a thousand feet,  
16 though, Joe. In other words, that's -- this --  
17 and I'll get into that when I discuss this, but  
18 in other words, this data from THALES, the actual  
19 unusable radials with reflectivity issues, we're  
20 not talking about the reflectivity over a  
21 thousand feet, the actual threshold of being able  
22 to receive the signal, grows very quickly.

23 We're talking about this report is a bit  
24 skewed in the fact that it's representing those  
25 arcs at a thousand feet being unusable, which is

67

1 a very low altitude. In other words, this report  
2 is -- it's written by a design/build firm. I'll  
3 let you finish.

4 MR. CIRIELLO: In other words, anything over  
5 a thousand feet, somebody can get all 360-degree  
6 radials.

7 MR. GORMAN: Yeah, but below a thousand,  
8 they're condemning it completely. I mean, that's  
9 really what this says. And a thousand feet is  
10 a -- is a low altitude.

11 MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah.

12 MR. GORMAN: The thing is usable. This  
13 study shows that marsh spot being usable.

14 Anything below a thousand, there's an unusability  
15 factor. Anything above, then the receptibility  
16 of the signal goes up dramatically. And that's  
17 how this report's hard to read.

18 MR. CIRIELLO: You know, Florida's quite  
19 flat. And a thousand feet in Pennsylvania is  
20 different than a thousand feet down here, but --

21 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Can I interrupt you just  
22 for a second?

23 MR. CIRIELLO: My thought was that the  
24 unused -- unusable radials that you say would be  
25 in the west and northwest side of the airport --

68

1 and I wasn't aware of your thousand foot. But  
2 most people who would be making an approach into  
3 the airport would be coming in over land and not  
4 over the sea, so to speak, on the east side. So,  
5 the radials that are unused on this side, I think  
6 would be a lot more critical than radials on the  
7 other side.

8 So, if we're looking at a location that  
9 we're going to lose the radials on this side, we  
10 need to find a way to where we can be guaranteed  
11 all 360 degrees. But I wasn't aware of what Jack  
12 said about the thousand foot, but -- I don't

13 know. I was out flying around at less than a  
14 thousand foot down around DeLand where I would  
15 look out to the side and I saw towers higher than  
16 I was, because it was so hazy out, you know,  
17 so --

18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. If I might just,  
19 Mr. Gorman, I just want it clarified. Staff  
20 recommendation, are you asking us to authorize  
21 you to solicit the FAA southern region just to  
22 further look at maybe can you explore other  
23 locations, or are we looking at this one  
24 particular location and that's it?

25 MR. WUELLNER: Well, I think we have a

69

1 problem siting it anywhere else physically, is  
2 getting it in and meeting the requirements  
3 without wholesale devastation of -- of  
4 environment in the area, which is going to  
5 require a whole different level of permitting  
6 than what we're talking out there. There's very  
7 little you have to do, because it's naturally  
8 cleared to a -- to a great extent.

9 Plus, when you look at developing the  
10 approaches, it's a -- it's a great location for  
11 the approach part of it, for reestablishing the

12 approach part of it.

13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I was just wondering if  
14 we're being premature and we're -- if we go -- or  
15 have motions around the Staff recommendation,  
16 which is to allow Mr. Gorman to work with you and  
17 to seek out --

18 MR. WUELLNER: Well, that is a -- that is a  
19 part of what we asked.

20 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Right. That's what I  
21 thought. So, we're not here necessarily today to  
22 reestablish new locations and --

23 MR. WUELLNER: I think until you have the  
24 determination from FAA that they'll certify it in  
25 that location --

70

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Right.

2 MR. WUELLNER: -- which, you know --

3 MR. GORMAN: That's part of the problem.

4 CHAIRMAN GREEN: That's why I think we might  
5 be jumping before the -- the cart before the  
6 horse.

7 MR. WUELLNER: Once you have that answer,  
8 then let's move it. Let's go.

9 MR. GORMAN: Let me have the floor.

10 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. Sure. Mr. Gorman?



11 MR. GORMAN: All right. What we've got here  
12 is we've got a study from THALES. Now, I'm going  
13 to criticize the THALES study for just a moment  
14 here.

15 It's a study written by design/build firm,  
16 and it's written with a supposition that a  
17 westerly arc transmission is, of course, critical  
18 to the useful nature of this -- of this facility.  
19 And it's my thought and the thought of many of  
20 the pilots I've talked to that we aren't totally  
21 critical with westerly arcs below a thousand  
22 feet. So, the usability of this in their study  
23 point is not that compromised, at least not for  
24 the actual usability of it.

25 Just a bit of a cryptic comment, it's

71

1 amazing how well the VOR, in its present location  
2 worked, and it was certainly very recently  
3 certified. And so, it amazes me that that  
4 certification is now so dead.

5 And as a matter of fact, I have been in  
6 touch with the FAA, because I did take that to  
7 heart. I have -- my keen interest is a  
8 reflection on the interest of literally dozens of  
9 pilots in the area, the major FBO, the corporate

10 pilots that -- that list there, the flight  
11 school, its instructors. And I think the --  
12 adhering to Earth Tech's 10-year plan to build  
13 this Taxiway B in that exact location again is --

14 MR. WUELLNER: Well, it wasn't Earth Tech.

15 MR. GORMAN: -- doesn't serve -- doesn't  
16 serve the needs of the flying public right now.

17 In other words, the THALES study deals with  
18 this supposition. And only -- let's see. The  
19 only local or westerly arc is absolutely a  
20 necessity for utility. It's -- that -- the only  
21 arc will be compromised is below a thousand feet,  
22 like I've mentioned several times before.

23 One thing of course I would concur with is  
24 that the existing equipment is old, and it's in a  
25 15-foot metal shelter, and all of this is in very

72

1 poor condition. But some of the recent -- I, of  
2 course, have taken the matter to heart and some  
3 of the research that I have come from is that  
4 salvage from FAA, a much more modern VOR with  
5 shelter, is available at little to no cost.

6 And I have a number of different people that  
7 I'll forward and try to work, as well as I can  
8 with Ed, to -- to make this information

9 available -- I've just recently done this  
10 research -- so that we don't necessarily have to  
11 use this ancient equipment, you know, let it  
12 shuffle along in the field there, when you can  
13 just put in some much newer electronics at little  
14 or no cost, run it at the proper but maximum  
15 amount of transmission and then get a maximum  
16 utility from it.

17 I also don't believe that the only feasible  
18 VOR site is the small dry section of land offset  
19 approximately 650 feet northwest of Runway 13/31.  
20 I think until -- we've got the court -- the cart  
21 before the horse just a little bit, and I think  
22 before we go and pave over the VOR site that  
23 exists now, we need to suspend temporarily the  
24 actual construction of Taxiway B.

25 I don't hear anybody come to me and ask, "My

73

1 God, when will Taxiway B be done?" I've  
2 interviewed everybody on the field about that,  
3 including Northrop Grumman, including S&K (sic)  
4 Logistics, the major FBO, the flight school, and  
5 the fact is, is that this THALES study does not  
6 reflect the feasibility of elevating to its  
7 maximum extent, changing the equipment, and then

8 reflecting on the usability of the VOR in its  
9 present location. Or -- I was disappointed, of  
10 course, just before we got on the board, that the  
11 actual unit was moved. And that gives you the  
12 800 feet.

13 So, not that we won't move it and -- but I  
14 think we need to just slow down, take a deep  
15 breath, and before we pave over that site,  
16 reflect on all of these issues and find out, you  
17 know, will they buy it moved, will they not buy  
18 it moved?

19 But there certainly has been a tremendous --  
20 maybe it's because I feel, you know, that it's a  
21 very good -- it's a necessity for the airport.  
22 It puts the airport on the map. It's good  
23 marketing for the airport. For maybe -- and that  
24 attracted the attention, but I certainly heard a  
25 lot about it.

74

1 So, before we go pave over that spot, I'd  
2 like to just take and temporarily suspend that  
3 construction over that area and take a look and  
4 see what the FAA will buy, what they won't buy,  
5 what's available for free, and put the issue to  
6 bed like that.

7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. Ciriello?

8 MR. GORMAN: I'm going to make a motion to  
9 do that --

10 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I just want to make sure  
11 there's -- I've closed public comment. Excuse  
12 me. Is there any more board comment?

13 MR. GEORGE: Yeah, but I don't know what it  
14 is right now.

15 MR. CIRIELLO: Had a hand up.

16 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I closed public comment.

17 MR. GEORGE: One of the things that -- one  
18 of the things that you brought up, Jack, about  
19 halting Taxiway B, if that'll solve the problem,  
20 that's fine, but I think that it creates another  
21 problem in that we have funding for Taxiway B  
22 that goes away like end of May, end of June.  
23 What -- do you know what that is off the top of  
24 your head, Ed?

25 MR. GORMAN: That, to me -- I don't know the

75

1 details to that, George, but I've tried to find  
2 some of the details.

3 MR. WUELLNER: It's a --

4 MR. GORMAN: Going away and going away for  
5 another day are two different issues.

6 MR. GEORGE: Absolutely, it is. Absolutely.

7 MR. GORMAN: I mean, I don't think that the  
8 U.S. Government's going to go away, and I don't  
9 think that they're going to stop funding taxiways  
10 because of the runway encouragement issue. But  
11 right now, that particular piece of pavement  
12 doesn't alleviate any congestion and it's going  
13 to not serve any particular immediate needs, so  
14 I'm just -- I just want to take a deep breath.  
15 You're right. I don't want to lose the funding  
16 forever. I agree.

17 MR. WUELLNER: Well --

18 MR. GEORGE: I have another question.  
19 Taxiway B, we're talking about extending and  
20 going through here (indicating). And that cuts  
21 the VOR out.

22 MR. WUELLNER: That's right.

23 MR. GEORGE: Is there -- is there a  
24 possibility of taking Taxiway B and coming down  
25 and going this way that would leave that VOR site

76

1 there (indicating)?

2 MR. GORMAN: Yes, sir.

3 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, but not within the  
4 constraints of your existing grant. That's --

5 that's the part I want to just keep you clear on.

6 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

7 MR. WUELLNER: You have an existing grant  
8 that covers a specific project right now. If it  
9 were just a DOT project, you would have a lot of  
10 latitude to move stuff around because of the  
11 grant conditions. FAA's just really, really  
12 particular about once you -- once you say it's  
13 here, that's what you build. You can't expand  
14 that definition. You can't contract it.

15 What -- what you can do -- I mean, you can  
16 certainly delay the onset of -- of formal  
17 construction. But you've got to get contract  
18 concurrence, number one, to do that.

19 MR. GORMAN: We may want engineering  
20 changes. There may be some engineering changes.

21 MR. WUELLNER: Well, I'm going to say this  
22 as cleanly as possible. If you want to change  
23 what is Taxiway B now, then we need to just go  
24 ahead and release all of the AIP grant funds,  
25 because you will not be able to keep it based on

77

1 the time durations and the fact that you have  
2 changed the project from what was granted.

3 So, it will no longer be eligible as that

4 project. So, you will need to just shuffle the  
5 funds back to FAA. We'll get back in line and  
6 reprogram what will be a different Taxiway B in  
7 the future.

8 MR. GEORGE: Those funds amount to what, how  
9 many dollars?

10 MR. WUELLNER: Right now, \$1.5 million of  
11 federal money, and then there's additionally a 5  
12 percent share of the Authority and FDOT have in  
13 that mass.

14 MR. GEORGE: Okay. All right.

15 MR. WUELLNER: So, it's --

16 MR. GORMAN: My thought on that, is we need  
17 Taxiway Charlie -- I'm sorry. I didn't mean to  
18 interrupt you. Taxiway -- we need Taxiway  
19 Charlie desperately, and it would be nice to get  
20 a concurrent plan. But we do taxi -- there's  
21 environmental issues, I understand. But we do  
22 Taxiway Charlie, maybe we put a bend in Bravo,  
23 and we put the whole thing together. So actually  
24 we have a working entity --

25 MR. WUELLNER: Well, you --

78

1 MR. GORMAN: -- a piece of pavement that  
2 works --



3 MR. WUELLNER: You sort of have. You've  
4 already submitted the environmental assessment  
5 paperwork initially for the extension of Taxiway  
6 B to the south, the part -- what is -- what would  
7 be B extended, which is your version of C, kind  
8 of replacement C, if you will. That's in the  
9 works in terms of beginning the environmental  
10 process to do that. And then that eventually  
11 would be eligible for an FAA grant to construct  
12 at some point.

13 MR. GORMAN: Right. I can't imagine that --  
14 you've got such an environmental concern with  
15 Charlie, I can't imagine that moving -- for  
16 instance, Mr. George's idea of moving Bravo down  
17 that little extension would be an environmental  
18 concern to them. I can't imagine you'd --

19 MR. WUELLNER: No.

20 MR. GORMAN: -- have such a tremendous  
21 concern with C --

22 MR. WUELLNER: -- the section you're  
23 currently trying to build of Bravo is of no  
24 environmental significance, but the other piece  
25 is.

1 MR. GORMAN: Right.

2 MR. GEORGE: Question, Ed. Based on your  
3 experience, your professional background and all  
4 of this stuff, we made this proposal for Taxiway  
5 B based on the assumption that the VOR would work  
6 in our new chosen place. We now have an  
7 engineering report, be it good or bad --

8 MR. WUELLNER: No, no. That's not -- just  
9 factually, that's not quite right. You made the  
10 submittal or the authorization to move Taxiway B  
11 forward with the understanding you were not going  
12 to have a TVOR. Now you are -- you know, now  
13 that everybody's --

14 MR. GEORGE: Oh, okay.

15 MR. WUELLNER: -- kind of awake to the idea  
16 the VOR was going away, which is fine, but based  
17 on the original master plan adoption, the VOR  
18 disappeared. That's why B is programmed. That's  
19 why B is funded now. That's why -- now we're  
20 trying to kind of back-door fit the VOR back into  
21 the picture.

22 MR. GEORGE: That makes a big difference.

23 MR. GORMAN: One last comment on that. I  
24 don't mean to be acidic, but I'm looking at  
25 Mr. Cox. Now, before we got elected, I remember

1 Mr. Cox and I sitting in this -- the gallery over  
2 here, and I remember that Taxiway B was funded  
3 without -- it was a bit nasty in doing it, but it  
4 was funded without the benefit of request for  
5 public comment.

6 If you will look at the minutes, you will  
7 notice that Taxiway B was funded without request  
8 for public comment. And Mr. Cox and I were in  
9 the --

10 MR. WUELLNER: In what respect?

11 MR. GORMAN: -- public at that time and we  
12 had lots to say. And I believe there was --

13 MR. COX: There was a neglect to ask for  
14 public comment after the -- the vote for it. I  
15 mean, we looked at this -- and it's a minor  
16 point, but he's exactly right.

17 CHAIRMAN GREEN: After the vote? Because  
18 just procedurally, we have public comment first  
19 and that's closed, and then there's board  
20 discussion and then a vote.

21 MR. GORMAN: There was no request. The  
22 minutes will reflect that.

23 MR. WUELLNER: Well, regardless of that, I  
24 mean, even understanding that, the project was  
25 determined long ago in the master plan project

1 and was adopted through multiple work programs  
2 and solicitive of comment. And I think you're  
3 going to get the concurrence of your attorney  
4 that there is no obligation to solicit specific  
5 public comment on an item when a -- when a  
6 general public comments place exists on your  
7 agenda.

8 So, I mean, you have nothing there that's of  
9 legal consequence, let's put it that way,  
10 relative to soliciting public comment.

