

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

ST. JOHNS AIRPORT AUTHORITY

WORKSHOP MEETING

Held in The Conference Center, Meeting Room B

4730 Casa Cola Way

St. Augustine, Florida

on Monday, October 28, 2024

from 4:00 p.m. to 6:15 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

- Reba Ludlow, Chairman
- Jennifer Liotta
- Robert Olson
- Dennis Clarke
- Michelle Cash-Chapman

ALSO PRESENT:

JEREMIAH R. BLOCKER, ESQUIRE
 DOUGLAS LAW FIRM
 100 SOUTHPARK BOULEVARD, SUITE 414,
 ST. AUGUSTINE, FLORIDA 32086
 COUNSEL FOR AIRPORT AUTHORITY

CHAD ROBERTS, ESQUIRE
 THE ROBERTS FIRM, PLLC
 1633 CHALLEN AVE
 JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA 32205
 AVIATION COUNSEL FOR AIRPORT AUTHORITY

COURTNEY PITTMAN, Interim Executive Director

LAURA DWYER PIERLE, RPR
 ST. AUGUSTINE COURT REPORTERS
 904-825-0570

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

- - -
I N D E X
- - -

	PAGE
Workshop Meeting	3
Pledge of Allegiance	3
Roll Call	3
Executive Director Search	4
Capacity Study and Planning for New Runway West U.S. One	35
East Side Planning and 3 Acres of Development	79
South GA Access Road	90
Public Comment	110
Board Member Comments	115
Adjournment	119
Certificate of Reporter	121

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

2 - - -

3 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Good afternoon everybody.
4 We have -- we are only missing one board member
5 Jennifer, and she is on her way in. We have both
6 attorneys. So we have our quorum. And so we will
7 call the meeting to order at 4:00 o'clock.

8 Please stand for the pledge of allegiance.

9 (Pledge of Allegiance.)

10 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Thank you. I like it when
11 you guys show up for workshops just because you
12 know you can -- they're not as formal and you can
13 stand up and talk. We like to have Scott Maynard
14 here with us today from the chamber and Kim
15 Kendall. Yes. Yes. We're happy. And I think we
16 are expecting a few other notables. Because we're
17 the notables.

18 Okay. So we've had the pledge of allegiance.

19 (Roll Call)

20 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: We will have a roll call.

21 So I guess you start, Bob.

22 MR. OLSON: Present.

23 MR. CLARKE: Dennis Clarke present.

24 MS. CASH-CHAPMAN: Michelle Chapman present.

25 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Reba Ludlow present.

1 Jennifer is on her way.

2 Jeremiah is here and Chad Roberts is here. So
3 we are ready to begin our workshop.

4 Our agenda item, the first item on the list is
5 the executive director search. So I'm glad we --
6 well, is our agenda approved as planned. I forgot
7 to say that, right.

8 MR. CLARKE: Yes.

9 (Agenda Item - Executive Director Search)

10 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Yes. If we approve the
11 agenda as shown then we could go first next to the
12 executive director search.

13 So on that, I think Courtney will speak to us
14 first on the executive director search.

15 MR. PITTMAN: Madam Chair, if it please the
16 board, I would like to approach the podium and do
17 my presentations today at the podium.

18 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: That would be most
19 wonderful. We would be very happy. That way we
20 can see you better.

21 Oh, there is Henry. Goodness.

22 MR. DEAN: I took a detour.

23 MR. PITTMAN: Good afternoon, members of the
24 board. Thank you for your time today.

25 We are here to discuss a matter of utmost

1 importance to the future of this organization, the
2 search of our next executive director and the
3 process by which we undertake that search.

4 As you know this role is critical to the
5 continued success and growth of our airport
6 especially at the time when we are advancing key
7 strategic initiatives. However, I have concerns
8 regarding the staffs' current capacity to manage
9 this search effectively given the staffs' shortages
10 we have. Our team is stretched thin and primary
11 focus has always remains on ensuring day to day
12 operations are running smoothly. This includes
13 maintaining the highest level of safety, security
14 ensuring that the airport's strategic priorities
15 stay on track.

16 With this in mind, I believe that having staff
17 attempt to conduct the logistics of the search has
18 the potential for the process to be less than
19 expectations that you have and be potentially
20 concerning to the candidates we want to recruit,
21 the very best. Additionally, in order to be fair
22 and transparent to all candidates I suggest that
23 the logistics of this search be conducted by an
24 independent third-party or general counsel's office
25 to avoid any potential conflicts of interest.

1 Based on her previous successful experience
2 with executive searches, I recommend
3 Mrs. Cash-Chapman to take charge of this process.
4 She has the expertise needed to coordinate a
5 thorough, fair and efficient search that would
6 ensure that we find the best candidate for this
7 important role.

8 I am confident that delegating this
9 responsibility will allow us to maintain
10 operational stability while ensuring the search is
11 handled with professionalism and diligence it
12 requires.

13 Thank you for considering this approach. I
14 welcome your thoughts on how we can move forward in
15 a way that serves the best interest of the airport,
16 the candidates and our team. Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Well, thank you, Courtney.

18 MR. CLARKE: I have a question for
19 Ms. Cash-Chapman. Are you willing and able to take
20 on this task?

21 MS. CASH-CHAPMAN: Well --

22 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Actually we should explain
23 the task. The task is the process of getting
24 another executive director that what a board member
25 would do is check on several processes. Do you

1 want to do the Florida Aviation Council; the County
2 HR Department? Do we advertise? And where do we
3 advertise? So her duty would be to come back to
4 the board with a process for electing, locating the
5 resumes and electing. So are you able to do that?

6 MS. CASH-CHAPMAN: Yeah, that's fine. I am
7 happy to do that.

8 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: You have experience with
9 that. Good. So thank you. So Michelle will take
10 on the task of finding the -- giving the board
11 options of the process of electing another
12 executive director, like who gets the resumes, how
13 it's advertised, and things like that. So thank
14 you very much. As you know it is a daunting task.
15 She has been through this.

16 Anything else, Dennis?

17 MR. CLARKE: No, that's all.

18 MS. CASH-CHAPMAN: Could I suggest then that
19 we put on our next meeting agenda the executive
20 director search and that way I can give you guys
21 all of the options and scenarios on what we think
22 would be the best possible way to move forward.

23 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: That's perfect. And
24 Courtney has already agreed that the executive
25 director search is on every agenda until the time.

1 So that's exactly what we would like to do.

2 And speaking of that and jumping out here,
3 that our next meeting it says on the paper November
4 11th but that is Veterans Day and then the fourth
5 one would be -- the fourth Monday would be close to
6 Thanksgiving. So if everyone agrees we should move
7 it to the 18th, which is in the middle and there
8 are no conflicts.

9 Is that all right with you, Bob?

10 (Whereupon, Jennifer Liotta entered they
11 meeting.)

12 MR. OLSON: Yeah, it's probably good we move
13 it. I think the 11th is even a staff holiday --

14 MR. PITTMAN: That's correct.

15 MR. OLSON: -- in our office. So yeah, the
16 18th. Yeah.

17 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: The 18th, 4:00 o'clock. And
18 Ms. Jennifer Liotta has arrived.

19 MS. LIOTTA: Many, many apologies. Sorry.

20 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Did you have to go around
21 the tree service?

22 MS. LIOTTA: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: We all did. No problem.
24 But we're happy you're here.

25 MS. LIOTTA: So what are we looking at?

1 MR. OLSON: Regular meeting November 18th, in
2 lieu of the 11th.

3 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Yes.

4 MS. LIOTTA: Oh, because of it being a
5 holiday?

6 MR. OLSON: Yes.

7 MS. LIOTTA: Are we also discussing
8 rescheduling the executive director special meeting
9 that got canceled?

10 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: No. We are going to have
11 our next meeting will be the 18th and at that time
12 Michelle has offered to or accepted the
13 responsibility to come back with a process of
14 electing an executive director. So she can
15 look at -- we will -- you know, it is a workshop,
16 but we do not want one person to override everybody
17 else on the board. So please ask to be able to
18 speak before you speak.

19 Yes, Jennifer.

20 MS. LIOTTA: Okay. I'm sorry. I was a couple
21 of minutes late on all this. That's totally my
22 fault. Do we have any -- my recollection was at
23 prior meetings we asked for all of the unsolicited
24 resumes to be looked at.

25 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Today we are not doing that.

1 Today we are electing somebody to go through the
2 process. We are not bringing resumes to everybody
3 today. Nobody has resumes.

4 MS. LIOTTA: But why don't we have resumes?
5 Was anybody asking about that? Because I thought
6 that was the discussion and the consensus at a
7 prior meeting.

8 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: No, that was your consensus.
9 It was not consensus of the board. I went back
10 through the meeting, the meeting minutes.

11 MS. LIOTTA: I'd actually -- point of order
12 can we pull up that, because my recollection is
13 different.

14 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Okay.

15 MS. LIOTTA: And, like, as you said, no one
16 person should be making decisions for the entire
17 board. So if we need to just get a consensus now
18 that would certainly be fine.

19 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: And a consensus of what? I
20 mean, we have a consensus of a process to elect an
21 executive director. Don't we have to have a
22 process first? Yes?

23 MS. LIOTTA: This is my recollection from
24 prior meetings was that we all discussed and there
25 was a consensus that we would look at the currently

1 available unsolicited resumes and then if the board
2 as a whole thought it was worth discussing an offer
3 of employment with any of the available candidates
4 before doing a full search we could look at that.
5 But we would have to have staff pull together those
6 resumes and send them around so they could be
7 looked at by the board members at a thing like a
8 workshop that we are doing right now.

9 And my recollection further was I actually
10 sent an e-mail to staff in September based on that
11 recollection asking for those materials to be sent
12 to me so I could have time to review them. And I
13 didn't get them. And so if my recollection is
14 faulty so be it. But that was my recollection and I
15 don't know what the recollection of the other
16 people on the board is. But if that is the
17 recollection and those materials are available, we
18 have an opportunity right now to do that, which is
19 to look at those previously unsolicited resumes and
20 see what -- if we wanted to go ahead and to have
21 any kind of process with those people. That would
22 be helpful for Michelle in putting together a
23 proposal at the very least and we would be all on
24 the same page.

25 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Thank you. However, that,

1 you know, the board can't do this. So we have to
2 go back to our --

3 MS. LIOTTA: Why can't the board do this?

4 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: We can't go find resumes.
5 We have to talk to Courtney. Courtney is the
6 interim executive director. Courtney, would you
7 like to speak, please?

8 MR. PITTMAN: Yes, I would, madam chairman.

9 All right. So what you missed, Ms. Liotta, is
10 the presentation I just did on the executive
11 director search where I spoke to, one, about how we
12 were going to conduct the search and also the
13 matter of fairness. Because initially it was said
14 that staff was not to do the search because it
15 would be a conflict of interest being that I for
16 one am one of the candidates.

17 Also I presented earlier before you came in
18 here about the shortages in staff that we have in
19 trying to conduct the proper search and getting it
20 done the right way.

21 Looking back at the minutes there wasn't
22 consistent -- there wasn't clear direction. And
23 also what we had after the last meeting we had two
24 back to back hurricanes. We had an FA audit. And
25 then we also had inspections and the

1 groundbreaking. We had event after event after
2 event.

3 All right. So doing a true assessment of what
4 we have, we are working at the Airport Authority
5 with a bookkeeper, a receptionist, and myself. And
6 so I presented it to the board in the form of a
7 workshop and suggested to the board if
8 Mrs. Cash-Chapman, who has had experience with
9 doing it before, would take charge of it. So that
10 way it's done in all fairness.

11 MS. CASH-CHAPMAN: Can I be recognized for
12 just a minute?

13 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Courtney.

14 MR. PITTMAN: I'm done.

15 MS. CASH-CHAPMAN: I would like to suggest
16 real quick that I think that the two can kind of
17 happen simultaneously. If we can agree as a board,
18 if we receive any resumes not to contact those
19 people. I think it might be in our best interest
20 if Courtney could send us all the resumes he's
21 received prior to the next meeting, because that
22 way when I present our options you would have had
23 time to look over the current candidates that we
24 have, because that will be one of the options that
25 I would imagine that we don't do a national search,

1 we work with what we have. So we have the time
2 now -- not now, but if we have the time between now
3 and our next meeting November 18th to look through
4 that stuff, we might be able to make a decision on
5 the 18th which way we want to go.

6 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: That's a moot point.

7 MS. CASH-CHAPMAN: Why?

8 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Because Jennifer already has
9 a resume she is pushing and she is the only one
10 that knows the author of it.

11 MS. LIOTTA: No, I never said such a thing.

12 MS. CASH-CHAPMAN: I think -- I think Courtney
13 had mentioned we have a couple of resumes already
14 in-house. I haven't seen any.

15 MS. LIOTTA: Yeah, because when I mentioned --
16 because when I mentioned to the board that I got an
17 unsolicited resume of a person I don't know that I
18 thought looked --

19 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: How did you get that resume?