11 MR. GORMAN: Maybe not as far as --

12 MR. WUELLNER: I don't, you know, disagree  
13 that somebody should have been afforded that  
14 opportunity, but that's not my --

15 MR. GORMAN: Assuring the needs of the  
16 flying public, was all I was concerned with,  
17 because --

18 MR. WUELLNER: Uh-huh.

19 MR. GEORGE: Regardless of whether it was  
20 approved by the master plan or not, it still is a  
21 function that, you know, as it was approved, that  
22 they should have had, you know, comment.

23 MR. WUELLNER: It's had multiple  
24 opportunities for comment. It has been first at  
25 the master plan process. It was submitted as a

1 part of a grant package that had approval of this  
2 board. It was -- the grant itself was accepted  
3 by this board in a public meeting. The -- I  
4 mean, there are -- it's every year on the annual  
5 budget part of it.

6 MR. GEORGE: Well, it's good to get the  
7 history. Let's talk about going forward.

8 MR. WUELLNER: The capital development  
9 programs are all subject to public comment. I  
10 mean, it's not like it's -- there's been no  
11 attempt -- which I just want to make absolutely  
12 clear, I have no interest one way or the other  
13 relative to the VOR. I -- you know, my personal  
14 preference is to navigate via one.

15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, I think what we need  
16 to do now is focus on what is on our agenda. And  
17 I think Mr. Gorman had a motion.

18 MR. GORMAN: I was going to make a motion to  
19 temporarily suspend -- it sounds like we're going  
20 to have to go through some more grants we  
21 should -- but temporarily suspend the  
22 construction of Taxiway B pending a full issues  
23 study so that we can figure out what really we  
24 are going to do with that, since I have had  
25 myself an awful lot of dialogue along those

1 lines. And that's along with Mr. George's  
2 motion.

3 I would like to make that motion, that we  
4 temporarily suspend the construction of Taxiway B  
5 so we do not pave over that spot, because I  
6 have -- other than THALES, I have information  
7 that it is possible to recertify it in that area.

8 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay.

9 MR. WUELLNER: What -- what do you want me  
10 to tell the contractor? That's -- because  
11 they've got to agree to extend the duration of  
12 the contract without risking the grant in itself  
13 at this point. I mean, I need something to tell  
14 them when we would anticipate releasing the  
15 project.

16 MR. CIRIELLO: There's no second to that.

17 MR. WUELLNER: The taxiway project.

18 MR. CIRIELLO: You can't tell them anything.

19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Right. That's right.

20 MR. WUELLNER: Okay.

21 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is there any second to the  
22 motion?

23 MR. COX: Can we have some discussion?

24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I will, but if there's no

25 second, then there's no discussion because

84

1 there's not a motion to discuss. Motion will  
2 fail for lack of a second.

3 Now, is there another motion that wants to  
4 be entertained?

5 MR. COX: I'd just like to have some  
6 discussion on what we're talking about.

7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay.

8 MR. COX: What's the negative impact to the  
9 airport or the Authority if the contractor's put  
10 on hold? Any -- monetarily, is there any?

11 MR. WUELLNER: The only thing you risk there  
12 is the contractor electing not to accept the  
13 extension puts you in breach of contract, which  
14 potentially holds you out there -- I will leave  
15 that to these guys (indicating) to sort out, but  
16 I don't know that you want to necessarily go the  
17 route of terminating the contract purposely or,  
18 you know, by default. I'm sure he's never seen  
19 it, so I --

20 MR. BURNETT: I'm unfamiliar with the  
21 contract, but I can tell you -- I mean, the  
22 direction could be given to Staff to pursue and  
23 bring it back to the Authority whether or not the

24 contractor will agree to an extension.

25 MR. GORMAN: Extend it --

85

1 MR. WUELLNER: I mean, we can certainly ask.

2 There's no harm in asking.

3 MR. GORMAN: Extend it pending possible

4 engineering changes.

5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Your recommendation which

6 deals with to discuss with AAA (sic) with

7 Mr. Gorman's help, could we put a time limit on

8 that? What do you need, 30 days, 25 days, in

9 other words, so we don't go out of contract --

10 MR. WUELLNER: I just want to make sure that

11 there can be no -- under the existing con -- the

12 grant -- I just want to make sure you're clear on

13 the financial side of it. There can be no

14 modification to the existing engineering under

15 the current grant. That's okay.

16 I mean, if you come to the decision you want

17 to relocate the taxiway, that's fine. We just

18 simply tell them we're not going to use this

19 grant; we'll turn it back; we'll get in line with

20 a revised Taxiway B project. I mean, okay. I

21 mean, you just -- other than you don't have what

22 you have right now, you'll have it again some



23 day.

24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. Ciriello?

25 MR. CIRIELLO: I've got a few questions, Ed.

86

1 With what you just said, with what Jack was  
2 referring to, is putting a little dogleg here to  
3 go past the VOR (indicating), would that be a  
4 change that would not be accepted?

5 MR. WUELLNER: Correct. It is different  
6 than the project you asked them for.

7 MR. CIRIELLO: All right. Now, originally,  
8 what was the thinking behind extending Taxiway B?  
9 And I assume it's going straight to here or here  
10 (indicating)?

11 MR. WUELLNER: It stops at Taxiway Delta,  
12 yes.

13 MR. CIRIELLO: Stops here (indicating). It  
14 will cross this runway here (indicating).

15 MR. WUELLNER: Yes, it does.

16 MR. CIRIELLO: And it's going to be in a  
17 straight line.

18 MR. WUELLNER: Yes, sir.

19 MR. CIRIELLO: What was the original idea of  
20 wanting to do that, the reasoning?

21 MR. WUELLNER: Well, I didn't conduct the

22 master plan study, but I assume it was --  
23 MR. CIRIELLO: Well, this is part of the  
24 master plan study. It's not something that the  
25 board in the last few years decided they wanted

87

1 to do.

2 MR. WUELLNER: Correct. It was adopted in  
3 '96 as a project. It's been moved forward in  
4 normal grant style.

5 MR. CIRIELLO: Well --

6 MR. GORMAN: Right now, Joe, it would not  
7 connect all the way through. It would only  
8 terminate at Runway 2/20.

9 MR. WUELLNER: Delta, that's correct.

10 MR. CIRIELLO: Right here (indicating).

11 MR. GORMAN: This little spot, yes.

12 MR. WUELLNER: No, no, no.

13 MR. CIRIELLO: It would have a dogleg  
14 because there's the VOR (indicating) --

15 MR. WUELLNER: The current project takes it  
16 all the way to Delta.

17 MR. CIRIELLO: Where is this Taxiway C he  
18 was talking about?

19 MR. GORMAN: C is Charlie, is way over here  
20 (indicating).

21 MR. CIRIELLO: Up here (indicating).  
22 MR. WUELLNER: It's the little section of  
23 parallel up on the --  
24 MR. CIRIELLO: Up here (indicating)?  
25 MR. WUELLNER: To the right. To the right.

88

1 To the right.  
2 MR. GORMAN: Keep going.  
3 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, right.  
4 MR. CIRIELLO: You mean they were going to  
5 extend it out here (indicating)?  
6 MR. WUELLNER: No, sir.  
7 MR. GORMAN: Joe, excuse me. I'll help you  
8 out. Right here (indicating), this particular  
9 taxiway here (indicating) --  
10 MR. CIRIELLO: Oh.  
11 MR. WUELLNER: That's Charlie.  
12 MR. GORMAN: -- if it was on this taxiway  
13 here (indicating), it renders this runway  
14 unusable until the aircraft vacates that because  
15 of this lack of separation (indicating), because  
16 of -- from the aircraft from the actual runway.  
17 And that's -- so this particular piece of  
18 taxiway (indicating) we really need, because you  
19 can't be on it and actually use this runway. But

20 that's the whole object. But this is the  
21 environmental issue that it has with this right  
22 here (indicating), this ditch.

23 MR. CIRIELLO: I'm not getting you here. If  
24 I was going flying and I was taxiing and the  
25 tower gave me some permission to go through their

89

1 stop sign, whatever it is, and I'm out in here  
2 somewhere (indicating) and you have a guy that's  
3 out here on final about -- and you tell me -- of  
4 course, the tower probably wouldn't let me be  
5 here --

6 MR. GEORGE: Right.

7 MR. CIRIELLO: But somehow if I'm there  
8 before this guy got in here (indicating), he  
9 can't land?

10 MR. GORMAN: You've got Dave, the tower  
11 chief, he's going to tell you --

12 MR. GEORGE: David Knight would approve you  
13 to taxi up to that intersection; do not proceed  
14 down C till he gives you the okay.

15 MR. GORMAN: Correct.

16 MR. CIRIELLO: Oh, I know that, but --

17 MR. GEORGE: The stop-short line is right  
18 there (indicating).

19 MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah.

20 MR. GEORGE: I thought Taxiway B went all  
21 the way over to here (indicating).

22 MR. WUELLNER: Those two -- no. That's -- B  
23 is the parallel. Bravo is the parallel.

24 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

25 MR. WUELLNER: Delta is the parallel to

90

1 6/20 -- or 6/24.

2 MR. GORMAN: With this funding issue, how  
3 far are you going to pave it?

4 MR. WUELLNER: It's from there all the way  
5 to Delta. That's what the first phase of this  
6 project is. That's what's funded.

7 MR. GORMAN: What Mr. George is talking  
8 about is just simply moving that issue down  
9 (indicating). That's the engineering change.

10 MR. CIRIELLO: That's that dogleg in here to  
11 go bypass here --

12 MR. GORMAN: That's the --

13 MR. CIRIELLO: That's a change in  
14 engineering and then they're not going to like  
15 that. We've got enough tied up into that now. I  
16 think that the issue of relocating that VOR is  
17 smaller than giving up all that money we've got

18 allocated right now. I don't want to give back  
19 something we've already got.

20 MR. GORMAN: VOR is hard to relocate.

21 MR. GEORGE: Ed?

22 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. George?

23 MR. GEORGE: Ed? Is there a possibility of  
24 convening a panel rapidly, like first part of  
25 next week, with FAA southern region, the guys

91

1 that did this engineering report, and actually  
2 sitting down, hammering out where the devil are  
3 the other locations? Could that happen?

4 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, but my suggestion is  
5 you'll have to do it in Atlanta, just to get the  
6 FAA people to participate. But we could -- that  
7 can be done.

8 MR. COX: Assuming they could do it on that  
9 time line.

10 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. Probably -- you know,  
11 I'm fairly confident in saying we can get some  
12 time with them next week in Atlanta. You won't  
13 get it here, but you can get it there.

14 MR. GEORGE: I would like them to make the  
15 following motion, that we authorize the attorneys  
16 to talk to the contractor, to just feel them out

17 on what they would do with a potential change and  
18 a potential stop. While they're doing that,  
19 authorize Ed to set up the meeting in Atlanta, if  
20 that's possible, and let's get it resolved where  
21 the options are where we can have a VOR on the  
22 field.

23 MR. WUELLNER: Identify the alternatives, is  
24 what we're -- is that correct?

25 MR. GEORGE: Identify the alternatives,

92

1 right.

2 MR. WUELLNER: And then y'all can decide  
3 whether that --

4 MR. GEORGE: And then at the next meeting,  
5 we'd discuss those alternatives and decide which  
6 way we want to go. We'll have more input at that  
7 time from what the contractors will say and we'll  
8 have input from other options.

9 MR. GORMAN: Is -- you're going to allow  
10 that construction to continue? Because that will  
11 pave over an alternative.

12 MR. WUELLNER: I think that's what he's --  
13 that was part of the motion.

14 MR. GORMAN: I see.

15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: And there's a motion on the

16 floor, so we need to stay with the motion. I

17 guess you might have to repeat it for us.

18 MR. COX: Repeat it, please.

19 MR. GEORGE: Okay. The motion was that we

20 authorize the attorney to contact the contractor

21 and brief him on our dilemma and inquire as to

22 the possibility of us delaying construction,

23 period.

24 Second piece, to have Ed set up a meeting at

25 any location that we might have to go, be it

93

1 Atlanta, Miami, or wherever, to get the proper

2 people at the table so that we can come up with

3 other alternatives for the VOR.

4 Then at the next meeting, we discuss the

5 results of all of that and make a decision to

6 either stop the project and go back, you know, or

7 put the VOR or don't have a VOR.

8 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any second to the motion?

9 MR. COX: I'll second the motion.

10 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any discussion? Joe?

11 MR. CIRIELLO: Ed, in my reading in the last

12 few months in AOPA, I understand that there are a

13 number of VORs in the country that are going to

14 be shut down because of GPS and that WAAS or



15 whatever it is, better communications coming up.  
16 And this isn't exactly a communication VOR, like  
17 some, you know, that 200 miles out, you dial it  
18 in to find the airport.

19 But would this kind of a VOR be considered  
20 with those others that the FAA's closing down?

21 The next five, six, seven, ten years, I don't  
22 think there'll be any VORs anywhere. So, we're  
23 talking putting in a lot of effort and money in  
24 here for something that we may not have or need.

25 MR. WUELLNER: I don't think there's

94

1 currently any federal plan to get rid of all  
2 VORs. They -- they are scaling back the total  
3 number of area-wide nav aids like that, but  
4 they're still going to remain as a backup system  
5 in place. At least that's the last I saw from  
6 FAA on it.

7 However, the only -- it's more of a  
8 technical issue, and I'm not even trying to  
9 resolve it tonight, but I think there's a  
10 question relative to some of the equipment you're  
11 proposing, whether it can be from a power  
12 standpoint brought back to terminal limits,  
13 because that would be a requirement FAA has, is

14 just total power.

15 MR. GORMAN: It's my understanding that the  
16 power --

17 MR. WUELLNER: If you can, that's great. I  
18 just don't know, though.

19 MR. GORMAN: -- the power outfit's an  
20 easily --

21 MR. WUELLNER: I just don't know those.

22 MR. GORMAN: Yeah, it is.

23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. We have a first and  
24 second. I have a small amendment to that, to our  
25 attorney, that if you find out that we are going

95

1 out of contract or run any risk of liability for  
2 default, that you immediately notify the board  
3 members. Okay. In other words, if we --

4 MR. GEORGE: And call a special meeting.

5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Right, and call a special  
6 meeting. So I don't want to wait 30 days and  
7 find out that we have defaulted on the contract.

8 MR. WUELLNER: Right.

9 MR. GEORGE: Good addition.

10 MR. BURNETT: I guess the only issue there  
11 is Mr. George accepting that addition and Mr. Cox  
12 approving it.

13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Right.  
14 MR. GEORGE: I accept it.  
15 MR. COX: I'll approve it.  
16 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay.  
17 MR. WUELLNER: And I'm going to assume,  
18 unless you tell me otherwise, that authorizes  
19 Mr. Gorman's travel, too, because you  
20 collectively have to do that.  
21 MR. GEORGE: Absolutely.  
22 MR. WUELLNER: I just want to make sure --  
23 MR. GEORGE: Absolutely. He can walk there.  
24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Telephone.  
25 MR. WUELLNER: I don't want him to have to

96

1 do that, either.  
2 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All in favor of the motion  
3 as amended?  
4 MR. CIRIELLO: Aye.  
5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Aye.  
6 MR. GEORGE: Aye.  
7 MR. COX: Aye.  
8 MR. GORMAN: Aye.  
9 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All opposed?  
10 (No opposition.)  
11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. The motion as

12 amended will carry.

13 We have several agenda items, so I'm just  
14 asking this board if we can look at it and  
15 discuss it thoroughly, but then move through the  
16 agenda items so we get to them all.

17 MR. WUELLNER: I think I missed what you  
18 said there.

19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I was just asking the  
20 board, we have a number of agenda items to get  
21 through, just so we thoroughly look at them but  
22 move along so we can get to them all.

23 MR. WUELLNER: Okay.

24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I don't want to miss  
25 anything.

97

1 MR. WUELLNER: You have -- in the latest  
2 revision of the AIP authorization legislation,  
3 they created an entitlement program for general  
4 aviation airports, which we qualify at the  
5 maximum entitlement, which is \$150,000 per year.

6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Are you switching to E.?  
7 I'm sorry.

8 MR. WUELLNER: I'm on Charlie, C.

9 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay.

10 MR. WUELLNER: Well, no, I'm sorry. We did

11 change the agenda. Never mind.

12 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I have C., the Ponce de  
13 Leon property.

14 MR. WUELLNER: Never mind.

15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: At least on my agenda.

16 MR. WUELLNER: It did change. My apology.

17 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. That's why I was  
18 afraid -- we've got purple ones, yellow ones.

19 MR. WUELLNER: My papers don't -- aren't  
20 re -- the agenda items are renumbered, so I went  
21 from B. to C. and it's not the right C.

22 MR. COX: Did you do your physical --

23 MR. WUELLNER: At this point in the day, I  
24 don't know.

25 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Do you want to -- can we go

98

1 to the Ponce de Leon, then, since that's  
2 everybody's --

3 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah.

4 7.C. - Ponce de Leon Property

5 MR. WUELLNER: I had a question. I did not  
6 get a chance, because we've been trying to do  
7 some other things to put a few words on paper  
8 relative to that project. But let me summarize  
9 it this way: The -- unless the -- the big

10 picture is to acquire all of the property, I'm  
11 not sure the Airport Authority should have any  
12 financial involvement in the project.

13 This comes from -- from the perspective that  
14 if you remember the development plan as  
15 proposed -- and I'm sorry I did not get a copy of  
16 it before the guy got out of here. But the  
17 development plan showed the extreme north end of  
18 the development as remaining in homes if these  
19 entities purchase strictly the golf course, which  
20 does not solve our problem, and our -- and it  
21 certainly does not allay our interest in -- in  
22 this project.

23 The only way we can become involved in the  
24 land acquisition or anything under a federal  
25 grant would be to complete a Part 150 study, or

99

1 what's also known as an airport noise and land  
2 use compatibility study, which is another effort  
3 on the scale of an airport master plan, that  
4 would detail all the environmental issues and  
5 noise issues and overflight issues and flight  
6 track issues and all of that, to come to a plan  
7 that is ultimately adopted by the airport, FAA,  
8 and the users relative to the future operation of

9 the airport, flight tracks, noise abatement  
10 procedures, all of those types of things, a very  
11 complicated and large-scale project.

12 Once that were completed, adopted, and  
13 everybody agrees to all of those parameters,  
14 assuming that study recommended acquisition of  
15 that property or in some way controlling that  
16 property interest, then would it become eligible  
17 for federal participation in any type of  
18 acquisition or noise mitigation or anything else  
19 it came out with, which it'd be more probable,  
20 that is, noise mitigation efforts, such as  
21 providing money for insulation of homes and the  
22 like versus actually acquiring the property.

23 So, FDOT, we could probably make the case  
24 for continued compatibility. It doesn't require  
25 that study, necessarily. You might make there,

100

1 but there's a fairly limited pocket of money  
2 that's available in the area of land acquisition,  
3 nowhere near the numbers that are being discussed  
4 for that whole project.

5 As a result, I don't see where we  
6 financially can jump in on this. I also have  
7 concerns about the expenditure of Authority money

8 because of the limitations in our charter, to be  
9 involved in a land swap if we're purchasing in  
10 any way property that would trade off to the  
11 benefit of the collective good in the community.

12 I think we have a much better shot and a  
13 much more proactive way of going about it being  
14 through the -- the zoning and comprehensive  
15 planning aspects as it relates specifically to  
16 the City of St. Augustine. We have excellent  
17 documents in place or assurances with the county  
18 in their process, but since that property has now  
19 been annexed and is now part of the city, it's  
20 going to fall under their jurisdiction. We up to  
21 this point have not had those assurances with the  
22 city because they've been far enough away,  
23 there's really nothing for them to oversee.

24 But now that that's property's close, the  
25 proper avenue for us and by far the least

101

1 expensive will be to pursue proper zoning,  
2 protection for the airport relative to height and  
3 noise, and continue the compatibility issues with  
4 that and the comprehensive plan with the city.

5 And I think they're willing to find a way to  
6 accommodate us.



7 In the event they choose not to, there are  
8 some minor protections afforded in Florida  
9 Statutes relative to continued compatibility with  
10 the airport. And while those haven't been  
11 explored in detail, they're notorious for being  
12 somewhat toothless; I'll warn you ahead of time.

13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any public comment?

14 MR. MARSH: I hate to keep coming up, but I  
15 remember when I was on the board and we adopted  
16 the master plan. It was -- when was it --

17 MR. WUELLNER: '96, uh-huh. March of '96.

18 MR. MARSH: Before anybody did any rezoning  
19 or planning of -- within a how many-mile radius  
20 was it, 30-mile radius, 20-mile radius?

21 MR. WUELLNER: No, no. It's three miles, I  
22 think, is all that's required.

23 MR. MARSH: That still would be in the  
24 radius there, that they had to come to the board  
25 for approval of that rezoning or project, which

102

1 obviously that wasn't done on that project.

2 MR. WUELLNER: Well, it is done. It is done  
3 within the county jurisdiction. At the time, the  
4 city limits were outside of the three-mile  
5 jurisdiction.

6 MR. MARSH: So, what you're saying, by  
7 annexing it into the city, they didn't have to --  
8 not comply to our master plan?

9 MR. WUELLNER: Correct. Now that it's in  
10 the city, it's outside of the county rules, so  
11 you've got to go to the city and adopt a separate  
12 set of rules to cover that piece of property,  
13 which we can do now. It's just a question of  
14 jurisdiction.

15 Once it became annexed, it became the  
16 city's -- as long as that municipality is  
17 required and does, and the city does have a  
18 comprehensive plan and their own zoning  
19 authority, which they still have, they're the  
20 power that we've got to negotiate a separate  
21 stand-alone --

22 MR. MARSH: So, the city was never brought  
23 into that.

24 MR. WUELLNER: When it was annexed, we were  
25 never -- you know, we were never a part of that.

103

1 MR. MARSH: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. Mesmer?

3 MR. MESMER: Just briefly. Are we talking  
4 about the right of eminent domain here, one?

5 Two, he talks about a master plan that's 1996.

6 I've got one --

7 MR. WUELLNER: It is that.

8 MR. MESMER: -- that's 1995.

9 MR. WUELLNER: That's the document. It  
10 was -- he's asking when it was adopted. It was  
11 actually adopted -- it was prepared in '95. It  
12 was adopted in March of '96. It's the same  
13 document.

14 MR. MESMER: I'm trying to keep up with this  
15 here and I'm trying to follow this. Are you  
16 pretty much staying close to this?

17 MR. WUELLNER: In many respects, because  
18 master plans are demand driven, we're ahead of  
19 this -- ahead of the curve in a lot of areas.

20 MR. MESMER: Are you going to do a revised  
21 copy?

22 MR. WUELLNER: Yes, but it will be a part of  
23 the next master plan.

24 MR. MESMER: And that will be when?

25 MR. WUELLNER: Well, it'll be up to these

104

1 guys, but probably within the next year. It'll  
2 be completed within the next year.

3 MR. MESMER: Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. Slingluff, did you --

5 MR. SLINGLUFF: I think the issue with the  
6 Ponce is something that we need to sort of step  
7 back from and look at how this is happening.  
8 We're going to see the same thing happening with  
9 Serenata Beach and other developments. We have  
10 Palencia going in.

11 As you fly around now, you really see  
12 these -- what I consider encroachments, because  
13 sooner or later, it's going to be, "What are we  
14 going to do about that damn airport?"

15 MR. WUELLNER: Uh-huh.

16 MR. SLINGLUFF: And I -- really, as -- as a  
17 board and as a community airport, we need to  
18 develop a PR program and an airport awareness  
19 program so that when the city does annex a golf  
20 course, they know that we better talk to the  
21 airport, or when there's a, you know, another  
22 condo project going in across the waterway, or  
23 where a restaurant is put in right across the  
24 waterway, they understand the impacts there.

25 And I think it needs to be not just a

105

1 regulation that's lying dormant in a book that is  
2 brought up after the fact, but something that is

3 proactive, community proactive on an ongoing  
4 basis. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thanks. Close public  
6 discussion. Any board members' discussion?  
7 Mr. Gorman?

8 MR. GORMAN: Yeah. Mr. Stokes, I  
9 understand, has a permit to build there. Is this  
10 correct? I'd like to get clear on that.

11 MR. WUELLNER: I don't think he does in and  
12 of itself. I think that's part of what he's just  
13 submitting.

14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: My understanding is he had  
15 plan A, and plan A was developing the golf  
16 course. That has now changed. Plan B, which he  
17 was submitting the next day after our workshop,  
18 was to incorporate an additional 200 plus  
19 whatever homes in the golf course area. That has  
20 not been approved as far as I know. They have --  
21 were hoping to get approval, which has some  
22 environmental things, too, to break ground in  
23 June.

24 MR. GORMAN: I suppose my question then  
25 reworded would be, does he have single-family

1 dwelling condominium approval and permitting at

2 this time? I don't know, either.

3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I don't know.

4 MR. GEORGE: What difference does it make?

5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah, I mean --

6 MR. GORMAN: He can go ahead and build. And

7 if he does build, as an airport board, we would

8 be somewhat irresponsible to not try to --

9 MR. WUELLNER: I would suspect his zoning is

10 probably in place for the area that's currently

11 developed. But the areas that surround it, and

12 particularly to the north that are not currently

13 in any kind of development other than pieces of

14 the golf course or undeveloped area, that those

15 probably are not covered by any type of current

16 zoning. So, he's going to have to go through

17 that kind of a revision with their, quote,

18 unquote, their master plan development.

19 The area that's got condos on it currently

20 and the like are probably -- or whatever they

21 call it, but that resort -- I don't even know how

22 they've got it zoned, frankly. But the area

23 that's currently built or has development on it

24 is probably fairly close to -- in terms of

25 multifamily and the like, is probably pretty

1 close to the correct zoning. If they want to  
2 change that to single-family homes, there's  
3 probably some amendments and changes that would  
4 be required. But anything that's not developed  
5 now, I bet you is not currently covered.

6 MR. GORMAN: So, to the best of your  
7 knowledge, Ed, he does not have permitting now.

8 MR. WUELLNER: My impression was he does  
9 not.

10 MR. GORMAN: Okay. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. George?

12 MR. GEORGE: I'd like to explain for the  
13 public what we're talking about, because a lot of  
14 you were not at a meeting we had last Wednesday,  
15 I think it was. We had a joint meeting between  
16 the county, the city, and the Airport Authority  
17 to discuss somehow or another acquiring the Ponce  
18 property for public use.

19 The idea was from the county and from the  
20 city, that that is an old golf course, you know,  
21 got a lot of historic value to it. It's got a  
22 lot of grounds on it. It had a lot of history.  
23 They would like to find a way to retain the golf  
24 course for public use, be it a public golf  
25 course, you know, whatever.

1       The Airport Authority was concerned with the  
2 noise, as we come in to land, that we drop down  
3 on the downwind here right over the property that  
4 they're going to put all of these houses on. And  
5 all you -- I can -- all we can see is complaints,  
6 complaints, complaints.

7       So, the direction from the meeting was that  
8 all three groups get to -- independently take a  
9 look at where we can find additional funds. The  
10 city and the county said, "We're booked with our  
11 commitment. We're not going to divert any of our  
12 existing funds to buy this."

13       The Airport Authority input was, "We would  
14 only be interested in participating in the  
15 purchase if we purchased it all," because if they  
16 purchase just the air -- the golf course, the new  
17 plan is that on the total property, 400 and  
18 something acres, there's going to be 720 homes or  
19 units.

20       If he sold the golf course to the county and  
21 the city and left the remaining property there,  
22 there would still be 520 units. So, the airport  
23 is concerned about us picking up 520 weekly or  
24 daily complaints, you know, from people. So,  
25 that's the background.



1       CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'd like -- if we don't  
2       have any more discussion, because we kind of had  
3       a lot of discussion on this at the joint meeting,  
4       I'd like to make a motion that we as the Airport  
5       Authority have explored this, we do not have any  
6       available FDOT or FAA funds, but that we move to  
7       do everything with the city to ensure noise  
8       abatement and any type of incompatibility with  
9       land use so that we start that PR process with  
10      the city. Is there any second?

11      MR. GORMAN: So, you wish to start a PR  
12      process with the city as far as --

13      CHAIRMAN GREEN: No, we were supposed to get  
14      back to the other entities. So, I'm making a  
15      motion for Mr. Wuellner to get back in a written  
16      form and say, we, the Authority, do not -- we do  
17      not have any grant fund money available within  
18      our authority, but we wish to work with the city  
19      to ensure any type of zoning or noise abatement  
20      or land use compatibility that we can to protect  
21      the airport.

22      MR. GORMAN: I would second that.

23      CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any further discussion?

24                (No discussion.)

25      CHAIRMAN GREEN: All in favor?

1 MR. CIRIELLO: Aye.

2 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Aye.

3 MR. GORMAN: Aye.

4 MR. GEORGE: Aye.

5 MR. COX: Aye.

6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All opposed?

7 (No opposition.)

8 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. The motion will  
9 carry. And we have ten agenda items. We've only  
10 gotten through three. And so, we do need to move  
11 this along, but I need to give the court reporter  
12 a break for about three or four minutes. Is that  
13 okay? All right. So, we'll -- we'll reconvene  
14 in about three minutes just to let people take  
15 potty breaks and --

16 (Whereupon, a recess was had.)

17 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We're going to reconvene  
18 the meeting. All right.

19 Our next agenda item is, Mr. Wuellner,  
20 Airport Attorney Contract Status.

21 7.D. - Airport Attorney Contract Status

22 MR. WUELLNER: Boy, am I out of order today.

23 All right.

24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: That's all right.

25 MR. WUELLNER: Basically, all we were

111

1 wanting to communicate to you is that based on  
2 some questions that were -- were asked by  
3 individual members, the original solicitation for  
4 Airport Authority attorney provided for a  
5 three-year duration of a contract. It is  
6 basically a month-to-month contract, as it was.  
7 It's not a fixed term. It did expire last year  
8 in terms of the three-year period and has been  
9 continuing, for lack of better terms, on a  
10 month-to-month basis since that time.

11 It's really up to you whether you want to  
12 continue doing that month-to-month, which was how  
13 it was originally structured, in which case, I  
14 don't -- I'm not aware of anything where you're  
15 prohibiting it because you can essentially  
16 terminate their services on a month's notice at  
17 any time.

18 The alternative is, we can go out, resolicit  
19 attorney services, if you desire, and you can go  
20 through that process of selecting one or  
21 reconfirming the one you have or whatever you  
22 choose at that point, much like we would do for  
23 general consultants, the same process. It's the

24 same statute that governs it.

25 It was selected competitively; that is, it

112

1 was done through the competitive consultants --  
2 CCNA for lack -- it was done that way originally,  
3 so it was done properly originally.

4 So, it's really your pleasure. But I did  
5 want to -- it was brought up and we did the  
6 research, and sure enough, the original  
7 three-year term, as solicited, has expired. So,  
8 it is on a month-to-month.

9 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any public comment?

10 (No public comment.)

11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Board comment?