20 MS. LIOTTA: A tenant of the airport said that
21 he had someone he thought --

22 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: You didn't get it from other
23 attorneys?

24 MS. LIOTTA: No.

25 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Oh.

1 MS. LIOTTA: But I've also heard at the last
2 meeting that other people had received resumes, any
3 member of the public --

4 MS. CASH-CHAPMAN: Yeah, I don't think the
5 last search, we got a whole lot of unsolicited
6 resumes.

7 MS. LIOTTA: Right. Any member of the public
8 can come up to one of us in the meeting. There was
9 no -- there is nothing unusual about it I don't
10 think. This position has been open for over 600
11 days. So it's not surprising that the word gets
12 around that there is an opportunity for an
13 executive director at this airport. So I am not
14 terribly shocked that one or more of us would get
15 potentially approached and I immediately brought it
16 to the rest of the board and said, here, I don't
17 know this person. This person could be of
18 interest.

19 My recollection was at that time when I did
20 that I was -- someone said, well, someone sent me a
21 resume too. So, okay, let's get all of these
22 unsolicited resumes together. If there is exciting
23 candidates there that the board would like to look
24 at we might be able to just get this done now.

25 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: So if we can get the resumes

1 together then we will have them at the next meeting
2 when you explain our different processes and then
3 we can decide or the board can decide on which
4 process is the best one.

5 MS. LIOTTA: I have one more
6 suggestion/request. Since we're not going to get
7 the resumes even though they apparently are around
8 somewhere and they have not been provided to the
9 board, and I understand that the staff is severely
10 limited, that our outside counsel take on support
11 for this, because there is a conflict of interest
12 and it does resolve that as well as the bandwidth
13 issue. And so whomever is tasked on working with
14 this in whatever capacity that we can rely on our
15 outside counsel for administrative support.

16 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Well, our outside counsel is
17 very efficient. However, we have to have a process
18 first. So as soon as Michelle comes back with some
19 options what process we want, then the attorneys --
20 of course, we will have to give it to someone. And
21 I agree with you it probably will be the attorneys,
22 because it can't be the board and it can't be the
23 executive director.

24 MS. LIOTTA: Well, I am just very confused
25 why --

1 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: But it all goes back to
2 waiting on the process to be approved first.

3 MS. LIOTTA: Well, I don't understand that
4 because as any member of the public could have
5 e-mailed Mr. Pittman or a member of staff and made
6 a public records request for such documents and
7 would have been expected to receive them. So I
8 don't understand why the board can't be provided
9 them without further meetings to decide what the
10 process is.

11 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Well, you know, if we had
12 not had four executive directors in 18 months maybe
13 they could put their hand on everything, however, I
14 think they're having a hard time, you know, keeping
15 up with the things that we put on them much less
16 something that happened like a month or two ago.
17 Thank you, please.

18 MR. OLSON: Madam Chair, I have, I guess, just
19 a procedural question about when we were, as
20 Ms. Liotta said, when we had agreed to do the
21 workshop to review the resumes there was -- I'm
22 trying to recall how we were going to handle the
23 identity of the applicants that we were going to
24 look at at that point. The reason I'm bringing
25 that up now is that if resumes are going to be

1 distributed to this board in advance of a meeting
2 now, we also probably need to decide, because if
3 they come to the board it's my understanding that
4 they are publicly accessible documents.

5 MS. LIOTTA: They already are. Anything that
6 has been --

7 MR. OLSON: The names of -- well, I haven't
8 received any.

9 MS. LIOTTA: Well, it's public record as soon
10 as somebody gives it to -- say if there was an
11 unsolicited resume sent in to Mr. Pittman it
12 becomes public record at that point.

13 MR. OLSON: Okay. But the resume that you
14 brought in --

15 MS. LIOTTA: I provided to --

16 MR. OLSON: -- had redacted --

17 MS. LIOTTA: Well, that's because that's how
18 it was sent to me.

19 MR. OLSON: Okay. So the identity of even
20 that applicant is now public information.

21 MS. LIOTTA: He gave me a redacted resume.
22 But if somebody sent -- whatever form it was sent
23 in that is what it is in the public record.

24 MR. OLSON: Okay. That explains it. So we
25 will be looking at both people whose names we know

1 who identified who they are and maybe applicants
2 that don't identify who they are.

3 MS. LIOTTA: I think my last recollection when
4 we did a workshop at the prior search was that
5 Ms. Chapman had prepared a set of redacted resumes
6 so that we could discuss resume one, two, three.

7 MR. OLSON: Yes. Right.

8 MS. LIOTTA: And it was a public -- it was in
9 a public forum.

10 MR. OLSON: Right.

11 MS. LIOTTA: So I guess technically if
12 somebody had just made a public records request
13 they probably could have gotten the full resumes.
14 But for the purposes of the workshop and to just
15 may be a little bit more kind, I guess, as a
16 process we took the names off and were able to talk
17 objectively about qualifications instead and that
18 was the process we did last time. I would imagine
19 we might get a similar process request this time
20 around.

21 MR. OLSON: Okay. Just raising the question.

22 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Thank you.

23 MR. OLSON: I guess it's been answered.

24 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: And I would like to ask a
25 legal opinion on she is the only one that has a

1 signature on the resume that was sent to her. So
2 what about the rest of the resumes. If his is
3 redacted then the rest should be redacted. If his
4 is public then the rest should be public.

5 MR. BLOCKER: That's completely up to the
6 board, Madam Chair. The format that it was sent,
7 you know, if an individual e-mails board members
8 and they redacted it, you know, the board can make
9 a policy that all those coming forward they want to
10 be in some type of form. You can put out a request
11 like applicants, you are submit to a certain way
12 and redact the names. Really that's up to the
13 board how you-all choose to proceed. If it is
14 unsolicited, if someone just randomly e-mails
15 you-all an application or resume that's already
16 redacted, at that point it would become a public
17 record. But the board can set the criteria for
18 however they want that going forward.

19 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Okay. So at this time we
20 are still -- we go back to the process first. And
21 since you are the only one that knows the name of
22 the resume that you got, then we have to decide
23 when the staff is able to come up with the other
24 resumes whether they're redacted. We'll decide at
25 that time at the 18th. Thank you.

1 Also, I think, this is a good time since
2 we're -- I'm looking at all my notes here. So
3 we've already approved Michelle to do the -- come
4 back with information on the process -- on the
5 process only. And so, yes, we all agree.

6 Also, this might be a good time to poll the
7 board members on any self-disclosures or
8 proprietary interests that would influence future
9 voting or the scope of any voting conflict by the
10 subject matter.

11 So the upcoming board, I will read this out,
12 may include -- we should do a self-disclosure
13 polled by each member to see if they have any
14 self-interest or any beneficial interest that may
15 affect their voting in the future.

16 MS. LIOTTA: I don't know -- I think I would
17 like to have our counsel weigh in on that. I know
18 that there is already law about each vote and
19 required disclosures. So doing speculative
20 disclosures I'm not sure is helpful. But I'd like
21 to hear from our outside counsel.

22 MR. BLOCKER: May I be heard, Madam Chair?

23 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Yes.

24 MR. BLOCKER: So just for clarification, so
25 when there is an agenda item that comes before the

1 board, each board member is responsible to adhere
2 to the rules of ethics. So if there a potential
3 conflict then the board member would need to at
4 that time make a disclosure or potentially remove
5 themselves from, you know, vote that could involve
6 some type of --

7 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: We cannot ask for that vote
8 now. We can ask for self-disclosure now.

9 MR. BLOCKER: Well, this is a workshop, Madam
10 Chair. So normally that would be done at a regular
11 board meeting.

12 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: We have a court reporter.
13 So, you know, if this is just a poll. We are not
14 voting on anything. It's just a poll to see if we
15 have the self-interest in something that would
16 benefit. I mean, we've got three pages of
17 activities here. And so this is what brought it
18 up. Because we had so many things, you know, that
19 the whole board needs to attend to and I think it's
20 imperative that we know if there is self-interest
21 involved. So do you mind if I poll?

22 MR. BLOCKER: Madam chair, that's up to you as
23 the chair. But there is no -- at this time there
24 is no ethical requirement because it's not -- all
25 these are workshop items.

1 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: I understand.

2 MR. BLOCKER: So these are for informational
3 purposes. So disclosure would be required and the
4 recusal would be required at the time of an actual
5 vote. Since we are not voting today that would not
6 be, you know.

7 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Yes.

8 MR. OLSON: But let me just clarify, Madam
9 Chair, your question was not generally do we, but
10 related to the items we are talking about today if
11 anyone has a special connection of a personal
12 nature to any of these topics we are talking about
13 today it would be good to know.

14 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Exactly. One development of
15 the east side, review of our leasing policies,
16 preparation of the east side and selection of the
17 permanent executive director. So as far as I'm
18 concerned, you know, I can say I personally have --
19 I am a tenant only. I have no beneficial interest
20 in the development. Will not benefit me personally
21 on the east side. Reviewing the leasing policies
22 that if we have somebody on a committee for leasing
23 policies, I mean, review of leasing policies then
24 that would definitely be a conflict. Preparation
25 of these, that property abuts to something else

1 then that should be disclosed. So every member
2 should disclose if they have a proprietary interest
3 in these things before we go further.

4 MR. OLSON: We're not discussing leasing
5 policies.

6 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: I'm saying this is
7 self-disclosure.

8 MR. OLSON: Okay. But you mentioned leasing
9 policies. I don't believe we are talking about
10 leasing policies.

11 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: That is not in here. But
12 we're also disclosing self-disclosure. So we have,
13 you know, people on the board that are in charge of
14 leasing policies, or supposed to head the committee
15 for leasing policies, but, you know, have an
16 obvious conflict.

17 MS. LIOTTA: There is no committee for leasing
18 policies that I am aware of.

19 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: And what are you head of;
20 what is your committee?

21 MS. LIOTTA: Oh, we talked about doing a
22 policy in general committee. But that never ended
23 up getting set up because we couldn't get that --
24 unfortunately one of the things that we never got
25 going. I don't think there has ever been a single

1 meeting for it. I think I our general counsel
2 wanted to say something.

3 MR. BLOCKER: Yes, Madam Chair. Thank you,
4 Madam Chair. Just to be more clear. So under the
5 rules of ethics if there is a potential conflict of
6 interest the onus is on the board member to report
7 that. If there is a board member that does have a
8 conflict of interest that is later found that they
9 did not disclose then that's where the liability
10 could attach to that particular board member.

11 So, in other words, if there -- I am trying to
12 think of the best way -- I just wanted to make
13 edification for everyone is prepared to disclose
14 when the time is correct. So if there -- if there
15 is an agenda item that is in front of the board,
16 there is a conflict of interest, it's better to
17 remove yourself. But if the board member did not
18 remove themselves and later there is an ethics
19 complaint that was filed then there could be some
20 liability attached. But the onus is on the board
21 member to make that. Like the board cannot direct
22 a board member to disclose. They would have to
23 simply when that agenda item comes up if there are
24 any, you know, certain matters ex parte, certain
25 other ex parte disclosures, or if there are any

1 disclosures that one of you -- that a board member
2 would want to make. Then it's on the board member
3 to make sure that they disclose it. So if there
4 later is an ethical, you know, ethics complaint
5 filed, the proper disclosures were made.

6 I just want to make sure, Madam Chair, because
7 my earlier explanation may have been a little
8 befuddled. I wasn't prepared to address it. Does
9 that make sense to the board?

10 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Yes. So I would like to ask
11 our other attorney.

12 MR. ROBERTS: I don't have an opinion on that,
13 Madam Chair.

14 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: It seems to me since
15 everyone is expressing their personal opinion, that
16 what difference does it make to wait until
17 something comes up when you can have a list and
18 say, "Do you have a conflict with this? Do you
19 have a conflict? Do you have a conflict? Do you
20 have a conflict?" Why can't that be done?

21 MR. BLOCKER: Well, the board can do whatever
22 it chooses. Generally there is case law that
23 outlines when there is ethics. Generally what
24 happens is there is an agenda, there is a formal
25 board meeting, prior to that board members can

1 engage in discussions and do that, but they can't
2 formally vote on something that they have a
3 conflict of interest. So that's generally there is
4 kind of a body of case law that supports that. Now
5 if the board wants to create a rule and say we
6 voluntarily want to kind of create, the board is
7 certainly able to do that. But that's not
8 necessarily the case here.

9 But I think what you are getting at you is
10 want to make sure that, you know, conflicts are
11 disclosed. And we would want to make sure whatever
12 that potential agenda item comes up there is a
13 clear direction for disclosure of any potential
14 conflicts. Does that make sense the way I
15 explained that?

16 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Yes. Also is it approved as
17 chairman that I can ask each board member five
18 questions?

19 MR. BLOCKER: I'm sorry. What was that?

20 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Is that the chairman can ask
21 each board member five questions?