12 Mr. Ciriello?

13 MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah. Madam Chair, oh, I  
14 guess in the interest of fairness, I would say  
15 that since this board has always put out bids to  
16 get attorneys, directors, consultants and whatnot  
17 when their contracts were up, I would think that  
18 I would like to go that route now.

19 I know the Bailey (sic) people can reapply,  
20 like they did when they got the job, but their  
21 contract is up. It's been up over a year and is  
22 going on a month-to-month basis. But if we're

23 going to do that without worrying about the  
24 three-year period, why do it in the first place?  
25 So, I would just like to see us move ahead

113

1 and put it up and see what we have out there.

2 MR. WUELLNER: I would just mention that  
3 they -- they were not the -- the firm you  
4 referred to was not an original firm that even  
5 presented their qualifications for consideration.  
6 So, they were never considered, because they  
7 never asked to be considered.

8 MR. CIRIELLO: Who is that?

9 MR. WUELLNER: The Baileys.

10 MR. CIRIELLO: No, no. That's who we have  
11 now, isn't it?

12 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Rogers, Towers.

13 MR. WUELLNER: Rogers, Towers.

14 MR. CIRIELLO: Oh, I'm sorry. I thought it  
15 was Bailey, Towers. I'm sorry.

16 MR. WUELLNER: That's a local firm.

17 MR. CIRIELLO: I'm sorry. I thought it  
18 was -- but whatever. It's been our procedure  
19 that when contracts are up, to rebid them to see  
20 what else is out there. For expediency, I'll  
21 make a motion that we go ahead and bid the

22 solicitor's job out and see what we get.

23 MR. GEORGE: I second that.

24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any discussion?

25 MR. GEORGE: My reasoning for seconding it

114

1 is procedures are typically put in place to keep  
2 you down the straight line. If there was a  
3 procedure there that says three years, like  
4 Mr. Ciriello said, it's probably a good thing to  
5 sit back and take another look.

6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'd just like to add one  
7 thing. Since we're on a month-to-month, I would  
8 prefer to talk to the firm and see -- to  
9 renegotiate the contract, because they have a  
10 wealth of information into this Authority and  
11 knowing its workings. And to jump midship,  
12 especially when we're in the middle of a master  
13 plan, I would be concerned about.

14 But I would be interested in, since the  
15 contract is month-to-month, you can change it at  
16 any time you want, within 30 days' notice, do a  
17 change, amounts, anything you want that way. So,  
18 I'm just a little leery of doing that right in  
19 the middle of all this master plan agenda.

20 MR. CIRIELLO: Then how do you know there

21 aren't some firms out there that thinks this is a  
22 lucrative job and would like to have it and  
23 you're denying them the chance to try to get it  
24 by renegotiation with the present people without  
25 looking at anybody else?

115

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I understand. I'm just  
2 concerned doing it right this minute versus a  
3 couple of months down the road when we have some  
4 handle on the master plan.

5 MR. CIRIELLO: Well, can we put a time limit  
6 on it?

7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: It's your motion. We have  
8 a motion and a second, so -- I mean, it may  
9 carry.

10 MR. CIRIELLO: Well, somebody could amend it  
11 for two months, three months or whatever -- I  
12 don't -- or vote it out.

13 MR. WUELLNER: Well, it will take you  
14 upwards of 90 days to solicit and put somebody  
15 else in place even if you wanted to. But, yeah,  
16 it will take that kind of time to go through the  
17 motions, so...

18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We have a motion to bid out  
19 for a new firm, and it was seconded.

20 MR. GEORGE: I'd like to second -- amend the  
21 motion then to include the time limit that we  
22 actually review this to be maybe sometime in four  
23 or five months down the road. That gives us a  
24 better chance to -- to take advantage of the  
25 history that we have with these circumstances

116

1 we've got going.

2 So, I'm amending to say that we go out for  
3 bid with those bids to come back in July the 1st.

4 MR. CIRIELLO: Can we do that?

5 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, but we wouldn't start  
6 it till May or June. I mean --

7 MR. GEORGE: That would be your call. We  
8 would like to have the bids on July the 1st.

9 MR. WUELLNER: Okay.

10 MR. GEORGE: That gives us some time.

11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. Cox?

12 MR. COX: Yeah, I'm going to -- repeat your  
13 concerns here with this -- about the situation.

14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, one, we're in  
15 litigation.

16 MR. COX: Right.

17 CHAIRMAN GREEN: They're representing us in  
18 the courtroom right now.



19 MR. COX: Exactly.

20 CHAIRMAN GREEN: And I don't want us to have

21 the Authority put in a position where we're

22 substituting counsel in the middle of litigation.

23 We have too many major things going on right this

24 moment.

25 We're on a month-to-month. So, on a

117

1 month-to-month contract, if something came up and

2 it was just horrendous that the firm did and we

3 felt that they weren't representing us, we can

4 terminate them --

5 MR. COX: Right.

6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: -- within 30 days.

7 MR. COX: So -- and I tend to agree with

8 you, is just to -- to look at this in a little

9 more cautionary sense, as opposed to let's put

10 out for bids and --

11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'd like to get us through

12 this litigation first, get it over, behind us,

13 settled.

14 MR. COX: I would agree with that.

15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: But that's just my thought.

16 MR. CIRIELLO: That could take years.

17 MR. WUELLNER: We're hoping not.

18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We can always bring it up  
19 again, you know, in 60 days. But there's --  
20 their motion's on the floor, first and second,  
21 so...

22 MR. CIRIELLO: Call the question.

23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: There's a motion on the  
24 floor to go out to bid within -- the bids being  
25 presented to the board by July 1. That's the

118

1 motion as amended. All in favor?

2 MR. CIRIELLO: Aye.

3 MR. GORMAN: Aye.

4 MR. GEORGE: Aye.

5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All opposed?

6 MR. COX: Nay.

7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Nay. The motion carries.

8 MR. WUELLNER: Okay.

9 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So, there's a motion and  
10 it's been carried to submit the bids to the board  
11 by the July meeting.

12 MR. WUELLNER: Would you like us, as a  
13 courtesy, to ask you again in May, to be sure you  
14 want it done by July?

15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: That would be fine.

16 MR. WUELLNER: I mean, that way, if there's

17 extraneous circumstances you want to think

18 about --

19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: That would still give you

20 good enough time to --

21 MR. WUELLNER: Otherwise, we'll be on

22 that --

23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: -- to put it on the May

24 agenda?

25 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah.

119

1 MR. GEORGE: Absolutely.

2 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. Next item?

3 7.E. - General Aviation Airport Entitlement Grant

4 MR. WUELLNER: Next item I've got is the

5 General Aviation Airport Entitlement Grant.

6 As I started to say earlier, there was a

7 three-year authorization for the AIP legislation.

8 They created a new program that had not been out

9 there for general aviation airports relative to

10 entitlements.

11 While I'm not a big fan of the entitlement

12 program in general, mainly because the amount of

13 money appropriated for airports is -- relative to

14 our size, is not enough to really get anything,

15 mortar and bricks, so to speak. It's not there.

16 The Authority has previously authorized two  
17 projects, one of which was the environmental  
18 assessment associated with what is now the  
19 Taxiway B project, to include the shoreline  
20 erosion protection and the like on the -- on the  
21 east side of Runway 13/31 on the -- toward the  
22 south end. They also authorize -- this is what  
23 you used for your share of the airport master  
24 plan, or a great portion of it, let's put it that  
25 way.

120

1 So, those are two projects you've done in  
2 the two previous years. This is the last year of  
3 the program, unless it's reauthorized. You have  
4 \$150,000 of FAA money, making it about a \$165,000  
5 total project that's available for you to find a  
6 project to match that dollar amount, or at least  
7 included in the amount. You have the option of  
8 funding anything above that or trying to find  
9 FDOT money to match anything above that. So, it  
10 can be used in that way.

11 It does have to be an AIP-eligible project.  
12 So, it is typically going to be limited to  
13 nonrevenue-producing kind of projects. So, you  
14 couldn't use this to build a hangar, as an

15 example. That's not -- that would not be an  
16 eligible item under FAA program.

17 So, with that, we need -- I gave you some  
18 projects that are out there in our JACIP or Joint  
19 Automated Capital Improvement Program that we use  
20 to communicate between the Airport Authority, FAA  
21 and FDOT, to give you some ideas of what projects  
22 are out there. I also gave you some background  
23 information on the AIP grant entitlement funds,  
24 so that you had some -- some idea what we were  
25 talking about before we got there.

121

1 Some suggested projects that we had -- let  
2 me grab those from you -- included the  
3 seaplane-related, seaplane ramp-related  
4 restoration or reimprovements out there. One  
5 was -- we've got listed the TVOR as a  
6 possibility, depending on the time line, but I'm  
7 not sure that that -- until we can define that  
8 better, whether it will or will not be eligible  
9 under FAA, but it may be.

10 A crash, fire and rescue facility is  
11 currently programmed with some FAA -- excuse me,  
12 FDOT funds, to the point of about 80 percent, and  
13 that will show up in your next year's budget, if

14 unaltered. It could be applied toward that kind  
15 of a project also in lieu of using entirely FDOT  
16 funds and Airport Authority funds.

17 And we've got on the list dredging of the  
18 seaplane base and entrance, but I'm not exactly  
19 sure how that will apply with eligibility with  
20 FAA also, although it's part and parcel to what  
21 we do as a seaplane base. I'm not sure that as  
22 long as that's passable by seaplanes, it may not  
23 be eligible as a -- because it's a maintenance  
24 item also. It may or may not. But the types of  
25 projects that are out there.

122

1 There's some open projects that we've done  
2 engineering work on but have not funded, one of  
3 which is the enclosure of the ditch between  
4 Taxiway Delta and Taxiway Echo. There's an open  
5 ditch, open-cut ditch that's fairly deep and  
6 somewhat of an anomaly around here. It's also  
7 subject to FDOT because they have a right-of-way  
8 easement through there for the water. It's a  
9 drainage ditch primarily for U.S. 1 versus  
10 airfield facilities.

11 We do have -- those permits were in place.  
12 I don't know if they're still -- still valid to

13 do some of that enclosure. The total there was  
14 about a \$300,000 effort to take it from  
15 essentially in front of hangar building H, which  
16 is the Top Gun hangar, to enclose it all the way  
17 to U.S. 1 and make the connection. So, that's  
18 about a \$300,000 item in total. Just give you a  
19 hierarchy of numbers.

20 There is a little bit of enclosure included  
21 in the Taxiway B, Phase 2. So, when you do  
22 extend it into the marshland, there's a little  
23 bit of ditch enclosure in there also that brings  
24 it up to the first T-hangar crossing there at --  
25 by the self-fuel facility. It would put all of

123

1 that in culvert versus being an open-cut ditch  
2 the way it is now. That's -- that's a project  
3 that's out there and available.

4 That engineering work was done. And as I  
5 said, it was originally permitted by DOT, and  
6 when we finally got engineering estimates, it  
7 exceeded what we had. I think there may be still  
8 a little DOT money that could be applied to that,  
9 too, and probably get very close to the --  
10 between \$2- and \$300,000 of total project that  
11 would be funded by others. So, I mean, that's

12 a -- if that's a project you want to throw out

13 there.

14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any public --

15 MR. WUELLNER: With that, if you've got any

16 other ideas, we can give you an idea of whether

17 they're AIP eligible and whether we can, you

18 know --

19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Public discussion?

20 (No public discussion.)

21 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Board? Mr. Cox?

22 MR. COX: I've got a couple of --

23 MR. WUELLNER: I think you had one.

24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'm sorry.

25 MR. COX: Oh, really? All right.

124

1 MR. MESMER: I just -- I don't know. Is

2 there any way you can get ahold of the

3 corporations or people to make contributions that

4 like to assist in this?

5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: What?

6 MR. MESMER: Just a thought.

7 MR. WUELLNER: What project?

8 MR. MESMER: The one you were just

9 discussing.

10 MR. WUELLNER: The ditch?



11 MR. MESMER: Yeah. You were discussing the  
12 Top Gun hangar, and correct me if I'm wrong,  
13 extend the taxiway into the marsh, you said?

14 MR. WUELLNER: No.

15 MR. MESMER: Redo that.

16 MR. WUELLNER: No. I've got you turned  
17 around. The -- the projects we're talking about  
18 there that we were just talking about are to  
19 close or enclose an open ditch that exists  
20 between the pavement out there. It's a fairly  
21 deep ditch that's onerous from a maintenance  
22 standpoint, as well as just aesthetically, also.

23 This would -- the first project that we have  
24 some numbers for is about a \$300,000 project, and  
25 it would go from Top Gun, moving west to U.S. 1,

125

1 and it would enclose that ditch into culvert and  
2 then it'd be invisible to you once it's  
3 completed. There would be dirt over the top of  
4 it and pipe underground.

5 Then I mentioned that there's a piece of  
6 this already going to be done when Phase 2 of  
7 Taxiway B is constructed. The part that -- that  
8 phase is the one that goes out into the marsh.  
9 So, when that's ever constructed, a good portion

10 of the ditch on the east end will get enclosed as  
11 a part of that project.

12 MR. MESMER: Okay. I missed the boat on  
13 that one.

14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. Slingluff?

15 MR. SLINGLUFF: Ed, what's the time line on  
16 this?

17 MR. WUELLNER: We need to have a project to  
18 them by the 15 -- 15th of this month? We just  
19 got their -- got their notification. They need a  
20 project. You just need to identify it.

21 And then they'll issue the grant whenever  
22 it's appropriated by Congress, which I don't  
23 know -- I don't think they're releasing those GA  
24 entitlement funds for this year yet, but it's  
25 probably along an October time line, or I'd say

126

1 first quarter next year for them.

2 MR. SLINGLUFF: Okay. And we've just -- we  
3 just got notification of this?

4 MR. WUELLNER: Well, the project -- we've  
5 got to submit projects, but they now want that  
6 project. We've had a couple of years to develop  
7 projects and such, but -- and we used the master  
8 plan, as I said, and the EA on Taxiway B

9 extension as the first two. Now we're down to a  
10 third project, and frankly, we don't know what to  
11 throw at it.

12 As I said, the amount of money isn't such  
13 that you can really get much constructed with it.  
14 By the time you do engineering and all the stuff  
15 required of those grants, you're typically down  
16 to a hundred thousand dollars or less of actual  
17 construction, which doesn't buy a whole lot of  
18 sticks and bricks so to speak.

19 MR. SLINGLUFF: Is it something, if we pass  
20 on, we --

21 MR. WUELLNER: It's gone.

22 MR. SLINGLUFF: Gone?

23 MR. WUELLNER: Right now, there's a  
24 possibility with the AIP reauthorization that  
25 will be through Congress in the next -- over the

127

1 next year, that they'll extend the program and  
2 allow you to again combine these funds. But  
3 again, you don't get them till the year they're  
4 appropriated. So, as an example, we could have  
5 created one project out of this, but you couldn't  
6 do it till year three. You could roll it over to  
7 the \$150-, \$150-, \$150- and have \$450,000, but

8 you couldn't do it till year three.

9 And there's no -- no sense right now whether  
10 they will, A, allow you to combine previous  
11 program years, or whether there'll indeed even be  
12 an entitlement program. That was the first time  
13 it was ever done.

14 MR. SLINGLUFF: Okay.

15 MR. WUELLNER: We're one of the lucky ones.  
16 We got \$150,000. A lot of the smaller GAs only  
17 got \$50-. So, it's even harder to find a use for  
18 that.

19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Board discussion, Mr. Cox?

20 MR. COX: Every time we have a heavy jet  
21 land, we lose business because we can't park it  
22 because we have a problem parking it. Sometimes  
23 we have to use runway 6 to put the thing there.