22 MR. BLOCKER: I'm unclear when you say five
23 questions, what do you mean?

24 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Yeah. I mean, so it's like
25 do you have a conflict. Like I just said, I don't

1 have a conflict on any of these things because I am
2 a tenant so nothing that could be done to the east
3 side is a conflict. Nothing that can be done, you
4 know, in leasing is a conflict. Nothing that can
5 be done on selection of the executive director
6 would be a conflict. So can every board member say
7 that?

8 MR. BLOCKER: So with each agenda item
9 generally that would be the chair would ask is
10 there any disclosures. Or if it's one that
11 requires ex parte communications, you would ask at
12 that time like is there any board member
13 disclosures and then the board member, you know, if
14 there was, would state what the conflict is.

15 What we will do, if I can digress, but
16 related. So we're kind of getting towards the end
17 of the year where we do our annual ethics training,
18 I'll send you all kind of the ethics. There has
19 been some updates in Florida Statute on that. That
20 would be, you know, the future of crystalized that.
21 Yes, the chair would ask if those agenda items --

22 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: What about the agenda items
23 that's identified east side property? So should a
24 board member disclose any conflict?

25 MR. BLOCKER: Yes, ma'am. They should.

1 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Right here.

2 MR. BLOCKER: They should. I guess my only
3 point in clarification would be this is a workshop.
4 So I don't know that there is a requirement to
5 disclose right now. A board member could disclose
6 now if there is a potential conflict. But because
7 there is no votes today, it's not a requirement.
8 Does that make sense?

9 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Yes. So if we have
10 conflicts on the east side -- you are saying that
11 we could go through all of these items today east
12 side, Casa Cola, you know, FBO, MRO and no one has
13 to disclose today if they have a conflict?

14 MR. BLOCKER: Well, there is no voting today.
15 So today is a workshop.

16 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: It doesn't mean that they
17 should not ethically disclose.

18 MR. BLOCKER: I'm not saying they should or
19 shouldn't. I'm saying there is not a requirement
20 during the workshop to disclose. A board member
21 can always disclose a conflict. It may be a good
22 idea depending on what the conflict is to disclose.
23 But there is no specific requirement. If this was
24 a formal board meeting where there is a formal
25 vote -- because remember as board members you have

1 to vote on every agenda item unless you are
2 recusing yourself based on a conflict. So the only
3 way -- the only way to address it at that time is a
4 board member would need to identify, you know, a
5 conflict, say I have a conflict in this matter. I
6 will not be voting on this. And there is some
7 additional paper they would need to get with me, we
8 would need to fill out to memorialize what that
9 conflict is.

10 MR. CLARKE: I have no conflicts. Again, I
11 was a former tenant of the airport. But I sold my
12 interest in my airplane two years ago. So I don't
13 have any conflicts.

14 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: I don't have any conflict
15 with it. Like I said, I'm a tenant. Bob.

16 MR. ROBERTS: I have no conflicts in any of
17 the items before us today.

18 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Thank you.

19 MS. LIOTTA: Well, I guess I'm a little
20 confused. I am the lawyer in the group so I always
21 tend to peel things back a little bit more.

22 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: You can just answer that.

23 MS. LIOTTA: No, I was asked something. And I
24 am going to give an answer. But I am going to pick
25 my own words. Thank you.

1 So I think it's a little bit inappropriate to
2 ask people what their conflicts might be because
3 you don't know what a conflict is going to possibly
4 be until you have the proposed vote. What
5 conflict? What nature?

6 One could speculate, as you have a t-hangar,
7 right. So there could be a scenario where an
8 executive director candidate wants to greatly raise
9 t-hangar rates and they think that's the best
10 interest of the airport. You may then have a
11 conflict. But you just said on the record that you
12 don't have any conflicts. So did you now just do
13 something wrong. I don't think that would be an
14 inappropriate thing to say to you. But this is why
15 I don't think it's appropriate to ask people to
16 speculate what a conflict might be in the future.

17 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Michelle, would you like
18 explain if you have a conflict or not. I mean, so
19 far the majority of the board has.

20 MS. CASH-CHAPMAN: I do need to say that I
21 feel like we're spending a whole lot of time on
22 something that could come up as each piece comes up
23 instead of a blanket one because that kind of
24 confused me when you started asking, because I
25 didn't know what you were referring to. So I think

1 that it would be most beneficial just as we get to
2 each one we ask instead. Because it sounds like --
3 I mean, realistically it sounds like we're waiting
4 for Jennifer to say that she has a conflict on
5 something and that's totally fine. But given her
6 history with conflicts on the board she does a
7 pretty good job at disclosing it and then recusing
8 herself when she needed. So I just want to put
9 that out there. We are spending a whole lot of
10 time on this. I don't know if we really need to.
11 So...

12 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Thank you. So is there
13 anything I could do that the majority of the board
14 would prefer that the board members stated their
15 conflict, the majority of the board asked the other
16 two members to disclose?

17 MR. BLOCKER: Yes, ma'am. So the board could
18 per your rules -- you all have rules that govern
19 these meetings, you all could create a rule going
20 forward that --

21 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Going forward. Today, I
22 mean, the majority today has voted -- the majority
23 has voted. So we can't require the other to vote
24 or not?

25 MR. BLOCKER: Yes, ma'am. So during workshop

1 there is not voting. That's one confusion.

2 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: I mean, stating their
3 conflicts.

4 MR. BLOCKER: Yes, ma'am. So I think what
5 might be the most helpful, Madam Chair, is if the
6 board wants to develop a rule going forward to
7 address conflicts in advance we can work on that.
8 But I want to make sure I understand your question.
9 I think Mr. Clarke has answered your question.

10 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Mr. Olson has and I have.

11 MR. BLOCKER: Mr. Olson has.

12 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Right. So the other two --

13 MS. CASH-CHAPMAN: I said I have none and then
14 I continued. Yeah, I just don't understand why we
15 are spending so much time on this.

16 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: So we have the major, major,
17 majority when it's four out of five.

18 MR. BLOCKER: I think it's super majority.

19 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Super majority, right. So
20 the only one we don't have, you know, disclosing
21 would be one.

22 MS. LIOTTA: I have disclosed conflicts
23 multiple times at multiple votes and I have no
24 trouble following the law. But I don't know the
25 future. And I can't predict every scenario and be

1 able to state with a certainty that I will or will
2 not have a conflict when the time for such a vote
3 arises. So I don't really think that it is a
4 useful -- a useful use of our time. Because that
5 is, I believe, why the statute is written the way
6 it is which is to be timely. Because at the time,
7 you know, if you have a conflict and it's incumbent
8 upon the person voting to say-so. But no one is
9 expected to know the future.

10 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Okay.

11 MR. CLARKE: May I make a comment. I suggest
12 that we just move on with our next item unless
13 Mr. Holesko comes up with anything that relates to
14 any item that Ms. Liotta might feel is a conflict
15 then, you know, she can tell us at that time.

16 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: At that time.

17 MR. CLARKE: I agree with the conflicts. I
18 would like to see the presentations.

19 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Right. Oh, yeah.

20 So okay. We just want to make sure that
21 everybody is on the same page. The board should be
22 on the same page for the good of the airport and
23 benefits the whole airport and not one or two
24 entities. So that's what I was trying to get at
25 that we all should be for the good of the airport.

1 (Agenda Item - Capacity Study and Planning for
2 Next Runway West US-1)

3 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: So, Courtney, are you on,
4 please.

5 MR. PITTMAN: Yes, ma'am.

6 At this time I want to discuss the capacity
7 study on the west side of U.S. One. It's
8 important -- this is a very important step for
9 enhancing both safety and efficiency of our
10 airport. Conducting a capacity study for runway
11 13-31 and planning our potential new runway west of
12 U.S. One. We've received consistent feedback from
13 our pilots about increasing delays for both
14 departures and arrivals. This congestion is
15 impacting not only our efficiency but also our
16 ability to manage traffic flow, safety, especially
17 during peak periods.

18 With the current projected growth in traffic
19 it is essential we understand the full capacity of
20 our runways and explore options that will support
21 smoother, safer operations in the future. By
22 planning now we can better meet the needs of our
23 pilots, reduce wait times, prepare for long term
24 demand.

25 To drive more insight I would like to hand the

1 conversation over to Andrew Holesko from Passero.

2 Andrew, please walk us through the details of
3 this proposed study and its implications.

4 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Question.

5 MR. OLSON: Before we get into the engineering
6 issues.

7 MR. PITTMAN: Yes, sir.

8 MR. OLSON: Has our number of operations been
9 markedly increasing?

10 MR. PITTMAN: Yes.

11 MR. OLSON: Because I know that we get those
12 figures and it doesn't appear that they really are.
13 I know that there has been some runup recently
14 because of landing fees being instituted at
15 airports south of us.

16 MR. PITTMAN: Correct.

17 MR. OLSON: I don't know how much that is.
18 But I've had at least one tenant aircraft owner
19 take me aside and think that maybe even some of our
20 operations numbers are overstated to what they
21 actually are. So I guess I'm leading up to a
22 question. What degree of -- let's see. Have
23 you -- let me ask it -- a different question. Are
24 the people flying in and out of here saying that
25 we're getting really busy or is the control

1 tower -- what are we hearing from the control tower
2 about managing the flights coming in and leaving?
3 Again, it seemed like someone very much knew what
4 they were talking about was actually concerned that
5 some of the operations numbers are overstated.

6 MR. PITTMAN: Okay. So I can speak to that.
7 They were deriving that information from
8 ForeFlight. ForeFlight isn't accurate when it
9 comes to the traffic count. What ForeFlight does
10 it goes off the ADS-B and says, hey, it doesn't
11 depict the actual operation. So, for example, if
12 an aircraft does a touch-and-go, which means an
13 aircraft cross the landing threshold, touch down on
14 the runway, lifted back off and came back around
15 again, that's two operations. ForeFlight is not
16 going to count that as two operations. ForeFlight
17 is going to take the ADS-B and say that aircraft
18 cost them November one, two, three, four, five and
19 so that's one. All right. So every time an
20 aircraft does it -- so we have a few flight schools
21 on this airport, the primary thing they do are
22 touch-and-goes.

23 You also have flight schools from the south
24 that have migrated north because of the landing
25 fees to the south, i.e., Indian River. So Indian

1 River when they do their cross country flights they
2 come up here up north do full stop taxi back and
3 touch-and-goes which impacts us. So you can ask
4 any corporate pilot when they get ready to pull up
5 to the hold short they see a Cessna 172 flying like
6 a kite down on final doing only 50 knots there is a
7 delay. Then you have an 8,000 foot runway the
8 rules state that for flight schools they must be
9 above 600 to 900 feet above ground level and pass
10 the departure end of a runway prior to being able
11 to start crosswind turn. So you've got an 8,000
12 foot runway. So that's well over a mile. So you
13 have this Cessna now climbing doing about 90 knots
14 has to go all the way past 8,000 foot runway to
15 turn right to make the crosswind. Now say you have
16 a Citation 500 at the hold short has to wait for
17 that Cessna to climb, get up to speed, pass the
18 departure end. So I think I'm dragging it out to
19 make this point. Meanwhile you have another Cessna
20 at the downwind, another Cessna turning base,
21 another Cessna on final. And so each one of these
22 kites coming down final -- we call them kites as
23 air traffic control, forgive me, because they fly
24 slow. No disrespect to any Cessna pilots.

25 But the point I'm trying to make is when this

1 happens so now this pilot who is burning fuel at a
2 ridiculous rate is seeing touch-and-go after
3 touch-and-go after touch-and-go come down. And now
4 they are getting to the point where they're having
5 to consider diverting or having to consider going
6 back to the ramp.

7 And so, yes, there are severe delays. And
8 another thing that people are not understanding is
9 sometimes we get these aircraft that come in and
10 want to do pattern work we have to refuse them. We
11 have to tell them to remain outside Class Delta due
12 to the said impact.

13 Now, you think about that pilot. That pilot
14 came up here from wherever to do -- to fulfill a
15 cross-country check off, you know what I'm saying,
16 for certification, qualification or training, what
17 have you, now they're coming all the way here to
18 St. Augustine and getting turned away because we're
19 full.

20 We also have aerobatic box to the east side of
21 the airport. So when the aerobatic box is active
22 now you only have the north, the west and the south
23 of the airport to utilize. And so now you're
24 handcuffed. As you can tell this is my wheelhouse.

25 MR. OLSON: I can tell.

1 MR. PITTMAN: So this is -- so we are -- so if
2 you come to contract towers we are in the 20's.
3 20's in American is traffic. So I am not adding
4 any complexities. I am not adding in the
5 topography. I am not adding in the fact that we
6 are adjacent to the ocean and pilots don't like to
7 fly over water especially students. So all of
8 these things impact single runway operation for
9 13-31.

10 MR. OLSON: Okay. One quick question.

11 MR. PITTMAN: Yes, sir.

12 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Quick.

13 MR. OLSON: And I am sure I am going to get an
14 extremely technically detailed answer. The project
15 that we're about ready to talk about from an
16 engineering standpoint.

17 MR. PITTMAN: Yes, sir.

18 MR. OLSON: That is going to be exclusively
19 for flight training or for other purposes?

20 MR. PITTMAN: No, it's going to be -- Andrew
21 can speak to this more in length. But it's going
22 to study -- all right. So there is a percentage
23 each runway is supposed to be able to handle. The
24 rule of air traffic control is safe, orderly,
25 expeditious flow of traffic. Those are the three

1 tenets of air traffic control. Right. So in order
2 to be safe, in order to be orderly, in order to be
3 efficient we have to -- you have to reload 60
4 percent usage, I'm sorry, of the runway. We've far
5 exceeded 60 percent on one piece of pavement. So
6 now you can't just tell pilots to remain out, don't
7 come in, don't land there. They have business.
8 Now you are messing with commerce, right. Now
9 you're opening yourself up to liability lawsuits.

10 And so this study is to get a true depiction
11 of where we stand as an airport so we can go to the
12 FAA, so we can go to the FDOT and say, hey, we
13 warrant another runway. We can't just go to the
14 FAA and FDOT and say, hey, we want another runway
15 just because it's cool or the controllers struggle.
16 No, we are building a case so when we present this
17 to them in the future that says not only do we have
18 this traffic, we took a step further, we did a
19 capacity survey. So we are just stacking things
20 upon things to say, hey, we are justified in the
21 west side runway project.

22 MR. OLSON: But there is no ground support on
23 the west side. So if someone was instructed to
24 land on that runway because they were coming in --

25 MR. PITTMAN: Yes, sir.

1 MR. OLSON: -- refueling, or I don't know,
2 whatever, having a quick business meeting in
3 St. Augustine.

4 MR. PITTMAN: Yes, sir.

5 MR. OLSON: What would this runway -- what
6 purpose would this runway serve that individual?

7 MR. PITTMAN: Great question. Okay. So what
8 you will do is -- so on the west side of the runway
9 that will take about five to seven years give or
10 take to build. So in that time we can as a unit
11 can start preparing for what we are going to put
12 over there. There is a lot of interest in the west
13 side. They are just waiting to see what we're
14 going to do. And so we can grow at the same time.
15 So while you are building said runway and doing the
16 scope and doing everything that is required prior
17 to even starting the groundwork for said runway you
18 can now start talking to other entities about
19 ground leases, about putting hangars in there,
20 self-serve fuel pits, schools. Like I said, I'm
21 having conversations with a lot of people, but it's
22 not at the point of presentation because we don't
23 have the runway yet. Right. We are not at that
24 level.

25 And so to answer your question directly so

1 judgments, I assume, today or along the way about
2 is it a priority to put our resources in this
3 direction or with the east side or with something
4 else. So that's why I am pressing you on these
5 things.

6 MR. PITTMAN: Absolutely. So I would say
7 this. Is it an issue today? No. But it's coming.

8 MR. OLSON: Okay.

9 MR. PITTMAN: So I would say to you the
10 numbers are ramping up. So you said that you would
11 be looking at the traffic. I need you to look at
12 traffic prior to COVID. We are catching up with
13 traffic prior to COVID. Florida is a flat state.
14 Right. It's the number one state for student
15 aviation. They are coming especially now that the
16 traffic is being pushed out of the south. So
17 schools are looking for other places to go. We are
18 already getting interest from other schools that
19 want to come to this airport for one. So it is
20 coming. So it is incumbent upon us to be prepared
21 for the wave before the wave gets here. So it is
22 the preplanning that I am speaking to.

23 Ms. Liotta.

24 MS. LIOTTA: I guess similar to what Bob was
25 saying is this is a resource allocation. And I

1 don't disagree with anything you're saying. It's
2 busy. It's probably just going to get busier, like
3 having additional capacity sounds like a really
4 good thing. But we've got -- we would be putting
5 it over on land that we don't know anything about.
6 As far as I know we haven't really had a study for
7 what it would take to build. Is it just a big
8 swamp over there? I don't know. I mean, so what
9 are the environmental? How are we going to get
10 utilities back there? That's not something the
11 airport is -- even if we had all the land leases
12 and all of the funding from the FAA to put in the
13 actual strip, if we can't get power and roads and
14 fire service back there, is it -- does it matter.
15 You know, so it's like if we don't have the
16 infrastructure planned for, can -- does it make
17 sense to be spending money doing the traffic study.
18 Because I think the answer to the traffic study is
19 probably going to tell us what we expect to hear
20 which it's going to be a yes. But if it's a yes,
21 but we can't do anything about it. Well, we've
22 already spent that money and that money we can't
23 get back.

24 MR. PITTMAN: Okay. So if I may, I disagree.
25 So it's steps. It's steps along the way.

1 So first you've got to do the capacity survey.
2 Right. So now you are thinking about aviation
3 safety. The last thing the FAA wants to do, the
4 last thing FDOT wants to do is say they contributed
5 to -- I'm going to say this word for the sake of
6 this meeting but air traffic controllers we don't
7 like saying it -- a crash. Right. So if you have
8 maximum capacity for that runway, we did a capacity
9 survey. We told the FAA we have maximum capacity
10 for this piece of pavement and they did nothing
11 about it, and then the aircraft crashed, it's not
12 on us. They're getting sued.

13 So when we do this capacity survey, that's
14 another check in the box of prerequisites to get
15 the money that we need to get the runway
16 established. If we do not do these things -- so
17 then you get the money from the FDOT. Now you get
18 the surveys approved. Now you get the support from
19 on high to say, hey, we're going to make sure we
20 support this because nobody is going to want to be
21 liable if something goes wrong. And so this is the
22 first step along the path to that.

23 MS. LIOTTA: I am not sure that I follow the
24 logic of that. Because if you can't build it, it
25 doesn't matter how busy you are. I'm sure that

1 there are airports that are at capacity and there
2 is just nothing that they can do about it. So if
3 it's a situation where we're at capacity, but the
4 land on the other side is just not buildable for
5 some reason then we're sort of in that same
6 situation of we don't know what we don't know about
7 that land and how long all the -- like the
8 infrastructure I am sure the county might be very,
9 very helpful with that. What would -- you know,
10 what groundwork can be laid before we start
11 spending money on studies?

12 MR. PITTMAN: Yes, ma'am.

13 MS. LIOTTA: And I think that this sort of
14 harkens back to some previous discussions we've had
15 about the need to bring in a CFO and do this
16 financial planning. I think there is a lot of very
17 valuable and helpful and useful projects out there.
18 But there is resource allocation. And, you know,
19 Dennis had mentioned this a number of times,
20 someone who could come in and do the financial
21 analysis, say, hey, we have competing projects,
22 competing things. These are to help us to plan for
23 where to put those dollars. Everyone agrees with
24 safety. No one is going to argue that. But we do
25 have constrained resources and there may be other

1 safety items on the airport that if we had spent
2 that money today on that instead of a study we may
3 have had a better safety outcome. I don't know.
4 But we're not getting -- we're not getting that
5 input.

6 One of the reasons we can't hire a CFO is we
7 don't -- I don't think we would get a really good
8 CFO candidate to come in until we get the executive
9 director issue resolved. So I think we're stuck.

10 MR. CLARKE: This might be a question for
11 Mr. Holesko. But I would presume that a capacity
12 study would be accompanied by an infrastructure
13 study, how to get the infrastructure to that place
14 or to where the new field would be. I mean, we have
15 developers in St. Johns County that are developing
16 raw land every day and they are running utility
17 lines and roads and all the other needs to that
18 facility, why wouldn't the same be true for the new
19 field.

20 I mean, one thing I want to clarify or just a
21 question. Would it change our designation as a
22 Class Delta airspace?

23 MR. PITTMAN: No.

24 MR. CLARKE: It would not. Would the
25 footprint of the Delta --

1 MR. PITTMAN: See the beauty of how our
2 airport -- so when you think about a Class Delta, a
3 Class Delta is on average a five-mile range around
4 center point, correct. But not all airports are
5 exactly five miles. Some airports are adjacent to
6 other airports. So you might have a packman
7 formation like you have in Hollywood, North Perry
8 down to the south. So some airports are different.
9 So you have your busy airports, your Class B's, you
10 understand, that's ground busier, busier airports,
11 but it all depends on the dimensions and the needs
12 of the said airspace.

13 Fortunately for us to the west we don't have
14 another airport that you have to compete with. And
15 so then the proximity of the runway to each other
16 which warrants them being referred to as parallels,
17 no, it would not.

18 MR. CLARKE: It would be within that volume?

19 MR. PITTMAN: Absolutely.

20 MR. CLARKE: Okay. Thank you.

21 MR. PITTMAN: And do you mind if Mr. Holesko
22 does a brief presentation. Because I think some of
23 the things he would add to some of your questions
24 for clarification purposes.

25 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Okay.

1 MR. PITTMAN: Mr. Holesko, if you may.

2 MR. HOLESKO: Good afternoon to the board,
3 staff and guests. The airfield capacity study has
4 been contemplated and talked about very casually
5 for years. There is no decision. Very good
6 comments and questions about what it could be and
7 what it should be. I think all those would be
8 logical results from the study. Any questions you
9 could possibly want to ask. There is no study yet.
10 There is no funding assigned yet. This is simply
11 presentation to you because it's been discussed
12 four directors ago, three directors ago, two
13 directors ago, with the current interim.

14 The reason for that is that the practical
15 capacity is in the FAA capacity handbook of the
16 single runway here at St. Augustine is 200,000
17 operations. The FAA general guidance says if you
18 have a practical capacity of 200,000 aircraft
19 operations when you cross 60 percent or 120,000
20 operations you should be planning and thinking
21 about what you are going to do in the future to
22 enhance capacity. That could be still things on
23 the east side of U.S. One. We have not looked at
24 all of the details of what you could do on the east
25 side of U.S. One. It could be the small runway on

1 the west side of U.S. One. To start looking at the
2 planning.

3 When you get to 80 percent of practical
4 capacity or 160,000 annual operations you should be
5 doing something at that point like a trigger. Do
6 you control the land? Are you doing the
7 environmental? Are you trying to build a parallel
8 runway? Are you trying to build more exit
9 taxiways? Whatever the case may be at 160,000
10 that's the window we have been in frankly for
11 pre-COVID --

12 MR. PITTMAN: Yes.

13 MR. HOLESKO: -- until now. Operations are
14 increasing from 120 to 140. I think there is even
15 a year in the 150,000 what you are getting near
16 75/80 percent. So those are values.

17 There is a new impact that's coming from the
18 airport south of St. Augustine and just popped up
19 in the past six months and that's the fact that
20 airports are using the new aircraft tracking
21 software called Virtower to monitor aircraft
22 flights to and from the airport and they are using
23 it to charge landing fees. It's an automated
24 system and it doesn't take staff time. There is
25 special vendors that are coming in saying I'm going

1 to take your Virtower report and I am going to
2 start sending out landing fees and you don't have
3 to do anything at the airport other than frankly,
4 A, take the new revenue. And also as the officials
5 probably get some criticism from some sectors of GA
6 that don't want you to charge landing fees. So
7 that's just a new concept.

8 And numerous airports -- I can't even tell you
9 which ones are actually going to do it, but they
10 all tend to be south of us. They all tend to be in
11 the greater Emory Riddle, Orlando area which are,
12 you know, high volume, high training. I don't know
13 where it all stands. But it's been discussed.
14 Well, what's going to happen with even a fraction
15 of those pilots. Well, they're going to start
16 coming in more to Palatka and St. Augustine.
17 Whether that happens or not no one knows. But
18 that's a part of it. But it was discussed in a
19 regional planning meeting, an aviation regional
20 planning meeting in the last three months what's
21 going on with that.

22 Yes, ma'am.

23 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: I'm sorry. I have a
24 question. I know that the government or the -- who
25 doesn't like it that Virtower is used as the ADS-B

1 for what it was not supposed to -- for what it was
2 not built to use for. Do you think that will ever
3 come up? Do you think that they could ever monitor
4 Virtower?

5 MR. HOLESKO: I don't know. I don't know. I
6 don't think this was an intended use of Virtower,
7 but I think a vendor has now come along and said,
8 well, there is a very interesting opportunity here
9 for the vendor and for airports that really need
10 the revenue. I'm not judging that in any way. I
11 totally understand why some airports are doing it.

12 So we are just going to go through some
13 alternatives. One of the more important things to
14 discuss today is a graphic on airport land, which
15 is actually all around the airport which includes
16 the parallel runway area west of U.S. One and then
17 talk about what you want to do in the future.

18 So we just talked about this real quick. The
19 annual service volume of the airport, which is the
20 practical capacity is 200,000. You're operating
21 around 70 percent. So the FAA would tell you you
22 should be doing something in terms of planning.
23 Which in your case I will tell you if the board
24 decides our plan is to do nothing, actually that's
25 a plan. You're deciding that it's not time to do

1 it yet, that's fine.