24 I suggest, just as a suggestion and an  
25 option, and we've talked about this before, we

128

1 either just do a study to find out what type of  
2 weight we can put on this area of the ramp here  
3 (indicating) or use that money, is that possible,  
4 harden the ramp to take heavy metal at that  
5 point, or somewhere where we can secure the  
6 airplane, because we can't -- you can't secure it

7 over here (indicating) even though this area of  
8 the ramp is -- is good for heavy metal.

9 Or, as another option, Ed, can we extend  
10 this nonmovement area taxiway (indicating) all  
11 the way down to the end of the hangars there so  
12 that --

13 MR. WUELLNER: Well, you -- certainly, you  
14 could look at that as a project. It's not  
15 currently shown in the master plan, which makes  
16 it unfundable in terms of FAA projects, the  
17 extension of the taxiway.

18 MR. COX: I think the priority would be to  
19 get -- to be able to get the heavy jet parked  
20 somewhere other than a runway. Is that an AIP --  
21 is that AIP acceptable?

22 MR. WUELLNER: That's -- well, yeah, the  
23 concept is. The trouble is, and again, the  
24 amount of money available isn't enough to --

25 MR. COX: Wouldn't do that?

129

1 MR. WUELLNER: I mean, you can look at the  
2 study part of it, maybe even do the engineering,  
3 but you're not going to get something built.

4 MR. COX: The study may find that the ramp  
5 would be all right. I don't know.

6 MR. WUELLNER: I'm not sure the study --

7 MR. COOPER: The weight capability of the

8 ramp's not the only issue there. It's the size

9 of the ramp, too.

10 MR. WUELLNER: Well, no, beyond that, is the

11 study itself fundable under AIP?

12 MR. COOPER: (Nods head.)

13 MR. COX: All right. Well, that's a

14 consideration.

15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. Gorman?

16 MR. GORMAN: What type of time frame are we

17 considering to be able to change this master plan

18 to be able to -- to be able to address issues

19 that we actually do have? In other words, I

20 concur with Mr. Cox that that's a very immediate

21 issue.

22 MR. WUELLNER: We could --

23 MR. GORMAN: We have no idea of the -- of

24 the construction density of the concrete. We

25 have no idea really. There's no particular study

130

1 that will allow you, insurance-wise, to put a

2 heavy jet on places. And I concur with him; that

3 needs to be done and that's an immediate concern.

4 How long does it take you --

5 MR. WUELLNER: The rule is this --

6 MR. GORMAN: -- to change a 10-year master  
7 plan to get this thing fixed?

8 MR. WUELLNER: It's -- it's not master  
9 plan-driven. It's airport layout plan-driven.

10 So, you can propose a change to the ALP, the  
11 airport layout plan drawing itself, submit that  
12 to FAA and FDOT and gain their concurrence, which  
13 can be fairly quick sometimes, less than a month  
14 sometimes. With that then showing on the airport  
15 layout plan, it becomes eligible for funding.

16 But if it's not shown on that graphic  
17 representation, it's not eligible as it sits. It  
18 can be done. If that's a project you want to  
19 pursue, we'll put that down, but I think we've  
20 got to concurrently doing an ALP update, which  
21 is --

22 MR. GORMAN: Right. Not to be acidic, but  
23 we're -- we've got a Taxiway B extension which is  
24 not necessary right now. But what is necessary  
25 right now is an apron study, apron enhancement,

131

1 and an ability to park more jets in more places  
2 safely without having insurance concerns. And so  
3 I would concur with him; if there's project

4 money, there's a project we need to do.

5 MR. WUELLNER: Uh-huh.

6 MR. GORMAN: I've heard that from a number  
7 of different people.

8 MR. COX: We jump through hoops every time a  
9 Boeing 737 wants to come here in to put a -- we  
10 jump through all of these hoops to try to -- to  
11 try to get the tower together where we can put it  
12 and whether or not the ramp's going to be able to  
13 hold it and the wing turning area, et cetera. I  
14 think -- I mean, we -- they go to Craig. They  
15 don't come here.

16 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Do you think we could  
17 entertain a motion from a board member as to  
18 maybe priority number one might be apron  
19 enhancement and number two something --

20 MR. COX: And that may not be a -- yeah.

21 CHAIRMAN GREEN: -- just to give our  
22 director some direction so we don't lose this  
23 money? I mean, give him some type of projects  
24 that might be --

25 MR. GEORGE: Let's talk about the rest of

132

1 the projects.

2 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, if the apron part is



3 what you want to do and we -- if FAA doesn't have  
4 a problem with us doing -- putting it as the  
5 project, then doing the ALP update, that finally  
6 solidifies the project in terms of making it  
7 legal as an AIP project, if they don't have a  
8 problem with that order, which I frankly don't  
9 know, then we'll go -- we can go that direction.

10 But I need a secondary project in the event  
11 they aren't going to let us amend the ALP after  
12 the fact. If you give me a fallback project,  
13 we'll pursue it as the apron-related thing and  
14 see where it goes.

15 MR. COX: And as the airport director, from  
16 what you listed on the list of stuff there, what  
17 would be your feeling would be high prior -- two  
18 or three items that are high priority, maybe, for  
19 our consideration?

20 MR. WUELLNER: Well, in terms of feasibility  
21 of funding, FAA has, for whatever reason, given a  
22 priority of funding to preservation of existing  
23 assets. It's always a -- right now a funding  
24 priority. Anything new capacity tends to score  
25 poorly, at least for general aviation airports.

1 The seaplane ramp facility out there is

2 in -- is in -- it's seen better days. And it's  
3 not a high activity location, but it won't be in  
4 its current state. And one of the things that we  
5 did on the study a year or two ago was look at  
6 the feasibility of adding floating dock  
7 facilities and some -- some things that allow  
8 aircraft fueling out there. Right now, it's just  
9 not feasible under the current develop -- the way  
10 it's developed. You can't get fuel to them  
11 safely and without creating the potential -- high  
12 potential of an environmental problem with the  
13 fuel.

14 So, my -- my thought was, if you took the  
15 money, did the rehab on -- as much as you could  
16 on the rehab of the existing pavement out there,  
17 of the seaplane ramp/apron area that's associated  
18 with it, we'll pursue funding under FAA under  
19 other grants, as well as DOT, and see if we can't  
20 get the dock facilities. I don't know that FAA's  
21 going to buy the dock aspect of it. And, again,  
22 there's a limited amount of money and it's -- but  
23 it could use some shoring up.

24 This is in the area where we've lost  
25 considerable property on the east side edge of

1 that runway due to erosion related to storms,  
2 primarily. And the seaplane's not fared -- the  
3 seaplane ramp area has not fared well either in  
4 that. It's in that area that's continually  
5 having impacts on erosion. It is tidally  
6 influenced, so it's going to have water movement  
7 through it.

8 You know, I don't know where you're going to  
9 get with the TVOR. Crash, fire, rescue, you've  
10 really got funded through DOT. I mean, it's --  
11 it augments that and frees a few more FDOT  
12 dollars. It's probably more trouble than it's  
13 worth, frankly, when you go to put it under a  
14 federal grant versus state grant.

15 MR. GEORGE: What about a parking -- this  
16 drainage ditch that's right here (indicating),  
17 and extending the refuel -- self-service  
18 refueling pad to include some tie-downs?

19 MR. WUELLNER: Not FAA eligible. It's a  
20 revenue-producing project. It's not --

21 MR. GEORGE: Okay. Good point.

22 MR. WUELLNER: They're really kind of --  
23 they're very restrictive on the types of projects  
24 that FAA will let you. DOT, that wouldn't be a  
25 problem, not at all. They helped us build it, in

1 fact. You can't build taxiways to T-hangars.

2 You can't build T-hangars. You can't --

3 MR. GEORGE: So your suggestion is the  
4 seaplane ramp.

5 MR. WUELLNER: Well, I think that's -- the  
6 other alternative -- I mean, I know you don't  
7 want to hear this part of it, but I was thinking  
8 if you -- when you get to the point of making a  
9 decision on Taxiway B, as to whether you build it  
10 where it is, that's -- that would be an excellent  
11 place to be able to easily and probably  
12 inexpensively add on a hardstand location for a  
13 large airplane, where you could take it right off  
14 of Taxiway B onto an area that allows it to turn  
15 around and reorient back out.

16 I think you're going to be needing -- my  
17 caution in doing something in the immediate  
18 terminal area is that the master plan's likely to  
19 show a substantial redevelopment required to  
20 accommodate additional or future parked aircraft  
21 and the like.

22 When you go in there and expend public  
23 money, especially from FAA, who you're going to  
24 have a 20-year commitment on whatever you do  
25 there, you kind of commit yourself to perhaps an

1 engineering quandary in that immediate area  
2 that's not easily resolved moving projects out  
3 into the 20-year time line -- in the master plan  
4 time line.

5 I -- I absolutely agree we need a place to  
6 park those kind of airplanes off of the runway  
7 system. I'm just not sure that's easily  
8 accommodated close in to the terminal without  
9 making a mistake in putting something there  
10 that's less than permanent, especially for FAA  
11 grant purposes.

12 MR. GEORGE: Ed, is somebody paying for our  
13 new maintenance facility?

14 MR. WUELLNER: Well, that wouldn't be  
15 eligible under FAA. That would be --

16 MR. GEORGE: That's not revenue-producing.

17 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, but it's not open to  
18 the public. It's not a public use item like  
19 infrastructure, core infrastructure.

20 MR. GEORGE: How about constructing a  
21 facility for Civil Air Patrol?

22 MR. WUELLNER: Not FAA eligible. Again, the  
23 same problem. They're also really persnickety  
24 about funding facilities for any other  
25 governmental entity. You can't even use them as

1 justification.

2 For instance, if you had increased military  
3 traffic here, they'd tell you that's not our  
4 obligation to build additional facilities; you  
5 need to look to the military to fund the  
6 additional -- if it's -- the demand's from the  
7 military, it's demand that they should pay for.  
8 I know it gets a little territorial at that  
9 level.

10 MR. GORMAN: All I know is that serving the  
11 needs of the tenants right now does include an  
12 apron. And I don't -- I haven't heard of any  
13 other immediate needs, but I do hear that need  
14 often, and I've heard it from more than one of  
15 our tenants here and -- the airport tenants.

16 And so, I don't know, in -- the eligibility  
17 of the funds is something that seems to be such  
18 a, you know, a gray area. And if it's  
19 revenue-producing, it can, too. But I know  
20 that's an immediate need. And I know --

21 MR. WUELLNER: What if we looked at --

22 MR. GORMAN: -- that we need to concentrate  
23 on immediate needs and --

24 MR. WUELLNER: What if we looked at --

25 rather than looking at the close-in terminal

138

1 areas, brought it out, like in a line close to  
2 where the paver apron is, you know, out far  
3 enough that if you extended the apron development  
4 in the terminal area, you haven't made a -- you  
5 haven't made an engineering issue out of finding  
6 a hard place for those -- for those larger  
7 airplanes to park.

8 You could come right off of runway 2/20  
9 on -- actually east or west for that matter, and  
10 create a hardstand location off of that that  
11 keeps you out of the runway protection area  
12 but --

13 MR. GEORGE: To the south or to the north?

14 MR. WUELLNER: We could do it either place,  
15 whatever way worked. My -- my thought was you  
16 might want to consider it --

17 MR. GEORGE: You're saying here (indicating)  
18 or here (indicating).

19 MR. WUELLNER: Up north, just -- excuse  
20 me -- east of that a little bit. Up toward the  
21 paver apron. Yeah, that side of the taxiway.  
22 One side or the other.

23 MR. GEORGE: Okay. Okay.

24 MR. WUELLNER: See, one of the things you're  
25 going to -- you know, I hate to be the -- stating

139

1 the obvious sometimes, but -- you know, and I  
2 don't want this affiliated with me because I  
3 didn't do it, but you've got a long-term issue in  
4 development relative to, what do you do with  
5 runway 2/20 or 6/24.

6 You're going to have a long-term issue of  
7 having to maximize the development this side of  
8 the street before you ever consider longer-term  
9 development alternatives west of U.S. 1, whether  
10 you ever want to consider that or not.

11 But you -- you're going to have a hard time  
12 expanding the existing FBO apron area, creating  
13 large aircraft parking or anything where the  
14 terminal is cur -- how it's currently laid out  
15 with 2/20 open, or 6/24, for that matter. It's  
16 just, you're constrained entirely in terms of  
17 physical property.

18 MR. GORMAN: Mr. Wuellner, general aviation  
19 aircraft require runways to be able to land into  
20 the wind and you would preclude the ability of  
21 them to use this runway.

22 MR. WUELLNER: I'm just -- I'm going to make



23 this statement only because you have -- you have  
24 a -- for FAA purposes, you only have two runways  
25 that are eligible for funding right now, and one

140

1 of which is not 2/20.

2 So, any future work on that runway is  
3 excluded because you have, and your master plan  
4 says, that 2/20 -- or excuse me, that the  
5 combination of any two runways out here gets you  
6 their mandated 99.9 percent wind coverage.  
7 Whether you -- it's ideal or not is, you know,  
8 open for debate. The ideal runway direction is  
9 neither of those two, when it comes right down to  
10 it.

11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I think we need to give you  
12 some direction on which projects to throw out  
13 there so we can get something here by the 15th  
14 and use the money that we have.

15 MR. SLINGLUFF: Is public comment closed?

16 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yes, it is.

17 Entertain any motions to give Mr. Wuellner  
18 some direction.

19 MR. GEORGE: We need to put some priorities  
20 here.

21 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Right.

22 MR. GEORGE: I'll start the ball rolling. I  
23 make a motion we establish the following  
24 priorities for you to work on. And if you run  
25 into roadblocks on one, go to number two, number

141

1 three.

2 Large aircraft apron, to come up with a  
3 facility, you know, to help those aircraft.  
4 Seaplane ramp is number two. And number three,  
5 this nonaircraft access, at least down to the  
6 first area there (indicating).

7 MR. WUELLNER: To --

8 MR. GORMAN: I have a comment when you  
9 get --

10 MR. WUELLNER: -- what is it?

11 MR. GEORGE: I'm sorry?

12 MR. WUELLNER: For hangar row J --

13 MR. GEORGE: Use hangar row from --

14 MR. WUELLNER: -- for j, K?

15 MR. GEORGE: Yeah, without having to go  
16 outside, right.

17 MR. GORMAN: Madam Chairman?

18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is there a second?

19 MR. GEORGE: I'm done.

20 CHAIRMAN GREEN: There's a motion on the

21 floor. Is there a second?

22 MR. COX: I'll second it.

23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Discussion?

24 MR. GORMAN: I would like to amend it to

25 include in that laundry list a heliport, as

142

1 that's needed right now. I mean, there's a big  
2 problem with the -- with the corporate jets that  
3 land or anybody that lands helicopters that use  
4 the aprons that exist as FOD all over. In other  
5 words, it creates a hazard to the jets.

6 MR. GEORGE: Where would you like to see the  
7 heliport, number four?

8 MR. GORMAN: Right by this --

9 CHAIRMAN GREEN: No.

10 MR. GEORGE: No, no, no. I don't care about  
11 that. Where would you like to see it in the  
12 list?

13 MR. GORMAN: Number four.

14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Number four.

15 MR. GORMAN: Number four, sir.

16 MR. WUELLNER: Well, depending on how you do  
17 the large aircraft apron, you can cross-utilize  
18 it, too.

19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. We have a motion and

20 a second and an amendment. Do you accept the  
21 amendment?

22 MR. GEORGE: I accept the amendment.

23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. Cox?

24 MR. COX: Accept.

25 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All in favor?

143

1 MR. CIRIELLO: Aye.

2 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Aye.

3 MR. GORMAN: Aye.

4 MR. GEORGE: Aye.

5 MR. COX: Aye.

6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All opposed?

7 (No opposition.)

8 MR. GORMAN: Can I ask one question? Does

9 that -- is that number four, in other words, is

10 this in order of precedence --

11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Uh-huh.

12 MR. GORMAN: -- or in order of precedence to

13 actually look at them? I would have amended

14 that.

15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: But I think that was kind

16 of taken care of. Mr. Wuellner said with the

17 apron development --

18 MR. GEORGE: With the apron, he could look

19 at that --

20 CHAIRMAN GREEN: -- he might be able to  
21 throw it in.

22 MR. GORMAN: All right.

23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah.

24 MR. COX: What order was the new pilot  
25 clubhouse in there?

144

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Next agenda item F.?

2 MR. WUELLNER: Becomes the new 4.

3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Agenda item F.

4 7.F. - Executive Director's Employment

5 Contract Renewal

6 MR. WUELLNER: This pertains to my contract  
7 with this board and the fact that that is rapidly  
8 approaching its expiration this fall. And the  
9 contract provides for a 180-day period where we  
10 just kind of let each other know whether -- what  
11 our intentions are. That would normally be in  
12 March of this year.

13 Since Mr. George was kind enough to tell us  
14 a couple of meetings ago that he won't be here  
15 during that time, I felt like we probably ought  
16 to make you aware of that in February so that you  
17 have some idea -- you can have that discussion

18 whenever you want.

19 But it's more informational. There's no  
20 specific action required today. We did attach a  
21 copy of that contract so that you have some idea  
22 of what you're operating under right now. And I  
23 guess, essentially, you just kind of need to let  
24 me know what your intentions are collectively.

25 MR. COX: By the March meeting.

145

1 MR. WUELLNER: Not necessarily. I mean, the  
2 contract allows it to go month-to-month at the  
3 end, you know, if it ends up in that situation.  
4 My preference would be, and probably yours, is to  
5 get something wrapped up, if that's the direction  
6 you intend to go.

7 And that could be done -- I mean, the reason  
8 the date's kind of weird in it is that the  
9 previous two renewals of it have never occurred  
10 at the end of the contract; they typically have  
11 occurred before that and pick up a new starting  
12 date. And, you know, that could be done as early  
13 as, you know, within a couple of months, or it  
14 can go through the end, or we can all agree to  
15 shake hands and be friends and be done with it in  
16 September.

17 So, you know, I felt like while it's an  
18 interesting quandary to be in from my  
19 perspective, you know, part of my job  
20 responsibilities are to keep you informed of  
21 those things.

22 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any public comment?

23 Mr. Mesmer?

24 MR. MESMER: Can I ask you what they pay  
25 you?

146

1 MR. WUELLNER: Currently?

2 MR. MESMER: Uh-huh.

3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: It's in our budget.

4 MR. WUELLNER: Mid-70's is fair. I'm not  
5 exactly sure of the number.

6 MR. MESMER: Okay. Is this brought up to  
7 the board, basically negotiated through the  
8 board?

9 MR. WUELLNER: Yes.

10 MR. MESMER: Is the public allowed input?

11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We have public comment when  
12 the -- we did our budget review, fiscal budget,  
13 the end of last year and all of that came up,  
14 yes.

15 MR. MESMER: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any other public comment?

17 (No public comment.)

18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Board comment? Discussion,

19 Mr. Ciriello?

20 MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah. According to this

21 Staff recommendation that's here for you to get

22 along with, Ed, my understanding is that you and

23 Ed would get together with this employment

24 agreement and say if it's fine with you and him

25 completely, as such. You would just come back to

147

1 the board and say we'll just go ahead and sign a

2 contract for the next three, five, or whatever

3 years it is as such, or if there's any changes

4 you or he wants to make, you would come back to

5 us with the changes and then we would discuss it

6 and vote on it? Or does it mean that you and him

7 get together and it's -- and finalize it?

8 MR. WUELLNER: No, it would come back.

9 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah. I'm just looking at

10 the staff --

11 MR. WUELLNER: The way it was envisioned

12 here, it would just simply -- if the direction of

13 all of you collectively is to negotiate a new

14 contract, the suggestion was you appoint a single



15 person to do that --

16 MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah.

17 MR. WUELLNER: -- representing the board.

18 Then anything has to come back to the board for  
19 approval.

20 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. Gorman?

21 MR. GORMAN: Well, pending that whole  
22 discussion, no offense to Mr. Wuellner, who I'm  
23 sure is competent enough, I'd like to see some  
24 type of an evaluation issue, in other words, an  
25 evaluation mail-out or whatever is necessary for

148

1 a very impartial ability for both the tenants,  
2 the users, and everybody involved at the airport  
3 to be able to comment on performance. In other  
4 words, not just my opinion, but everyone's  
5 opinion. And I don't think that's an unfair  
6 thing to do before you actually renew someone's  
7 contract.

8 MR. CIRIELLO: Madam Chair?

9 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yes, Mr. Ciriello.

10 MR. CIRIELLO: What Jack, Mr. Gorman is  
11 saying, the board -- generally every year, the  
12 chairman would pass out a questionnaire to each  
13 board member to fill out for the performance of

14 the director and then turn them back in to the  
15 chair, and then the chair would bring it to the  
16 board with a recommendation of, you know, whether  
17 to give him a raise or whatnot and everything.

18 But I don't think that -- although I know  
19 we're here to represent the public and everything  
20 like that, but I think in this particular  
21 instance, I don't think that any input other than  
22 the board to whether we're satisfied with his  
23 duties and his pay and everything is any more  
24 responsibility than ours and anybody -- you know,  
25 that it's not anybody else's.

149

1 I understand what Jack's saying. And we do  
2 evaluate, the board does evaluate him every year  
3 to see whether they're going to give him a raise  
4 or keep him where he's at and whether he's doing  
5 a good job, bad job or whatever. So, he does get  
6 evaluated every year, is what I'm getting at.

7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. George?

8 MR. GEORGE: I think it's up to each board  
9 member to evaluate how they feel about his  
10 performance. And if that includes that board  
11 member contacting one of the tenants on the field  
12 to get input, then that's at that board member's

13 discretion.

14 I could not support the board going out  
15 carte blanche with an evaluation and asking  
16 employees, if you will, to report back on how  
17 things are done. I would say that if that's the  
18 way you want to look into it, then make your  
19 phone calls and then let it, you know -- you  
20 measure that how you want to.

21 MR. GORMAN: Then could I say that if we are  
22 going to then discuss this, no offense again to  
23 the staff, but that could be discussed without  
24 Staff's presence, only because we can have a full  
25 and open discussion of the issues?

150

1 In other words, I understand and I take your  
2 point, in other words, that we're not going just  
3 to mail out hundreds of brochures to people, and  
4 that you feel it's the board members'  
5 responsibility to interview tenants or whatever,  
6 and that's not a bad thought. But I am saying  
7 that we actually then need to have a discussion  
8 group to actually think about this evaluation in  
9 total. And again, no offense to the staff  
10 members, but with -- in public, but without --

11 MR. GEORGE: I don't know if we can do that.

12 Attorney, legal?

13 MR. GORMAN: I don't know either. I'm just  
14 asking.

15 MR. GEORGE: Legal?

16 MR. GORMAN: I'm trying not to be -- to make  
17 anything embarrassing for Mr. Wuellner, but I'm  
18 trying to be able to discuss it frankly.

19 MR. BURNETT: In effect, you're trying to  
20 find a way to have a shade meeting that I don't  
21 think is provided for under the law. So, we can  
22 look at that for you, and if I can find a -- if  
23 we can find a way to accomplish that purpose,  
24 we'll be happy to advise you.

25 But my recollection on this -- on this

151

1 issue, and having worked at the County Attorney's  
2 Office prior to going into private practice and  
3 having to advise the Board of County  
4 Commissioners on these issues, I don't -- I do  
5 not believe that you can have such a shade  
6 meeting.

7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I would suggest we treat  
8 this as we would a small business with an  
9 employee. We sit down with them. We have our  
10 board discussion. "Mr. Wuellner, we have

11 concerns this way," or "You've done an excellent  
12 job," or whatever it is. But we sit down to him,  
13 talk to him, and address our concerns.

14 I think the only reason Mr. Ciriello is  
15 bringing up what we've done before with the  
16 chairman is just so everybody kind of got their  
17 own input maybe privately on a piece of paper and  
18 the chairman kind of condensed it all so it  
19 wasn't that, "Mr. George says this" and  
20 "Mr. Ciriello says this," just "The board has  
21 concerns this way, this way," or "We need to look  
22 at this, this, and this in the contract." So, it  
23 comes out as a consensus that we can discuss the  
24 contract.

25 MR. CIRIELLO: Ed, the questionnaire that

152

1 Mr. Rose passed out to the board last year for  
2 the evaluations, do you have any blanks or copies  
3 of that that maybe you could show the board --

4 MR. WUELLNER: Sure.

5 MR. CIRIELLO: -- what he did? I mean --  
6 and then we all collectively turned them in to  
7 him, and then he came back to the board with his  
8 recommendations.

9 But, as the chairwoman said, that when a

10 business goes to evaluate -- not the regular  
11 employees like I was in a steel mill; I was just  
12 an employee. But if a board of a company was  
13 going to go and evaluate the upper-echelon  
14 employees, which you would be as director, they  
15 don't go to the employees and say, well, look,  
16 we're talking -- thinking about your director  
17 here; do we keep him, do we give him a raise, or  
18 whatever. They don't go to the employees or do  
19 anything like that. The board does it all within  
20 themselves with the person in -- involved.

21 So, I think that maybe just as a -- oh, what  
22 word am I looking for? If you had a copy of this  
23 that Mr. Rose gave to every board -- not that  
24 we'd have to use it specifically, but to give  
25 everybody an idea what he did so that the board

153

1 could say, well, they want to do it a little  
2 different, maybe add something to it or take  
3 something off, to direction -- to give us  
4 direction.

5 Of course, I've gone through this, so I --  
6 you know, but I don't think it's anybody's  
7 responsibility but the board's to evaluate your  
8 efficiency and your work. And, of course, it

9 will come to the public whenever the Chair says,  
10 "Well, the board is recommending that we do this  
11 or that," but -- for their input, but to get to  
12 the evaluation, I don't think it's anybody's job  
13 but ours.

14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. George?

15 MR. GEORGE: Can we legally do an evaluation  
16 form and have it all turned in to you without  
17 having a --

18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I believe that's -- the  
19 only thing the Chair would do is put everything  
20 you individually have on one piece of paper --

21 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN GREEN: -- consolidate it, so that  
23 everybody's concerns are addressed at one open  
24 meeting.

25 Do we have a motion then how to go forward

154

1 with this for our next meeting? We have a  
2 180-day window, so it's not -- we don't have to  
3 make any contractual determinations.

4 MR. MESMER: Public comment?

5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I closed the public  
6 comment, Mr. Mesmer.

7 MR. CIRIELLO: Well, I'll make a motion we

8 go with Staff recommendation and we allow the  
9 Chair to get Ed and go over the current document  
10 to see if there's any additions, corrections, or  
11 deletions or whatever, and then come back to the  
12 board for the board's input.

13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Discussion? Uh-huh.

14 MR. CIRIELLO: Because we're not talking  
15 about a pay raise or anything here for the  
16 evaluation. We're just talking about whether  
17 this contract's acceptable to the director or  
18 not. That's all. I don't even know why I  
19 brought in the pay raise part, but really it's --

20 MR. WUELLNER: It's more fundamental than  
21 that, whether you intend to do a contract.

22 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Right.

23 MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah.

24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. There's a motion on  
25 the floor to accept Staff's recommendation. Is

155

1 there a second?

2 MR. COX: What's the Staff's recommendation?

3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: It's written on your agenda  
4 memorandum. Staff's recommendation is the  
5 Authority to discuss and agree how to proceed,  
6 perhaps designate the chairman, and Mr. Ciriello



7 suggested the chairman, the task of negotiating  
8 an agreement, with consensus of the Authority  
9 support. And his consensus was we'll hand out  
10 the questionnaires that was done by the last  
11 chairman, get back together in a consensus, in an  
12 open meeting, and discuss it.

13 MR. COX: If that's the motion, I'll second  
14 it.

15 MR. GEORGE: I didn't hear the second part  
16 about the evaluation, is the reason I didn't say  
17 anything.

18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: That would be handed out  
19 under the consensus of the Authority.

20 MR. CIRIELLO: In the agreement, Mr. George,  
21 I re -- I don't see it right offhand, but I think  
22 there's a -- something in here that yearly, he is  
23 evaluated for his performance. So, that's in his  
24 contract.

25 So, all this motion is for is for the

156

1 Chairwoman and Mr. Wuellner to review his  
2 employment document to see if it's acceptable the  
3 way it is or if they want to do anything with it  
4 to change it. All the other stuff is -- was just  
5 talk, because it's all covered in here.

6 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

7 MR. CIRIELLO: Has nothing to do with  
8 anything, with evaluations or anything. Just his  
9 contract.

10 CHAIRMAN GREEN: There's a motion on the  
11 floor. It's been seconded. All in favor?

12 MR. CIRIELLO: Aye.

13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Aye.

14 MR. GEORGE: Aye.

15 MR. COX: Aye.

16 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All opposed?

17 MR. GORMAN: (Raises his pen.)

18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. And since we have a  
19 time window, I can get those evaluation forms and  
20 hand them out or just put them in the packet for  
21 next meeting.

22 Next agenda item?

23 7.G. - AAAE Annual Meeting

24 MR. WUELLNER: Next item I have is relative  
25 to the AAAE annual meeting, whether anyone on the

157

1 Airport Authority was interested in attending  
2 that, and if so, it will just require a board  
3 motion to attend that, anyone wishing to go.  
4 We've provided background information

5 (indicating) about AAAE, for those that didn't  
6 know what that was, and then also provided  
7 specific conference-related information.

8 MR. GEORGE: What's the date of it?

9 CHAIRMAN GREEN: April 27 through 30.

10 MR. COX: Los Angeles.

11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any public discussion?

12 (No public discussion.)

13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I don't know if you guys  
14 can go. Board discussion? Mr. Cox?

15 MR. COX: Just, in my opinion, it's a  
16 very -- I've been to one of these before, several  
17 of these, actually, and they're very  
18 worthwhile -- I don't know for the small airport,  
19 but I think it would be a real eye-opening  
20 experience for one of our representatives to go.  
21 And I am not insinuating that I would like to go,  
22 because I can't.

23 So, I think if there's a board member that  
24 wants to go, it'd be a very good input for our  
25 airport and vice versa from the conference to the

158

1 Airport Authority. You meet a lot of different  
2 airport people. You get a lot of really good  
3 ideas. There's a lot of information that comes

4 out. So, I highly recommend that one of us

5 attend that.

6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. Gorman? I thought you

7 had your hand up.

8 MR. GORMAN: Oh, I was just supporting --

9 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any other discussion?

10 MR. GEORGE: I would like to go.

11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay.

12 MR. GORMAN: Can more than one go? I'm

13 sorry.

14 MR. CIRIELLO: We didn't vote on it yet.

15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Right. I think, Ed,

16 there's funding for --

17 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. Yeah.

18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: It doesn't matter?

19 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. Anybody that wants to

20 go.

21 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. Then I'll make a

22 motion that we just individually, if you want to

23 attend, go ahead and directly tell Mr. Wuellner,

24 as long as there's no limitation on how many can

25 go.

159

1 MR. WUELLNER: Just let me know as soon as

2 possible so we can get the arrangements made.