2 Existing airfield, you know, we can still look
3 more at 13-31. We can still talk with the tower
4 and try and look for areas to be more efficient and
5 move planes differently here and inside the
6 airfield area. When you look at the airport layout
7 plan which you had two of the board members run
8 ALP. We talked about it back then.

9 I want to take it a little bit further that
10 you actually looked during the last master planning
11 process building a new airport south of this
12 airport, down closer to Flagler County. I think
13 that was an alternative. Not a heavy alternative.
14 But we looked at that because more people are
15 moving to St. Johns County. Land is being used in
16 St. Johns County and there just aren't going to be
17 that many opportunities to build a new significant
18 aviation facility in this county. We did not
19 choose to move forward with the one south. This
20 area is still available which we will talk about
21 and that's why the airport land is so important.

22 If the Airport Authority has an opportunity to
23 control land and it doesn't you're not going to
24 have that opportunity at some point in the future.
25 That's part of the presentation today when we get

1 to the land graph.

2 Next. And there is the land graph. So I'm
3 going to walk over to the land graph. So the
4 yellow is current airport property. Parcel five is
5 the land area where the small parallel runway shown
6 west of U.S. One and the blue area -- again, yellow
7 is airport. The blue area is owned by one owner.
8 It is the State of Florida. The area to the west
9 of the blue parcel is the future 312 corridor.
10 This photograph was taken -- actually you can see
11 it's not even cleared yet in the area we are using
12 as the base map. But the 312 corridor is going to
13 run directly west of this parcel. So everything
14 you see here is going to be inside the future 312.

15 Parcel two all the little pieces are the
16 houses that we talked about that we don't control
17 right here in the terminal area.

18 Parcel one is the available land where the
19 previous executive director lived. We all know
20 it's very valuable land because it's very close to
21 being marsh front.

22 Parcel three we all clapped a few months ago.
23 Fantastic getting control of Gun Club. So parcel
24 three is now yellow.

25 Parcel four is a private land owner that has

1 approached the Airport Authority several times and
2 said we'd like to relocate, please come buy us.
3 It's just hasn't happened yet. But they are a
4 willing seller.

5 The reason that five is important is that
6 it's, again, it's a contiguous parcel. There have
7 been some very preliminary discussions on land.
8 State of Florida owns this. Entities associated
9 with the State of Florida want number one. So is
10 this the proper time to talk about how the Airport
11 Authority somehow leverages your ownership of one
12 to get ownership of five. I can't tell you that.
13 That's a part of the study. That's a part of the
14 study. State of Florida wants this, you own it,
15 you want that. The State of Florida owns it. This
16 is the time to have that discussion.

17 MR. ROBERTS: What's the red in there?

18 MR. HOLESKO: The red is a big racetrack, a
19 private racetrack in the back and, Chad, I am not
20 sure what the other one is. But they are not the
21 same entity.

22 MR. ROBERTS: You can leave it out?

23 MR. HOLESKO: They are not the same entity.
24 The top one is the abandon racetrack, the shooting
25 range back off of Big Oak.

1 MR. CLARKE: Real quick question.

2 MR. HOLESKO: Yes, sir.

3 MR. CLARKE: Is there room to stretch that
4 3500 foot runway up to 4500?

5 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Yes. Yes. Good on land.

6 Okay. Next slide we just -- this is just a
7 little more detailed slide. The airport layout
8 plan simply shows a 3,200 foot runway. Dennis
9 during the preparation wanted -- Dennis' capital
10 improvement plan meetings asked us to draw a
11 graphic and said, Andrew, just put some parallel
12 taxiways on it, show where the roadways could come
13 in off Big Oak and possibly 312 and just show some
14 development areas instead of just having a blank
15 runway and a little bit of open field. So we did.
16 Here is the graphic. This is 3200 by 75. You've
17 got 16, 32 -- 64 hangar -- 64 box hangars shown.
18 Absolutely not saying that it's going to be 64 box
19 hangars. It's broken down into four quadrants. I
20 think somebody did mention demand over there. I'm
21 sorry. Mr. Olson asked about demand. If the
22 Airport Authority wants, nobody says that you can't
23 put a self-service fuel farm over there. If the
24 Airport Authority wants to put fuel there, if you
25 want to have a small building, a small flight

1 planning building, I mean, all those things could
2 occur over there if the Airport Authority wants to
3 put those over there. Or it could be a very basic
4 touch-and-go practice run that would be fine too.

5 So just a simple graphic. We did that for
6 Mr. Clark.

7 MR. CLARKE: Thank you.

8 MR. HOLESKO: So, again, the action plan
9 Florida DOT is not going to program any money for
10 grants and the FAA is not going to talk with you
11 about providing any level of financial support
12 until they see a capacity study documenting the
13 need. So that's the idea. You have to be able to
14 show them what's happening on the airport. Are you
15 in -- truly in the 60/80 percent capacity window
16 and what do you want to do next.

17 There is the interest-ability to secure the
18 needed land. I think that we can all assume as St.
19 Johns County residents that someday that parcel
20 that's blue is not going to blue. Somebody is
21 going to control that parcel and when 312 is
22 developed something is going to happen with that
23 parcel inside 312 and whether the airport is
24 compatible with that or not or it's compatible with
25 the airport that's a whole another question.

1 You do have to do an environmental study. You
2 do have to look at the feasibility over all
3 projects and have a funding plan. Again, Florida
4 DOT and FAA aren't going to support you with any
5 level of funding. You can stop at any time you
6 want including today. Like you can say, no, we
7 don't want to do that or you can start to go down
8 the path.

9 But to design it, permit it and construct it
10 we are not even talking about that today because
11 the technical study is a planning study. It's not
12 an engineering study. We are not doing topographic
13 survey or soils testing, any of those things. We
14 would look at some very preliminary environmental
15 factors to look at obviously the wetland foot plan
16 and things like that. But there would be no
17 physical improvements proposed in the land
18 whatsoever. And I put up there the timeframe.
19 It's a pretty vague timeframe. Three to five to
20 seven years. If the Airport Authority said we want
21 to go absolutely as fast as we possibly can
22 starting today, I would tell you you still can't do
23 it in three years. If you want to move slow it
24 could be ten years. But it's probably somewhere in
25 the five to seven years of just logical processes

1 and steps that you can decide to proceed with or
2 not proceed with at any point and that's all it
3 will take. It's not going to be something quick.

4 If you decided today and you actively worked
5 at it maybe you'd land a plane on the runway in
6 2030 and it's 2024. It's probably 2030. And
7 that's not really, really aggressive. But that's
8 chipping away piece by piece. And a reminder on
9 that is Florida DOT is programming what year, '30
10 or '31?

11 MR. SINGLETARY: '31 I think.

12 MR. HOLESKO: '31. So when you have your next
13 CIP meeting with Florida DOT, Florida DOT is going
14 to assign you your capacity improvement program
15 funding for 2031. So if you don't put something in
16 here, and again you don't have to use it for that,
17 but you also are not telling them we are thinking
18 about planning and designing and building a new
19 airport in 2031.

20 Next year they will be planning for 2032.
21 They will assign some level of projects for the
22 Airport Authority in those years beyond 2030,
23 because they plan six years out when you have your
24 CIP Meeting.

25 MR. OLSON: Could I --

1 MR. HOLESKO: Yes, sir.

2 MR. OLSON: Since you are talking about FDOT.
3 The FAA support for this, could you speak to that
4 also.

5 MR. HOLESKO: Mr. Olson, I don't believe the
6 FAA is going to support this until you do the
7 feasibility study. Florida DOT has stated that
8 they will --

9 MR. OLSON: No.

10 MR. HOLESKO: I'm sorry. Go ahead.

11 MR. OLSON: Well, I'm interrupting you -- your
12 answer. Just the whole big picture of FAA
13 participating in the way FDOT is doing, I mean, is
14 this something that FAA will also support because
15 it's going to be expensive?

16 MR. HOLESKO: Yes. Once you start the
17 planning process and show them and can document
18 that you are into the 60 percent or 80 percent
19 window, yes, you would expect the FAA to also
20 program funds for your project each phase of the
21 way.

22 MS. LIOTTA: What -- okay. So assuming all
23 those things happen and we get to the support
24 phase, what portion -- I mean, I know it's a
25 guess -- what portion of such a project would they

1 be supporting, not that could be told, however it
2 makes sense to answer that. Like is it scope of
3 the work or percentage of the project, like what is
4 kind of like the best that we could hope for?

5 MR. HOLESKO: In theory over time the best
6 scenario that you could hope for if there was a
7 justified airport capacity study then the physical
8 improvements including land acquisition and
9 environmental and mitigation and all those things,
10 the best case scenario is that the FAA pays
11 90 percent, Florida DOT pays 80/20 of the
12 nonfederal share which is 8 percent and the Airport
13 Authority pays two.

14 MS. LIOTTA: Does that count bringing all new
15 utilities all the way from everywhere they are now
16 to the new land? Because there is, like you said,
17 there is the water, the roads, the power.

18 MR. HOLESKO: It does not -- the roadway would
19 be yes. But the water systems and all that would
20 typically be other agencies, not sewer and water.
21 And, again, can you get sewer and water? Possibly
22 yes. But I wouldn't say that much more than the
23 roadway which is going to be a big cost in itself.

24 MS. LIOTTA: Yes. So I'm aware that the north
25 side there is like, I think, and I am not sure if

1 it's through appropriations yet. But there was a
2 big chunk of money that was going to open up that
3 whole stretch. That came in from working with the
4 county and them helping us go get a special
5 allocation of funds outside of your typical FAA
6 process. This kind of sounds like something that
7 we would benefit from looking again at something
8 like that. I know it's outside of your scope.
9 But, you know, I would think that we would want to
10 start talking to the county about putting in like
11 how they could help with putting in the
12 infrastructure, because it would be, like I said
13 before, you know, we could spend a lot of time and
14 effort and money, but if we can't afford to get the
15 water service, there won't be another runway.

16 MR. HOLESKO: Agreed. I believe that frankly
17 both staff and every Authority member it's like any
18 question that you could have that you want to have
19 answered just tell us what it is and then you would
20 put it in your scope so that you can have that
21 answered. The feasibility and partnering with the
22 county, what does that look like? How could it be
23 done? I think that would be a part of the scope if
24 you want to have that answer to that question. Any
25 question that you would want to have, how would

1 this possibly work, how would the aerospace works,
2 anything like that can all be a part of the
3 capacity study. Because everyone is going to want
4 to know the answers to those questions also. Like
5 FDOT and FAA they want to know is there going to be
6 an airport out there with no roadways, sewer and
7 water, that doesn't make sense to them either.
8 How would that happen?

9 MS. LIOTTA: Thank you.

10 MR. HOLESKO: Yes, sir.

11 MR. CLARKE: You may want to look up Appleton,
12 Wisconsin Airport had an expansion and they were
13 able to get funding, program funding from either
14 the state agency or the FAA for utility service
15 because that was the only way that the other
16 facility could be constructed. So if you want to
17 look that up it may give you some ideas as well.

18 MR. HOLESKO: The idea of improved roadways,
19 sewer and water and Big Oak. You're the primary
20 land owner on Big Oak Road.

21 MR. CLARKE: Yeah.

22 MR. HOLESKO: So your partnering with the
23 county or any other utility to provide service to
24 your own land to make it more valuable and
25 frankly -- but making your own land, the Airport

1 Authority land more beneficial to develop involves
2 sewer and water. You need it too.

3 MR. CLARKE: Sure.

4 MR. OLSON: Just following up I think that's
5 good discussion. Because I don't know if is there
6 a year for 312 actually construction at this point?

7 MR. HOLESKO: I just know it's been a moving
8 target. I don't know. I know that we are coming
9 in from both sides. We will be in the middle
10 shortly. But I don't know the year.

11 MR. OLSON: But what I was thinking is that if
12 312 -- when 312 is built, I guess if it's built, it
13 will likely -- wouldn't the County's water and
14 sewer enterprise actually build trunk lines with
15 it, because they do extension to service new
16 development areas.

17 MR. HOLESKO: That's absolutely a conversation
18 that we would have with St. Johns County. I don't
19 know the answer to that.

20 MR. ROBERTS: Because there would be
21 presumably along 312 as part of 312 development,
22 there would be other service, other customers for
23 water and sewer.

24 MR. HOLESKO: A little bit of different for
25 this piece of 312 is that on the other side of Big

1 Oak and airport land on this runway when 312 goes
2 in everything to the west is part of the swamp and
3 it's conservation land all the way down I-95. So
4 don't expect there to be development west of the
5 new 312 corridor.