3 MR. GORMAN: We'll keep it cheap.

4 MR. COX: I'll make a motion that any number  
5 of the Airport Authority members that want to  
6 attend, be able to attend the AAAE conference.

7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'll second that.

8 MR. CIRIELLO: He made the motion.

9 MR. COX: Oh, he did?

10 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All -- all in favor?

11 MR. CIRIELLO: Aye.

12 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Aye.

13 MR. GEORGE: Aye.

14 MR. COX: Aye.

15 MR. GORMAN: Aye.

16 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All opposed?

17 (No opposition.)

18 MR. CIRIELLO: Actually we're going with  
19 Staff's recommendation.

20 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah. Next agenda item?

21 7.H. - Property Purchase Authorization

22 417 Indian Bend Road

23 MR. WUELLNER: Relative to the property  
24 purchase of -- at 417 Indian Bend, we received a  
25 letter, which I am not sure made it to you, but

160

1 we received a letter from the -- from the Harveys

2 relative to the purchase of their property, which  
3 is located right at the end of Estrella Avenue,  
4 the extreme east end of it where it begins the  
5 curve -- well, just past the curve, actually,  
6 because we own a piece of it right around the  
7 corner. But it's immediately adjacent to us.

8 This is one of the pieces of property that  
9 the Authority began eminent domain procedures on  
10 about two years ago and ultimately backed off on.

11 Since that time, it's my understanding the  
12 Harveys have had it for sale, or shortly  
13 thereafter, seeing in a sense -- if I can sound  
14 this callous -- but just kind of seeing the  
15 handwriting on the wall long term, put the  
16 property up for sale and have since given us a  
17 letter indicating that they're willing to sell.

18 And I think everyone's intent is to try to keep  
19 it outside of the, quote, unquote, eminent domain  
20 process, if at all possible, and come up with an  
21 amicable sale.

22 To that end, we had the appraisal that was  
23 done back over two years ago re -- reviewed, and  
24 revised to reflect current market conditions.

25 The current appraisal, as we received it,

1 indicates a property value of \$426,500 for the  
2 property down there.

3 Now, since this would likely result in  
4 eminent domain in the future, you have the  
5 latitude within Florida Statutes and your Florida  
6 DOT grant to exceed that amount by up to 10  
7 percent. The Harveys have indicated a  
8 willingness to sell at \$459-, I believe was the  
9 last number I heard from them, which would  
10 certainly be within that -- that 10 percent  
11 number.

12 And if -- if we're serious about opening up  
13 the Araquay Park neighborhood to development,  
14 this will be a key piece of property to do that.  
15 If that's the intention of the Authority to move  
16 along that way, our recommendation is the  
17 \$426,500, but I think you also need to allow the  
18 ability to get into that 10 percent number to get  
19 to the \$459- asking price or, you know, whatever  
20 it takes to do it within the 10 percent. With  
21 that, that's kind of where we are with it.

22 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Public discussion?

23 MR. WUELLNER: You also have a copy of the  
24 appraisal, those of you --

25 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. Slingluff?

1 MR. SLINGLUFF: What was the previous  
2 appraisal at?

3 MR. WUELLNER: \$390-. And that was --

4 MR. SLINGLUFF: And the board has had this  
5 subject for how many years?

6 MR. WUELLNER: Over two.

7 MR. MARSH: I would like to say --

8 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mark?

9 MR. MARSH: -- I've known Mr. Harvey for I  
10 guess 15 -- 15 or 20 years, and we've kept this  
11 gentleman in limbo for a long time. And for him  
12 to come to the board now and say that he would  
13 like to sell his property, it was something we  
14 should have bought a long time ago, I don't think  
15 he really knew if he wanted to sell or didn't; he  
16 just wanted to know when he was going to have to  
17 sell his property.

18 And as a -- as a long-time supporter of the  
19 airport and being on the board twice, I would  
20 strongly urge y'all to pay Mr. Harvey his asking  
21 price and let's let this man get on with his  
22 life.

23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you. Any other  
24 public comment?

25 (No further public comment.)



1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Board comment? Mr. Gorman?

2 MR. GORMAN: Yes. If this piece of property  
3 is purchased, I mean, how key is that to actually  
4 then being -- having an entire row purchased so  
5 actually something can be accomplished?

6 MR. WUELLNER: I think at the previous  
7 master plan workshop, we handed out the property  
8 map or showed the parcels within the Araquay Park  
9 neighborhood that the Authority currently owns.

10 That is kind of at the mouth of --

11 MR. GEORGE: This (indicating)?

12 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, exactly.

13 MR. GEORGE: Show me where it is.

14 MR. WUELLNER: I don't have a big way to  
15 show it, but it's this 26 and half of 25  
16 (indicating). It's the plat of this neighborhood  
17 here (indicating). It's the property located  
18 right here (indicating).

19 The Authority owns all but one property in  
20 this entirety (indicating) of this block here.  
21 It's also the area that would -- currently under  
22 Water Management District permit, is an area that  
23 will all -- will become a drainage retention  
24 area.

25 MR. GORMAN: And if this is purchased --

1 I'm sorry. If this is purchased, in other words,  
2 do you feel then that the pieces of the puzzle  
3 are in order to be able to start something we  
4 badly need, the construction of other hangars, or  
5 will we be delayed for years on some of this --

6 MR. WUELLNER: You have one other property  
7 to wrap up to open up the next block. And if  
8 you -- if you look at this (indicating), you can  
9 see you're only a couple of properties from being  
10 able to, in a sense, carve out the east side,  
11 east side here. But you could certainly begin  
12 the development of other stuff.

13 MR. GORMAN: What kind of a time frame are  
14 we talking about, though? This -- this issue's  
15 been going on for years.

16 MR. WUELLNER: Well, you have -- I'm trying  
17 to remember exactly on your -- what your grant  
18 programming is, but you're one to two -- one- to  
19 two-year time line to have DOT funds for  
20 development of infrastructure related to it. I'm  
21 trying to remember exactly when it falls, but  
22 it's -- it's either this July or next July that  
23 it opens up, the funding becomes available for  
24 part of the infrastructure development in that

25 area.

165

1 MR. GORMAN: And what's the possibility of  
2 buying those other key prop -- those other key  
3 properties that --

4 MR. WUELLNER: You also have additional land  
5 acquisition money coming up beginning after July  
6 of this year, so...

7 MR. GEORGE: How much is that; do you know?

8 MR. WUELLNER: I think the one in the middle  
9 of the block there had indicated -- you know, we  
10 were fairly close when we were looking at it from  
11 an eminent domain standpoint. In price, there  
12 wasn't a whole lot of difference between what we  
13 were offering and what he was saying he was --  
14 would negotiate to sell for. So, we weren't  
15 terribly off on that one. So, I think that one  
16 could be wrapped up certainly within that  
17 two-year time line, which frees that whole block.

18 MR. GORMAN: My point being, I mean, is  
19 there an eminent domain issue on the last of  
20 these that is going to be contentious that will  
21 continue this entire project ad infinitum so that  
22 we don't actually accomplish anything; we just  
23 continue to rent houses?

24 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, I -- I think you've got  
25 the ability to develop -- begin the development

166

1 of some portions of this without getting into  
2 that kind of struggle.

3 But there are some properties in there that  
4 I think aren't going to be available for sale  
5 without eminent domain until we start  
6 construction there. I think at that point,  
7 you'll see those discussions, assuming we're  
8 funded pretty well for acquisition at that point.

9 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Further discussion?

10 (No further discussion.)

11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: According to your  
12 memorandum, we would be reimbursed 50 percent?

13 MR. WUELLNER: Correct.

14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Prior to the 10 percent?

15 MR. WUELLNER: Well, it would include that  
16 amount if you use it.

17 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Oh.

18 MR. WUELLNER: It's just that under normal  
19 conditions without the threat of eminent domain,  
20 you're limited to the appraised value. With the  
21 threat of eminent domain in the next year or so,  
22 you can exceed that appraisal amount in order to

23 avoid eminent domain.

24 MR. GEORGE: What was in the budget --

25 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. George?

167

1 MR. GEORGE: What was in the budget plan for

2 land acquisition this year?

3 MR. WUELLNER: I believe it's \$600,000,

4 \$500- or \$600,000 total.

5 MR. GEORGE: This would knock a big hole in

6 it.

7 MR. WUELLNER: Oh, yeah.

8 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. Cox?

9 MR. COX: Will you entertain a motion?

10 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yes, sir.

11 MR. COX: I move that we accept Staff

12 recommendation and purchase the home.

13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: For the \$426,500, which is

14 the Staff recommendation?

15 MR. COX: Or within the 10 percent that

16 Mr. Wuellner says we can accomplish that

17 purchase.

18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Do I have a second?

19 MR. GEORGE: You have a second.

20 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Further discussion?

21 (No further discussion.)

22 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All in favor?

23 MR. CIRIELLO: Aye.

24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Aye.

25 MR. GEORGE: Aye.

168

1 MR. COX: Aye.

2 MR. GORMAN: Aye.

3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All opposed?

4 (No opposition.)

5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Motion carries.

6 7.I. - Hangar Row I

7 MR. WUELLNER: The last item I have for  
8 action is relative to Hangar Row I, which is the  
9 old paint shop row. And what we're going to ask  
10 you to do, is since we've not been able to locate  
11 a paint shop willing to pay market value, if you  
12 wouldn't mind, can we construct some leases there  
13 for storage with a provision in the lease that in  
14 the event a paint shop is identified, that those  
15 leases can be terminated within a reasonable time  
16 line, you know, and put that facility in there  
17 for the intention -- but rather than continue to  
18 let it work on 30-day kind of leases, if no one  
19 has any objections.

20 MR. COX: Construct what?

21 MR. WUELLNER: We can construct the lease.

22 MR. COX: Oh.

23 MR. GORMAN: No modifications to the paint  
24 facility.

25 MR. WUELLNER: No.

169

1 MR. GORMAN: Just keep the paint facility  
2 and just lease it out.

3 MR. WUELLNER: Correct. It would just be  
4 leased as storage temporarily.

5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any public discussion?  
6 Mr. Slingluff?

7 MR. SLINGLUFF: With the -- the rehab has  
8 started on the bulk hangar, and we still don't  
9 have the new hangar available, so if there is any  
10 space available in the I row of hangars, we would  
11 desperately need it for that short term. I don't  
12 think it'd be more than 30 days, just to move  
13 some new aircraft under shelter.

14 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, we've got one I know of  
15 that's available. Depending how quickly they get  
16 the other out, we might have two available.

17 MR. COX: Two?

18 MR. WUELLNER: Two units -- two of the three  
19 units.

20 MR. MILLER: I just had one question. Is

21 the storage --

22 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I need you to stand up and

23 identify yourself.

24 MR. MILLER: Russell Miller. Just a

25 question.

170

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you.

2 MR. MILLER: Is that storage you're talking

3 about nonairplanes?

4 MR. WUELLNER: It is --

5 MR. MILLER: Are you talking about rental --

6 rent it to people on the waiting list or --

7 MR. WUELLNER: There's a specific list for

8 commercial or corporate-type hangars versus

9 standard T's.

10 MR. MILLER: So, it wouldn't be like storage

11 of boxes or anything like that. It would be

12 aircraft.

13 MR. WUELLNER: No. Aircraft.

14 MR. MILLER: Okay.

15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any further public

16 discussion?

17 (No further public discussion.)

18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Board?



19 MR. GORMAN: One other question. Can you  
20 make just as much money on a 30-day basis? That  
21 way, it allows, for instance, Mr. Slingluff to  
22 utilize it?

23 MR. WUELLNER: Oh, yeah.

24 MR. GORMAN: Or are you going to be able  
25 to --

171

1 MR. WUELLNER: We don't have any problem  
2 with that.

3 MR. GORMAN: -- take a tremendous concession  
4 on the income?

5 MR. WUELLNER: It's going to be a month or  
6 two till we can get it to where someone could  
7 take all of it if they wanted to because of the  
8 existing lease. You have a 30-day notification.  
9 So, allowing him to use it for a month is not --  
10 does not affect the big picture.

11 MR. GORMAN: In other words, he's a tenant;  
12 we can meet his needs and still do what you  
13 want --

14 MR. WUELLNER: Yes.

15 MR. GORMAN: -- is probably what it's going  
16 to boil down to.

17 MR. WUELLNER: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: My understanding it's  
19 not -- it's, quote, unquote, unoccupied, but we  
20 have a lease of it.

21 MR. WUELLNER: A portion of it is.

22 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We still have a contract on  
23 it that we have to comply with, a notification.

24 MR. WUELLNER: Correct. We have a  
25 short-term lease --

172

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Correct.

2 MR. WUELLNER: -- with someone.

3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All right. Entertain a  
4 motion --

5 MR. GEORGE: What is the --

6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Oh, I'm sorry?

7 MR. GEORGE: Excuse me. What is the  
8 notice-to-vacate period that you were going to  
9 put in there?

10 MR. WUELLNER: Thirty days. Well, for that  
11 purpose, probably 60 days. Give somebody a  
12 chance to get out of there. If we identify paint  
13 shop, we could make it available within 60 days  
14 of signing a contract.

15 MR. GEORGE: What is the lease revenue that  
16 comes in from one of those buildings under this

17 arrangement?

18 MR. WUELLNER: Well, currently, it's in  
19 excess of -- we can easily get \$3.50 a square  
20 foot for it, which is right at 3,000. So about  
21 \$10,500 a year on an annual basis, so...

22 MR. GEORGE: Okay. How much were we trying  
23 to get for the paint shop?

24 MR. WUELLNER: We started at \$3.50, trying  
25 to get \$4 a square foot for it, which if we go to

173

1 a longer-term lease, like in corporate-type use,  
2 I could easily get over \$4 for it. But having  
3 that proviso that you're going to potentially  
4 kick them out in 60 days is going to diminish the  
5 long-term value of it a little bit.

6 MR. GEORGE: What I'm hearing --

7 MR. WUELLNER: Plus, it's a little deficient  
8 in terms of operating --

9 MR. GEORGE: What I'm hearing you say is  
10 that we could, on a longer-term basis, we could  
11 get \$3.50 to \$4 a foot. If we turned around and  
12 rented it to a paint facility, we could get \$3.50  
13 to \$4 a foot.

14 MR. WUELLNER: At least.

15 MR. GEORGE: Is there something magical

16 about --

17 MR. WUELLNER: Well, the actual appraisal  
18 for -- no. Part of the problem is the actual  
19 appraised value to use it as paint was \$6 a  
20 square foot, I believe. But we've been unable to  
21 identify anywhere near that number.

22 Our feeling was -- from Staff was that in  
23 worst case, it would revert back to storage and  
24 you could at least get the \$3.50, \$4 a square  
25 foot. And if you use that as a starting point

174

1 for a new paint facility with an escalator over  
2 the first five years, you could get closer to the  
3 \$6 number without having to have that up front.  
4 You gain some latitude in the negotiation side.

5 MR. GEORGE: But you think there's an  
6 advantage to the airport to maintain that as a  
7 potential paint shop? I realize we've got a lot  
8 of money in it.

9 MR. WUELLNER: It's been this board's  
10 decision to do that. I personally find some  
11 limitations in that facility for a paint facility  
12 long term, but -- it's operationally very  
13 difficult to -- it's just not well laid out for a  
14 paint operation, especially without the fourth

15 unit in it.

16 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Entertain a motion to give

17 Mr. Wuellner direction to negotiate a lease.

18 MR. COX: I move to give Mr. Wuellner

19 direction to negotiate the lease.

20 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Second?

21 MR. GEORGE: Second it.

22 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Discussion?