6 MR. OLSON: Except maybe where 312 leaves U.S.
7 One.

8 MR. HOLESKO: Yes. And quite frankly the
9 County knows, they've seen your airport master plan
10 that shows that there is supposed to be a Big Oak
11 connection at 312 and frankly you even -- the
12 Airport Authority said for the good of St. Johns
13 County it would be good for a limited use highway
14 to extend all the way from the Big Oak intersection
15 of 312 all the way to I-95 with an interchange.
16 But not with development on the side. Simply a two
17 lane road in and out of a connection from 312 to
18 I-95.

19 MR. OLSON: Okay. Okay.

20 MR. HOLESKO: But that's a long, long, long
21 time away.

22 MR. OLSON: Okay.

23 MR. HOLESKO: That's my last slide.

24 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Okay.

25 MR. HOLESKO: Again, any more questions on

1 that?

2 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: No. That's great to get our
3 future out there for us to start looking at and
4 working toward.

5 Any questions from the audience? It's a
6 workshop. You can ask.

7 Okay. None. Well, thank you, Andrew.

8 MR. OLSON: So what's next?

9 MS. LIOTTA: I have maybe while we are
10 waiting for -- oh, sorry. Maybe a quick question,
11 if you don't mind, Vinny. Would you mind if I
12 asked you a question.

13 MR. BEYERS: Sure. Why not.

14 MS. LIOTTA: You were -- we were talking
15 about the -- what is Atlantic seeing operations
16 wise?

17 MR. BEYERS: Traffic is down.

18 MR. LIOTTA: Traffic is down.

19 MR. BEYERS: Down, yes. And we project it to
20 be flat or even down next year.

21 MS. LIOTTA: Okay.

22 MR. PITTMAN: Can I respond to that?

23 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Yes. Thank you.

24 MR. PITTMAN: Most traffic doesn't go to
25 Atlantic. They're expensive. So most traffic that

1 comes here does full stop taxi back and goes and
2 departs right back out. They go over to self-serve
3 fuel pits. Most of the aircraft here are light
4 simple aircraft that do not go to Atlantic. So
5 they wouldn't have any clue what comes to this true
6 airport unless they park there and then they get
7 fuel from them and they park at the FBO. Again,
8 most of the traffic does not land and go to the
9 FBO.

10 MR. LIOTTA: I believe that my airplanes
11 across Volato and the flight school represented
12 more operations at this airport in 2024 than any
13 single other entity. And we got all of our fuel
14 from Atlantic.

15 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Thank you. Any other
16 comments?

17 MR. BEYERS: Volato usually accounted for
18 usually probably 50 to 60, 70 trips a month. And
19 since their situation that has gone away.

20 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Thank you.

21 MR. OLSON: So I'm curious now just one follow
22 up. What do you -- what do you attribute your
23 decline that you are talking about?

24 MR. BEYERS: 2022 was a banner year for us.
25 We came out of COVID, you know. Flight operations

1 were up. Flight departures were thriving.
2 Everyone was traveling and, you know, everyone was
3 on the train, if you will. And then '23 we saw a
4 slight decline in that, you know, as the honeymoon
5 phase went away from that. And then this year is a
6 little bit of a decline. And then next year we
7 projected it to be flat, maybe a little bit less.

8 MR. OLSON: Well, we are not seeing decline in
9 fuel. We are not seeing a big run up. We are not
10 seeing a decline in your fuel.

11 MR. BEYERS: Yeah.

12 MR. OLSON: So it is not declining?

13 MR. BEYERS: It is declining. Fuel sales are
14 down. Traffic is down as a result.

15 MR. OLSON: Okay. So we will this year have
16 less revenue from your fuel yearly than the prior
17 year?

18 MR. BEYERS: I would agree, yeah. It will
19 probably be flat, maybe less next year. Also U.S.
20 Custom's activity has been really down.

21 MR. OLSON: Okay.

22 MR. BEYERS: Significantly.

23 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Thank you.

24 MS. LIOTTA: So we have mostly visitor
25 traffic, flight schools touch, leave, don't buy --

1 necessarily buy.

2 MR. BEYERS: A lot of touch-and-goes, a lot of
3 flight schools come in, and we still see a lot of
4 flight schools on the daily. There is a lot of
5 activity still going on at the airport. But for
6 Atlantic for the jet traffic, the corporate traffic
7 is flat or down.

8 MS. LIOTTA: Do we have any sense between the
9 two pieces of data like what percentage is just,
10 look, I guess, people who don't stay like just
11 touch-and-go types?

12 MR. PITTMAN: This is where I come in. All
13 right. So most of your traffic here -- all right.
14 So maybe input into the NAS most of your transient
15 aircraft are not going to come here and come to the
16 FBO. We're typically the most expensive in this
17 area. So a lot of your traffic is going to go to
18 self-serve fuel pits which we as the Airport
19 Authority control the prices. So they are not
20 parking at Atlantic. They either they want to go
21 to the overflow or they are doing what they've got
22 to do and go. So they are bypassing us and going
23 to Cecil -- I'm sorry -- they're going to Cecil
24 Field, Craig Airport, Flagler, they are going
25 places around us. For people who get on ForeFlight

1 and other things like that are looking at fuel
2 prices you know what I'm talking about.

3 All right. So that has significantly impacted
4 the air traffic, but it has not impacted our
5 traffic meaning the overall the airport because,
6 one, you have several flight schools here. So I
7 would argue that those Cirruses do more
8 touch-and-goes than Florida Flyers. I would argue
9 that those Cirruses do more touch-and-goes than
10 fact. That is not happening. All right. So then
11 all the other transient entities that come here and
12 do touch-and-go traffic as well.

13 And also whenever you have corporations, you
14 have a lot of corporate flights, so the corporate
15 flights who are being housed are not going to
16 Atlantic either. And so their numbers might have
17 dropped, but the airport itself has not dropped.
18 And, like I said, if you go on OPSNET, which is an
19 FAA approved website, they have the numbers. They
20 are inputted. Those are the numbers when I do my
21 yearly RSTM, runway safety training meeting, that I
22 do yearly those are the numbers that are derived,
23 that's where I get the numbers from. I don't get
24 it from the traffic count that the tower tabulates.
25 I get it from the FAA database. And that is the

1 approved and accepted numbers. Not ForeFlight
2 which doesn't even account for overflights. Only
3 accounts for all the touch-and-goes. And so, like
4 I said, theirs might be down but the airport as a
5 whole, because we have other places in the airport
6 to go, are not down and they are growing.

7 MR. OLSON: Okay. One other thought and it
8 may be incorrect but I'll throw it out. I would
9 expect some of the growth that could happen with
10 FBO business, fueling, other activity, would be --
11 we would need more commercial hangar space and be
12 able to host more corporate jets here.

13 MR. BEYERS: Hangar spaces are a rarity in
14 Florida right now. They can't build hangars fast
15 enough. If we would build hangars here that would
16 bring significant large cabin aircraft which burn
17 jet fuel, you know, two to three thousand gallons
18 uplift, hundred thousand gallons annually versus
19 pistons burning, you know, five gallons an hour.

20 MR. OLSON: So that's a big limiting factor,
21 right?

22 MR. BEYERS: Big limiting factor. We agree.
23 With Volato moving out of this space people have
24 been knocking down my door for hangar five space.
25 I have got three people on the hook right now that

1 want to move in. And, you know, I should have that
2 space filled within the next month. Outside of
3 that people have been asking -- they know there is
4 no hangar space in St. Augustine. So they kind of
5 quit asking, if you will. But when the phone rings
6 it rings a lot. And they can't find hangar 50
7 square miles away from here.

8 I know Signature up in Jacksonville is going
9 to be breaking ground on hangars relatively soon.
10 They're already taking LOI's for the hangar space.

11 Orlando just announced that Sheltair is
12 building two hangars out there. You just can't
13 build them fast enough. We're trying to -- we're
14 still interested in the commercial terminal. We
15 have been kind of bouncing that back and forth, and
16 building a 30,000 square foot hanger next to it to
17 get our people the bump to really start thinking
18 about it. We build a hangar I'll fill them in
19 three months.

20 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: We have been saying that for
21 years we need hangars for sure. Thank you, Vinny.

22 MR. PITTMAN: I agree with you on the
23 corporate hangars because that wing list doesn't
24 move.

25 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Right.

1 MR. PITTMAN: There is a need for that.

2 MR. BEYERS: Right. Being the sole provider
3 on the field selling jet fuel, and you guys are
4 enjoying the fuel fees that guys charge us. Yeah,
5 you got it on Avgas. But the jet fuel is the real
6 kicker. I mean, Avgas is doing six, seven thousand
7 gallons a month where jet fuel I am doing 150,000
8 gallons plus, you know.

9 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Thank you. Jose. Thank
10 you.

11 MR. RIERA: General Aviation point of view.

12 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Jose Riera.

13 MR. RIERA: Jose Riera, 133 Paranza Trace. I
14 am also a member of SABA. I was here flying on
15 Thursday from here to Palatka. It's only a 15
16 minute flight. It took me 30 minutes to get there.
17 Out of those 30 minutes 10 minutes were on the
18 ground waiting. I was number four in line for
19 taking off and we had to wait for about four or
20 five, or six airplanes. Okay. So from the
21 operations point of view, yes, it's increasing.
22 From general aviation why people doesn't come to
23 St. Augustine. They cannot find a place to park
24 because it costs 40 bucks to go to Atlantic when
25 they park there, you know. I come over here and

1 they charge me \$21, which I gladly pay because I
2 have to when I have to keep my airplane there
3 overnight because I don't have the place here. So
4 that point of view it's not because they are, you
5 know, traffic is down over there, yeah, probably
6 because of all the jets. Or general aviation who
7 wants to come and pay 40 bucks just to go to lunch
8 that cost you another 40 bucks. I mean, your
9 little hamburger becomes quite expensive.

10 So I am just telling you guys is that look at
11 the operations from one thing, don't look at what
12 the jet fuel sales does. Look at what we, the
13 general aviation pilots, have to do. Okay. I have
14 to wait. I like to be here. But I'm not here yet
15 because we don't have enough hangars. So just look
16 at the whole picture. Don't just look at one FBO
17 that sells jet fuel only. And we don't have
18 parking spot either for somebody to come and park
19 and stay if they can do it.

20 I had a guy that said, "Hey, what is there in
21 St. Augustine other than Atlantic?"

22 I say, "Nothing."

23 Well, they had to go somewhere else otherwise
24 they could have come -- we could have more people
25 coming in and spending more time here and more fuel

1 sales if that was the case. But, you know, the jet
2 traffic is one thing. The corporate traffic is
3 another one. Look at your general aviation as
4 well.

5 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Good point, Jose. Thank
6 you.

7 MS. LIOTTA: I've got maybe one more question
8 I promise on the -- you're saying there is more
9 traffic it seems to be a lot of the operations
10 driven by students fleeing fees from elsewhere.
11 Are we seeing a corresponding increase in fuel
12 sales or are we just seeing a burden with no
13 associated -- people are entitled. It's a public
14 use airport. I'm not -- I'm not trying to throw
15 shade on students, but the fact of the matter is
16 are we seeing an increase in revenue from the
17 increase in student traffic?

18 MR. PITTMAN: No.

19 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Thank you. Kim Kendall,
20 please.

21 MS. KENDALL: I have a couple of questions
22 real quick. First, I have two comments and a
23 question I really need to understand.

24 One comment referenced at the beginning about
25 conflict of interest or recusing yourselves. I do

1 think that's appropriate to be done today because
2 it was changed on agenda item number one to now let
3 you-all got -- to let you-all look at the resumes
4 before the next meeting. So that means you are
5 doing preliminary work before an agenda item that
6 you plan on voting on. So I do think that's
7 appropriate to have that done now.

8 Capacity study 100 percent I support that. I
9 think FDOT and the FAA really, really are going to
10 look at that. That's needed. I'm meeting with
11 Rutherford tomorrow to talk about this and other
12 stuff. I have been told by our legislative
13 director for the county that 9.65 million dollars
14 has been earmarked through THUD for the north and
15 south access roads and vital connections like
16 water, waste water, et cetera. But that the
17 Airport Authority is requesting twelve million
18 dollars in a two-phase request, six million each
19 time. You-all can't move forward until the State
20 does that. I need to know for propitiation
21 request. Knock on wood a week from now I am
22 elected.

23 So I want to understand and I want you-all to
24 know with my FAA background, I mean, this is a
25 priority for me big time. So I need to understand

1 moving forward I definitely want to hear back, I'm
2 hoping that you all will address it if you are
3 going to go over the capacity study now moving
4 forward. Somebody is going to move full steam
5 ahead as well. What kind of request and is that
6 correct? You-all I'm hearing that we're not
7 looking at infrastructure but yet the legislative
8 directive for the county said it is and the FAA
9 did. So I would like some clarity on that what
10 needs to requested on my end.

11 MR. PITTMAN: Yes, ma'am. I will speak to
12 that. So, yes, we did put a request
13 infrastructure. And most of the infrastructure we
14 will speak to in a minute will be on the northeast
15 side of the airport. So the infrastructure was the
16 sewer and water and, like I said, Andrew Holesko
17 and I will talk about that here shortly.
18 Increasing the water pressure to the north side and
19 connecting it to the south side and the south side
20 GA portion of the airport because one of the things
21 the fire marshal told us was the water pressure to
22 the south side was inadequate so that we are going
23 to fix that. So that is one of the things we have
24 come to you-all about for grant funding. Yes,
25 ma'am, we will be speaking.

1 MS. KENDALL: And the County has also said
2 they are going to put it on their request.

3 MR. OLSON: And the area that was just
4 referred to the east corporate area, that is
5 probably got the strongest economic development fee
6 connection with anything that we've talked about
7 today including what we just talked about. More
8 corporate presence at our airport is dependent on
9 really development of an east corporate area in a
10 big way because that's where the large hangar
11 complexes and other activity can go. Aircraft
12 assembly that's if Northrup Grumman is expanding,
13 needs to expand that's where they would expand the
14 east corporate area.

15 MS. KENDALL: I would agree with you and raise
16 you one I would argue that all of your land is an
17 economic driver.

18 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Thank you, Kendall. Okay.
19 Let's move along, please. We're having -- we're
20 behind guys.

21 (Agenda Item - East Side Planning and 3 Areas
22 of Development)

23 MR. PITTMAN: We have another traffic control.
24 Okay. At this point I would like to discuss the
25 development vision for the east side of the airport

1 which includes three key development areas. As you
2 know this aligns with our airport layout plan and
3 master plan, but it's crucial that we establish a
4 proactive plan to manage, prioritize our
5 development interests effectively. This plan will
6 help us stay organized, maximize land use
7 potential, and ensure we are prepared for future
8 growth opportunities.

9 To go into further detail about the
10 significance of this development and the strategic
11 importance I would like to turn the conversation
12 over to again Andrew Holesko who will elaborate on
13 specifics.

14 Additionally, I intend to have a resolution
15 prepared by next meeting for the board to review.
16 Not necessarily to vote on, but to review.

17 And, Mr. Holesko, would you please.

18 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Thank you.

19 MR. HOLESKO: Good afternoon, again. So the
20 east side presentation and a little bit -- and Matt
21 is going to talk about when I'm done the Casa Cola
22 roadway extension. Both support additional
23 corporate hangars. And I just want to remind
24 you-all again that you have money basically every
25 other year now from 2030 that the DOT is somewhat

1 alternating their grant fund offer to you on their
2 six year growth program from an airfield project to
3 a hangar project to airfield hangars. So you've
4 got three sets of additional funding coming up.
5 Matt might know exact dates and amounts more than
6 me. But I think it is in the vicinity of six
7 million dollars.

8 MR. SINGLETARY: Sounds correct.

9 MR. HOLESKO: Okay. So I just want to go
10 through a little bit of an update because we're
11 talking about the airport layout plan. We're
12 talking about Florida DEO and things like that.
13 And just where is the planning of wetlands, the
14 roadway, everything on here. Just a quick review
15 of what's going on on the east side.

16 So here we are in the existing basically
17 mostly -- mostly forested right now and
18 undeveloped. The reason it's forested and
19 undeveloped is that there are no roadways and there
20 is no sewer and water as we have discussed numerous
21 times.

22 First graphic here is the graphic from the
23 airport layout plan and the airport master plan.
24 As Courtney just mentioned the airport master plan
25 and AOP wanted to be able to accommodate three

1 types of development on the east side. On the
2 north section is corporate hangars. The center
3 section is a second FBO or another airport service
4 organization. It doesn't have to be an FBO, but
5 it's something that's an aviation related business.
6 And then the large parcel on the south is something
7 that's larger and more contiguous in theory whether
8 it was a Northrup Grumman type. I know they used
9 to have the right of first refusal. I don't know
10 where all that sits right now, but, again, that was
11 originally Northrop Grumman looking to do some type
12 of large scale, large aircraft development. At
13 least that was the concept at some point.

14 So corporate hangars, aviation service in the
15 central section and something larger aerospace or
16 MRO in the south.

17 Over a year ago you said let's go out and
18 determine where the wetlands are, let's get the
19 permits in place, let's get some level of
20 mitigation credits. We don't have all the
21 mitigation credits, but you do have credits for
22 impact to the green which is the fresh water
23 wetlands. You do have a little bit for the orange
24 which is the saltwater. So, again, we know where
25 all those are as you know where all those wetlands

1 are. As you continue to actively develop you will
2 be able to utilize your mitigation credits as you
3 develop and the other development at some point you
4 may need some more, you probably will need some
5 more, but you've got some certainly to start.

6 Again, I applaud the Gun Club acquisition.
7 That's the parcel you acquired. I mean, it really
8 is a very large parcel. It's been identified for
9 years and years its level of importance to the
10 Airport Authority and now it's airport land. So we
11 are logically getting there.

12 Next. Next year after July 1st Florida DOT is
13 going to offer you the first part of funding on an
14 80/20 grant. Right, Matt?

15 MR. SINGLETARY: Yes.

16 MR. HOLESKO: 80/20 grant. The total project
17 is 2.5 million dollars. They are going to give you
18 four million and ask for one million dollar cost
19 share at 20 percent to build that roadway. That
20 roadway also may include sewer and water. If for
21 some reason the other areas where the sewer and
22 water don't get funded, if that roadway doesn't
23 have sewer and water to it yet from the other
24 authorities, which are making all their decisions
25 before this is funded, then that roadway would need

1 to have some sewer and water capability or else it
2 also would not be able to support new development
3 in having the new road. Hopefully that's not going
4 to happen. This will all be roadway funded.

5 This graphic is the graphic that was submitted
6 to the Florida DEO grant application and I just
7 want to note that this project and this
8 coordination with St. Johns County was from
9 Courtney's predecessor, the previous interim, there
10 was some very good active discussions. And
11 Jeremiah I am bringing you these discussions --
12 there is a time when there was -- when the previous
13 interim director and Jeremiah were talking with
14 St. Johns County and partnering and what we can do
15 together and this was the result of one of those.
16 So there was a need for some good graphics. There
17 was a need for some specific technical analysis and
18 some cost estimates to describe this narrative so
19 that the State of Florida could provide sewer,
20 water and additional roadways. Building on the
21 Florida DOT funds, not in competition with, to
22 extend sewer and water and do the loop all the way
23 from U.S. One to do a continuous loop all the way
24 around the east side for sewer and water to provide
25 all the capacity that would be needed for all of

1 the development that was shown on the airport
2 layout plan.

3 So this graphic without the buildings, this is
4 the infrastructure graphic, this is the roadway,
5 this is the sewer and water. So without what the
6 end product is. Because everybody really wants the
7 hangars, people working and new airplanes and all
8 that, which is next. Click.

9 There is what we are trying to finally get to.
10 The big box around the parcel to the north I just
11 put it on there so you could see. That's the area
12 for corporate hangars coming off x-ray alpha
13 perpendicular to the east there is room for
14 corporate hangars.

15 Next please. Center area that's for possibly
16 a second FBO or a single larger FBO or some other
17 service where we are trying to support aviation.
18 It could avionics. It could be paint. I don't
19 know. You-all decide what the procurement is of
20 the center section.

21 And then the third parcel. The third parcel
22 is for something larger in scale. I still think
23 consistency with the airport layout plan and that
24 the southern parcel could be a single tenant,
25 something very large happening. It could be

1 aerospace. It could be Grumman. It could be
2 something big like that. It's the last piece of
3 available land to develop at this point where you
4 could put a really big piece of development on it
5 and put large airplanes, anything remotely similar
6 to what you have right now as Northrop Grumman. So
7 it's the last piece you can really put something
8 like that.

9 And that's what Florida DEO asks St. Johns
10 County and the Airport Authority to put in the
11 narrative. Not that the Airport Authority is
12 committed to all this, but tell us what we could do
13 if that sewer and water and roadway and all that
14 infrastructure is in there, what could you do with
15 it? What would you do with it if all that came?
16 That's what you see on the graphic in front of you.
17 That graphic is very similar of what we provide to
18 the DEO. And you-all saw that. You have seen
19 that. We have shown that to you before. The goal
20 today was to simply go through all those and show
21 you that the ALP was the foundation to the wetlands
22 to Gun Club. FDOT is doing the road. And all the
23 things that are progressing years and years in
24 advance.

25 That roadway project it's being funded by DOT

1 now. You requested that roadway project from DOT
2 five years ago. You didn't even own the Gun Club
3 Road property five years ago when you requested
4 that money. If you didn't request that money five
5 years ago it wouldn't be there now to build the
6 road.

7 So with that, I'm open for questions before
8 Matt comes up. Matt is doing the third one.

9 MR. ROBERTS: Just, Andrew, is it fair to say
10 that our -- the relocation and that infrastructure
11 will not -- we will not burn up our mitigation
12 credits on that from the appearance --

13 MR. HOLESKO: You will not.

14 MR. ROBERTS: -- correct, of doing that?

15 MR. HOLESKO: The specific question was when
16 we do the FDOT roadway and put in sewer and water
17 are we going to use all the mitigation credits that
18 the Airport Authority has right now? The answer is
19 no and actually it's only going to use a fraction
20 of them. There are areas that we have to go
21 through wetlands to do it, but it's not going to be
22 a lot.

23 MR. ROBERTS: Just the way that it plays
24 out --

25 MR. HOLESKO: Sure.

1 MR. ROBERTS: -- most of the road happens to
2 be on upland.

3 MR. HOLESKO: Uplands, correct. Without any
4 need for mitigation credits, correct. Yes.

5 MR. CLARKE: One question.

6 MR. ROBERTS: Yes.

7 MR. CLARKE: Mitigation credits I want to make
8 sure we are not going to run out of them for the
9 east side development. Are they going to be
10 available, you know, from whoever is selling them
11 in the county?

12 MR. HOLESKO: The same mitigation bank where
13 you bought your first credits knows that the
14 Airport Authority has an interest in more credits
15 long term. Now it's completely up to them whether
16 they choose to sell them to you in the future, but
17 they do know that this is not the last request from
18 the Airport Authority for mitigation credits.

19 MR. CLARKE: Okay. What about the west side
20 is that within the basin?

21 MR. HOLESKO: It is not. Everything west of
22 U.S. One is a different wetland mitigation bank.
23 And my understanding is those credits are more
24 readily available and less costly than anything
25 east of U.S. One.

1 MR. CLARKE: So the center that we would
2 identify then how many we need the better, would
3 you say, because I'm worried about all the other
4 development that's going on in the county, the
5 housing developments are growing like weeds.

6 MR. HOLESKO: Yeah, it should cost less to
7 mitigate west of U.S. One.

8 MR. CLARKE: Okay. Any idea on the acreage?

9 MR. HOLESKO: I don't think we -- Matt, we
10 haven't done a wetland footprint there yet.

11 MR. SINGLETARY: I don't know.

12 MR. HOLESKO: Happy to look at the wetland
13 footprint.

14 MR. CLARKE: I don't want to hold you to that.

15 MR. HOLESKO: I do recall, Dennis, that we did
16 that in the master planning process. So we might
17 be able to take a pretty quick look at the wetland
18 map right now. I believe we put the small parallel
19 runway on a parcel that was more upland as opposed
20 to being wet. But I can absolutely verify that for
21 you.

22 MR. CLARKE: That's okay.

23 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Okay. Any other questions
24 for Andrew?

25 Thank you, Andrew. Great news. Great news.

1 (Agenda Item- South GA Access Road)

2 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Courtney.

3 MR. PITTMAN: This is the last topic for
4 today. So I will make it quick for the sake of
5 time. We will talk about the Casa Cola roadway.
6 Not to make a decision but for us to start thinking
7 about what we want to do with Casa Cola.

8 Matt, if you would.

9 MR. SINGLETARY: This is back to the beginning
10 of the presentation. If you can scroll to the end.

11 Yes, so this Casa Cola Way roadway project
12 this is not -- it's a project we've actually
13 already initiated and started. So the purpose of
14 this discussion now is to give you a refresher on
15 what the project is, an update on what we have done
16 so far, and then talk about, you know, what we need
17 to do to move forward. There you go right there.
18 Yes, so you can onto the next slide, please.

19 Yeah. All right. So overview of what this
20 project is. We kind of already led in with some of
21 the discussion we just had on this area. So we
22 talked about, I think it was mentioned a minute
23 ago, the north side development, the south side
24 development. This is the south side development
25 area. So along U.S. One. This roadway is

1 important just like on the east side this is part
2 of the initial infrastructure that we need to get
3 development started. So that's kind of the
4 significance, the importance of it getting it going
5 with the roadway itself, it opens up development
6 both to the south and to the north. Per the
7 approved master plan ALP there is both non-aviation
8 and aviation development planned in this area. The
9 green box you see on this slide is kind of the
10 general area I'm talking about that we are looking
11 at for what could be more non-aviation and aviation
12 development.