23 (No discussion.)

24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All in favor?

25 MR. CIRIELLO: Aye.

175

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Aye.

2 MR. GEORGE: Aye.

3 MR. COX: Aye.

4 MR. GORMAN: Aye.

5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All opposed?

6 (No opposition.)

7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: That motion carries.

8 The next agenda I thought was project

9 updates. I'm assuming we've addressed them all,

10 except for the one we reserved. Oh, I'm sorry.

11 We have hangar row -- Hangar Row 1 (sic).

12 MR. WUELLNER: We did that. That was just

13 what we did.

14 MR. GEORGE: What is this videotaping --

15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: That was informational. We  
16 had asked for information.

17 MR. GEORGE: Okay. Fine. Okay.

18 7.J. - Project Updates

19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So, under Project Updates,  
20 I think the board had reserved just -- and we've  
21 had discussion on it, but direction for  
22 Mr. Wuellner as to options for us to restart  
23 Phase 2 --

24 MR. WUELLNER: Phase 2, that's right.

25 CHAIRMAN GREEN: -- the construction. So,

176

1 we wanted options as to whether we're going to  
2 use our own funding, look for reimbursement from  
3 the litigation, or what other options were  
4 available to us. And I -- we kind of tabled it  
5 to the end, but I think we're at the point we  
6 need to entertain a motion as to what specific  
7 direction we want to give him so that we can look  
8 at it soon and go forward with it. Is that where  
9 we were? Mr. Gorman?

10 MR. GORMAN: I was just curious as to  
11 actually trying to accomplish -- I believe I  
12 heard Wayne said there's to -- in other words, to

13 actually accomplish that goal. Would it be best  
14 to -- in other words, with the airport staff, I  
15 know they are quite competent, but I was  
16 concerned with the condition of the salvage of  
17 the actual building that is in Phase 2 now.

18 And I was concerned with the expertise  
19 ability to be able to inspect that salvage,  
20 recondition that salvage, and reassemble that  
21 salvage. And I was -- without trying to hire a  
22 contractor to do that, my thought was to hire an  
23 expert to help the staff possibly take care of  
24 this salvage issue.

25 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah.

177

1 MR. GEORGE: I think that the -- the design  
2 on those four hangars was so long ago, that the  
3 thought pattern from our primary tenant is that  
4 there'd be probably some better use to be made of  
5 that land or that space there.

6 So, what we were talking about was giving  
7 Mr. Wuellner the authorization to proceed  
8 posthaste with coming up with a new design for  
9 the use of that space and some cost estimates,  
10 for the board then to consider approving to go  
11 ahead with it, and we will use the funds out of

12 our own pocket to augment the \$160- we've got  
13 plus the \$200- that we've got there. So, that  
14 was what the discussion was --

15 MR. GORMAN: Right.

16 MR. GEORGE: -- but if you have some  
17 other --

18 MR. GORMAN: Well, that's -- that's fine.  
19 And then that would be -- in other words, just to  
20 expedite getting -- service the needs that are  
21 there --

22 MR. GEORGE: Absolutely.

23 MR. GORMAN: -- in other words. And the  
24 tenant has been thoroughly consulted about that  
25 that will service the needs?

178

1 MR. GEORGE: Well, the tenant is in on this  
2 design team that's going to come up with a new  
3 concept for what to do with that ground space.

4 MR. GORMAN: Because this thing, it will  
5 pay -- it's going to pay for itself quick.

6 MR. GEORGE: There is no intent to use the  
7 material that is there now. That has been moved  
8 off-site and will be saved for potential use  
9 after it's been inspected by a professional  
10 expert and brought back to status on some future



11 project.

12 MR. GORMAN: I believe there are two  
13 separate issues, then. I would -- that's a  
14 separate issue. I'd like to see an expert get in  
15 it that really knows steel buildings. But you're  
16 saying that first this new -- without a  
17 design/build idea, just we're going to give him  
18 some direction to be able to go ahead --

19 MR. GEORGE: He's going to pursue a design  
20 and an estimate before we tell him to go ahead.

21 MR. GORMAN: Using design/build firms or  
22 just using design?

23 MR. WUELLNER: You already have a firm  
24 under -- that's been selected that you can use.

25 MR. GORMAN: Okay. I understand.

179

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah. Okay. I would like  
2 to make a motion that we have Mr. Wuellner look  
3 at the design and/or build it with the firm we  
4 have, give us the numbers as to what it would be  
5 for the Authority to commence construction prior  
6 to waiting for any funds that would be recouped  
7 in litigation so that we can make a budgetary  
8 determination of whether -- the expense is going  
9 to be or not.

10 MR. WUELLNER: We'll have that to you at the  
11 March meeting.

12 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is there a second?

13 MR. GEORGE: I second that.

14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any further discussion?  
15 All in favor?

16 MR. GEORGE: Wait. One other discussion.  
17 As far as providing the numbers, you know, if the  
18 design substantially changes due to the  
19 requirements of our illustrious tenants, then I  
20 would like to know what contribution those  
21 tenants are going to make toward capital  
22 improvements, you know, over and above what we  
23 were going to spend to begin with.

24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah, I think the numbers  
25 that we're being given, if you compare apples

180

1 with apples, is what we had budgeted for in Phase  
2 2. Then if there's capital improvements beyond  
3 that, then it would cost an extra whatever.

4 MR. GEORGE: That's fine.

5 MR. WUELLNER: Those would be identified in  
6 the agenda memo.

7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All in favor?

8 MR. CIRIELLO: Aye.

9 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Aye.  
10 MR. GEORGE: Aye.  
11 MR. COX: Aye.  
12 MR. GORMAN: Aye.  
13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All opposed?  
14 (No opposition.)  
15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. That motion carries.  
16 MR. GEORGE: That was quick.  
17 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I think we discussed it  
18 pretty thoroughly.  
19 All right. Comments from the Authority  
20 members.  
21 MR. GORMAN: One more comment.  
22 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Oh, I'm going to get you.  
23 MR. GORMAN: I'm sorry.  
24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Was it on the project  
25 update?

181

1 MR. GORMAN: No.  
2 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Oh, okay.  
3 MR. GEORGE: Just let him start.  
4 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Sure. You can start.  
5 We'll start down here.  
6 8.E. - Mr. Jack Gorman  
7 MR. GORMAN: Comments about this entire --

8 CHAIRMAN GREEN: It's Authority members'  
9 comments. It's your -- you can address whatever.

10 MR. GORMAN: Number one on my agenda issue  
11 is that agenda issues be added at the end of  
12 these meetings and that we modify the meeting to  
13 include those.

14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. Let me ask you now,  
15 since when I ran the meeting at the beginning, I  
16 asked for approval of the agenda. So, at that  
17 point in time, that would be great if people  
18 could make a comment then at the beginning, "We  
19 need to add this" or whatever, so we'll know.

20 MR. GORMAN: That's fine.

21 CHAIRMAN GREEN: And also, we need to have  
22 some direction, because we had ten items and  
23 we're going on three hours here, which is lengthy  
24 for everybody, but it's also costly to keep a  
25 court reporter here that long. So, if we have

182

1 agenda items, to keep adding them would make our  
2 meetings a lot longer. Maybe we need to  
3 apportion them appropriately.

4 MR. WUELLNER: I -- I don't think he meant  
5 for this meeting, but for future meetings.

6 MR. GORMAN: I meant for future meetings.

7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Right. I just meant that  
8 we had ten already and we added another one, just  
9 to keep that all in mind for us.

10 MR. GEORGE: I think we do need a mechanism  
11 to identify agenda items that need to be added in  
12 the future, not to come to a meeting and say,  
13 "Okay, now add this item," because --

14 MR. GORMAN: Exactly.

15 MR. GEORGE: -- then the other board members  
16 don't have a chance to think about it.

17 MR. GORMAN: His point is my point.

18 MR. CIRIELLO: I don't understand this.  
19 We're here at a meeting. We're going through the  
20 agenda. We're talking about things. And then  
21 at -- we get at the end of the meeting, we're  
22 already supposed to know ahead of time for the  
23 third week of next month what we want on the  
24 agenda while we're here?

25 What happens tomorrow when I go home, or the

183

1 next day or next week, like Mr. George was  
2 saying, I think of a couple of other things and I  
3 call Ed up and suggest something to him? How can  
4 anybody sit here right now and think of something  
5 they want on the agenda for next month? You can

6 bring it up and talk to him about it right now.

7 It doesn't make much sense to me.

8 MR. WUELLNER: I don't think -- is that --

9 MR. COX: Something may come up in  
10 discussion.

11 MR. WUELLNER: Well, it wasn't to the  
12 exclusion, was it --

13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: No, no, no.

14 MR. WUELLNER: -- of normal agenda items?  
15 It's just specific things you want to see.

16 MR. CIRIELLO: No, just the idea. You know,  
17 you're jumping ahead one whole month on -- in a  
18 couple of minutes in one meeting.

19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. George?

20 MR. GEORGE: Joe, what we -- what I had in  
21 mind for that was, we have three new board  
22 members that throughout their campaign were  
23 saying that there were things that they would  
24 like to see happen.

25 We don't have -- we have not found the

184

1 mechanism for us to identify a discussion of  
2 those things that we said we would like to  
3 happen. And that was the point of get it on the  
4 agenda so that we can discuss it at some point in

5 the next couple of three months.

6 MR. WUELLNER: I -- excuse me, but I thought  
7 that was the -- one of the primary purposes  
8 behind the Authority members' section here at the  
9 end of the agenda, was to identify those areas so  
10 that they are put on future agendas. I mean,  
11 that is -- that is one of the key items here.

12 MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah, that the --

13 MR. WUELLNER: That's why it was originally  
14 placed on there.

15 MR. GEORGE: Okay. That was my question to  
16 you earlier about how do we get that --

17 MR. WUELLNER: By concurrence of the group,  
18 that they're, you know, moved forward onto an  
19 agenda, or if it can be handled right there, we  
20 handle it.

21 MR. CIRIELLO: The process is already there.  
22 It's already in effect.

23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. Cox?

24 8.D. - Mr. Bob Cox

25 MR. COX: Two very quick items. What's the

185

1 status on our web site, Ed?

2 MR. WUELLNER: I don't know. I have not had  
3 the chance to look at it in the last week,

4 whether it's up or not, to be honest with you.

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's not.

6 MR. WUELLNER: It's not?

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Just a blank statement,

8 "Opening December 2002."

9 MR. WUELLNER: It'll be open in December,

10 yeah. Close.

11 MR. COX: Okay. Well, that answered that

12 question.

13 Secondly, in consideration of the VOR

14 discussions and having Mr. Gorman as the liaison,

15 I'd like to ask the Authority to approve John

16 Roderick (phonetic), who is an expert in his own

17 right on electromagnetics and radio, and he's a

18 retired lieutenant colonel from the Air Force,

19 was the Pentagon's liaison to satellite

20 communications for all the wars that have gone on

21 from -- a long time.

22 So, he's a real good resource, and I would

23 like, if he -- and I already asked him; he

24 doesn't mind. So, if you want to utilize him as

25 a resource, and he said -- he indicated he could

186

1 travel with you, if you wanted it.

2 MR. GORMAN: Absolutely. Wonderful. Great.



3 Thank you.

4 MR. COX: That's all I have.

5 9. Public Comment

6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any additional public  
7 comment? Briefly. Mr. Mesmer?

8 MR. MESMER: Yeah. You know, a lot of the  
9 stuff I'm hearing is predicated on settling a  
10 lawsuit and you're counting on getting a lot of  
11 money. You must have a lot of confidence in  
12 winning this thing.

13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: And I don't want to cut you  
14 off, but we have in the past, before you were  
15 here, exhausted that remedy and discussed it at  
16 length about where we are and what we're trying  
17 to do with the lawsuit.

18 We've settled half. We're very close to the  
19 second half. But we need to go forward with the  
20 projects, which is why we're trying to fund them.  
21 But, you know, we've been -- that's been about a  
22 year and a half, two years into working with  
23 that.

24 MR. MESMER: Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you. Mr. Russell

2 MR. MILLER: I'm Russell Miller, Civil Air  
3 Patrol. I think everybody knows me now. I'll be  
4 real brief.

5 I put a packet to everybody's attention.  
6 Did everybody get that? That basically had a  
7 letter that -- requesting some help with some  
8 facilities for the Civil Air Patrol, which was  
9 brought up a few minutes ago.

10 I also would like to -- it also indicated  
11 we'd like to be part of the master plan process,  
12 be one of the tenants or some of the people that  
13 would help out during that master plan workshop.  
14 So, I'm hoping you will consider that.

15 Also, we've asked for a meeting facility,  
16 that we are -- we've already outgrown some of the  
17 places we're meeting. And we started a cadet's  
18 squadron, and we just solicited 1,500 students.  
19 We got 300 applications that are being processed.  
20 So we may end up with 50, 60, 70 cadets.

21 We have a new homeland defense initiative  
22 with the Civil Air Patrol. We need a place; we  
23 need a home. And I put a recommendation in  
24 there. I'd like to be put on the next meeting,  
25 on the agenda next meeting to make a presentation

1 regarding that, if that was possible.

2 And also, just to make one little comment  
3 about the FAA funding. One of the things that we  
4 wanted in the CAP was not just a building that  
5 only we would use. We don't -- we're not just --  
6 we'd like to have a multiuse facility that we  
7 could -- SAPA could use, the airport to have an  
8 air show or some kind of a thing that they need  
9 to have something, maybe some kind of museum,  
10 anything that would be a meeting hall, if you  
11 will, that could be used for multiple tenants and  
12 not just us.

13 The CAP needs a place; it needs a home, but  
14 we're not greedy enough to have everything to  
15 ourselves. And we -- you know, maybe some  
16 facilities with FAA. Maybe you could consider  
17 that as a meeting place that is open to the  
18 public, nonrevenue generating or something that  
19 may even help out the CAP and some of the other  
20 organizations that are needing space, because  
21 we're so locked out on space.

22 So, I just want to make those comments and  
23 ask if I could be put on the agenda next time to  
24 make a formal presentation.

25 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you very much. And

1 thank you for your packet, because I know that  
2 was in our workshop, that we told the Pilots  
3 Association, anybody, if they wanted to have some  
4 input, to provide that to us. Thank you. Last  
5 comment, Mr. Ciriello?

6 8.B. - Mr. Joseph Ciriello

7 MR. CIRIELLO: Yeah. Ed, I'm going to throw  
8 an idea -- or not an idea, it's a question. Not  
9 to answer it now, but come back next month,  
10 because it's running real late.

11 A couple of months ago, we had a problem  
12 with the restaurant, with the hours and the  
13 drinking and such not, and it was supposed to be  
14 looked into. And I don't recall any report  
15 coming back from that. And in that, could you  
16 come back and give us a report on the status of  
17 the restaurant?

18 I haven't heard whether they've been paying  
19 us any money for rent or are behind or ahead or  
20 whatever. You know, in other words, just come  
21 back with a report on the status of the  
22 restaurant.

23 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah.

24 MR. CIRIELLO: That's all I have.

25 10. - Next Regular Board Meeting

1           CHAIRMAN GREEN: Our next regular board

2           meeting is March 17. The meeting's adjourned.

3           (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 7:06 p.m.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2

3 STATE OF FLORIDA )

4 COUNTY OF ST. JOHNS )

5

6 I, JANET M. BEASON, RPR-CP, RMR, CRR, certify 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 3rd day of March, 2003.

12

13

\_\_\_\_\_  
JANET M. BEASON, RPR-CP, RMR, CRR  
Notary Public - State of Florida  
My Commission No.: DD102224  
Expires: April 30, 2006

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