13 So back to what, you know, where we are at
14 today and where we started back in basically the
15 beginning of '24, February we were authorized to do
16 the initial site investigations for this site
17 inside that green boundary I am referring to, you
18 know, to help do the first steps for development of
19 this whole area. And also other than the site
20 investigation aspect of it which there is a handful
21 of sub consults we worked with similar to what we
22 talked about over the last year or two on the east
23 side.

24 Topographic survey, geotechnical soil
25 investigations. We did environmental review

1 including wetland delineation, some traffic study
2 and also cultural resources assessment which that
3 is the one to look at anything that might have
4 historical significance on the site that would
5 holdup development.

6 So we did all these things so far. That's
7 completed. And we also did some conceptual layouts
8 of the roadway options for us to consider which is
9 part of what we kind of want your input on at the
10 end of this.

11 The other point to make this area has two
12 current projects related to the roadways with the
13 big red arrow there going from U.S. One back to the
14 road that leads to the conference center here and
15 just north of that we have taxiway F extension
16 which, you know, roadway vehicular access and then
17 taxiway F would allow for aircraft access and the
18 first next hangar development down here which would
19 be between the road and the taxiway.

20 Next slide please. So yes. So those
21 different site investigations this slide here I
22 just wanted to point out some of the significant or
23 notable items that resulted from our study of the
24 land there and the different studies that were
25 done. Unfortunately we do have wetlands in this

1 area as well. They are not right on top of the
2 footprint of the proposed roadway alignment but
3 there is some mainly to the south that gets pretty
4 close. So we do expect there to be some wetland
5 mitigation required and some impacts to the
6 wetlands.

7 Related to that same topic when we did the
8 soil borings we found that the groundwater is very
9 close to the surface which you might expect with
10 wetlands adjacent to the roadway. But that creates
11 some additional hurdles for design and
12 construction, proper engineering design, you want
13 to be up, you know, away from the groundwater to
14 have structural support of a roadway or building.
15 So you can either bring in some extra fill to raise
16 it up or also with the roadway you can put in pipes
17 underground like similar to a french drain to help
18 drain the water down. So those are two options
19 there. But I just want to point out, you know, you
20 have to kind of do that and also that could add
21 some extra impact on the wetlands. We will have
22 to, depending on the design, look at that closer.

23 The cultural resources assessment I think most
24 of you are familiar with the two historic buildings
25 over there. The one I think it is Civil Air

1 Patrol. I forget what the other building is. But
2 good news there those are historic buildings but
3 because they are not in their original location
4 they don't require any kind of special treatment
5 and the Airport Authority can dispose of them
6 however they need to, however you decide to. So no
7 additional cost associated with that.

8 The other main thing I wanted to point out and
9 make everyone aware of U.S. One is a state roadway.
10 So when you make a connection you have to meet
11 FDOT's requirements and so there is some costs
12 there with modifications to both the medians
13 between the two northbound and southbound lanes and
14 also turn lanes. And then also if we were to plan
15 for like the full development that's been discussed
16 in the pass including hotels, restaurants, office
17 spaces those are all high traffic demand and high
18 trip generating type uses that we do believe a
19 signal would be required if you were planning for
20 that if that didn't move forward.

21 Next slide please.

22 Go ahead.

23 MR. OLSON: What point would a signalized -- a
24 hotel is -- say we committed to a hotel and a hotel
25 is in development, would a hotel be able to go into

1 development without the signal and it would just be
2 whenever something -- we can signal -- the
3 signalized intersection can be put in place or
4 would this be prerequisite to in our hotel
5 development on that site?

6 MR. SINGLETARY: I'm not hundred percent sure
7 of the timing that would be needed, but, you know,
8 prior to that becoming operational I think you
9 would have to have your required signalization if
10 that's what's being required in place.

11 MR. OLSON: Okay. Okay.

12 MR. SINGLETARY: That's my understanding.

13 MR. OLSON: Yeah.

14 MR. SINGLETARY: So part one of this was the
15 site investigation. Part two was looking at some
16 concept plans. So we have got two options to
17 present here. One we are calling the basic option.
18 So it's primarily a two lane road all the way
19 through from U.S. One back to the conference center
20 access road.

21 We also did as part of our scope we are
22 considering to include drainage improvements along
23 the roadway and piping expanded, stormwater pond to
24 accommodate the road, and also water main like we
25 talked about the importance for the lack of water

1 in this area and the importance of upgrading that.
2 So it would be great if we do get the additional
3 funding from DEO or the appropriation to help
4 support. But right now we're considering that to
5 be part of the project the water main. Also an
6 optional type of thing concrete curbing is the
7 style of roadway that we're talking about, curbing
8 and gutter connected to your drainage.

9 So this basic option it is certainly capable
10 of serving your access to aviation development
11 here. However, similar to like what we were just
12 talking about if you did -- if you were planning
13 for and building for these facilities such as
14 hotels and restaurants and such you likely would
15 have to do more at least at the connection to U.S.
16 One an additional lane.

17 MR. CLARKE: I have a question.

18 MR. SINGLETARY: Go ahead.

19 MR. CLARKE: Indian Bend Road is it shown,
20 would it remain or could it be abandoned?

21 MR. SINGLETARY: So ultimately the concept is
22 that it would be abandoned, it would go away, it
23 would be removed. For this layout you see here to
24 do the first, to build the new road, build taxiway
25 F, build the way it's conceptualized now there is

1 box hangars in between the two there you could
2 build all that and Indian Bend could still be in
3 place and being used. But once you go beyond that
4 and start building hangars farther to the north it
5 would go away.

6 MR. CLARKE: There is no structures or
7 residences on it right now or in the future? It
8 would just be --

9 MR. SINGLETARY: Yes. It would be
10 redundant --

11 MR. CLARKE: Seen with the new Casa Cola Road?

12 MR. SINGLETARY: Yes. So it is intended it
13 would go away. I guess my point is it doesn't have
14 to go away immediately for this first kind of
15 development to start.

16 MR. CLARKE: Okay. Thank you.

17 MR. SINGLETARY: Sure. This is the basic
18 option.

19 Go to the next slide. So what we are
20 referring to is the full build option. It's not a
21 ton different. But it's just a different version
22 of the roadway that would be more able to
23 accommodate the future development to the south and
24 the north. It has this traffic circle element
25 which we showed you a rendering back earlier this

1 year. So it has that involved. It also does
2 include that extra turn -- dedicated turn lane on
3 U.S. One. And it includes the other items that I
4 already talked about as far as what we would
5 envision the scope.

6 So opposite the other one this one is capable
7 of -- we believe intended and capable of serving
8 the full build out of what we would envision for
9 all the different non-aviation items.

10 One other thing just to mention, I didn't say
11 it in the last one, the green in this is the
12 wetlands that were delineated. So you can see in
13 the last one it didn't overlay the footprint at
14 all. This one it has a little bit overlap down
15 there on the traffic circle. So in addition to,
16 you know, the concerns that I've already mentioned
17 from the soil investigation and everything this one
18 does actually have a little bit of an additional
19 because you are actually overlapping on your
20 roadway footprint.

21 So some initial looks at probable costs that
22 would be remaining in the project from this point
23 forward rough order of magnitude type of costs.
24 The basic options one and a half to two million,
25 full build options 1.75 to 2.25. So about a

1 quarter million more. This does not include any
2 wetland mitigation costs that might be incurred.
3 Also the work I talked about on U.S. One it does
4 not include any of that. Those are definitely
5 significant costs where it really would be great to
6 get that additional funding we were talking about
7 to help cover all of that. If any of that is
8 needed -- definitely the three hundred to six
9 hundred talking about U.S. One turn lane and median
10 that is needed. You have the signalization that
11 would be another big cost. But funding through
12 Florida DEO or County is a possibility.

13 To date the cost that's already accounted for
14 the work that I'm describing to you now to be
15 complete the five or six different subs, plus
16 Passero coordinating it, that's the cost that's
17 already been, that's not included in the money
18 above, but that's what is already in the project
19 now about \$100,000. There is the main grant
20 funding this project now. And as it has been
21 planned for is FDOT-PTGA grant and total of 1.28
22 million total funded project cost.

23 so Obviously based on these numbers we're
24 thrown out as estimates we're above that. So the
25 best path forward could be great if the money we're

1 talking about comes through from the nonstandard
2 sources. There are some things we can do to put in
3 alternates into the bid. Some value engineering
4 possibly down the road to help bring the project
5 within cost. But that's kind of where stand on
6 that. Go ahead.

7 MR. OLSON: On funding this could be something
8 that could be funded under tax increment financing
9 given the commercial development that is key to the
10 road. And the reason I bring that up is that the
11 example that I am most familiar with in this
12 jurisdiction of the county is the Vilano Road
13 improvements which was road and storm and sewer
14 that was tax increment financing through the
15 county. You know, basically the county issues
16 bonds and services those bonds with tax revenue
17 coming from the development that these improvements
18 would allow to happen. And the great thing would
19 be if it could be done like Vilano is that the
20 county essentially fronts the money and fronts the
21 bond servicing payments and then with the hope that
22 the tax -- the actual tax revenue will come into
23 play to be able to fund the balance of the bond
24 retirement as well as make up what the county put
25 in first. I don't know if I'm explaining it well.

1 But tax increment financing is on the books in
2 Florida. And it can't really be used too well with
3 some of the other things we're doing. But with --
4 if it is key to a commercial project that generates
5 significant tax revenue, restaurants, hotel,
6 whatever, that could be a tool that could be done
7 here. The county has experience in it. So...

8 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Thank you.

9 Any other questions for Matt?

10 Great presentation.

11 MR. SINGLETARY: One more slide real quick.

12 Sorry about that.

13 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: I am cutting you off there.

14 MR. SINGLETARY: The next big question is, you
15 know, where we go from here.

16 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Yeah.

17 MR. SINGLETARY: It's not a question. So the
18 next step would be -- so this was basically a
19 conceptual design type investigation. The next
20 step is going to the final design and bid documents
21 and permitting. One of the things that we're
22 asking input from you-all on is if you have
23 thoughts on the basic versus the full build out
24 option, design option that we presented.

25 But overall timeline we would be looking at if

1 we were approved and moved forward with, you know,
2 completing the design and bidding this project
3 we're looking at the middle of 2025 likely for
4 having bids and then, you know, all that in hand
5 targeted construction, you know, closer to the end
6 of the year, fall. That's all I've got.

7 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Okay. Very good.

8 Questions?

9 MS. LIOTTA: I've got a couple of questions on
10 mitigation.

11 MR. SINGLETARY: Yes. Sure.

12 MS. LIOTTA: There was just like that little
13 piece that was overlapping with the road. So it
14 would be just that, that would be the portion that
15 would require mitigation credits for the project or
16 would it extend like is there like a buffer?

17 MR. SINGLETARY: Yeah, I guess that is kind of
18 what I am saying is we don't have the design fully
19 developed yet to know where. Like I am saying you
20 might raise the site a little bit, and you've got
21 fill that comes out a little ways. So you would
22 have probably a little bit of overlap or
23 potentially the whole thing with the groundwater
24 being high if you had pipes in the ground, or, you
25 know, designed to draw the groundwater down. They

1 also sort of drain the wetland. And the permitting
2 agency would look at that and call that an impact
3 as well. So there are some impacts that I think
4 would be occurring. But I don't have a quantity on
5 what that is.

6 MR. HOLESKO: That would not be the entire
7 green area. I think most importantly we are not
8 planning on mitigating all that green there. It
9 would be the smallest amount possible.

10 MR. SINGLETARY: Yeah, we would try to keep it
11 at a minimum. We don't consider it extensive.

12 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: At this point we don't even
13 know that it could be a traffic circle.

14 MS. LIOTTA: Yeah, I am thinking ahead to I
15 think that was the area where most of that green is
16 was where there is a proposed hotel project.

17 MR. SINGLETARY: Yes.

18 MS. LIOTTA: So that would be a driver of
19 taxes, and revenue and jobs and all those good
20 things, but there is also a lot of wetlands there.
21 So it's just good to understand kind of what we're
22 looking at so the last discussion was a lot of
23 interest in putting out an RFP.

24 MR. SINGLETARY: Uh-huh.

25 MS. LIOTTA: But that would put the mitigation

1 on whoever takes that land lease and I don't even
2 know how likely -- how feasible it is for someone
3 to get that amount of mitigation credits to do an
4 actual project there. My understanding these are
5 not easy to get credits. And I also understand
6 that not every -- an area is not the end of the
7 story. There is like degrees of wetlands. So that
8 may be more information to have is that site so
9 impacted by wetlands. Like what would a potential
10 development there require in like actual mitigation
11 credits. Because that's going to --

12 MR. HOLESKO: So two things on that. So the
13 first is we can actually try to establish a scoring
14 right now to determine -- to make all that green go
15 away what would the mitigation be. We can
16 determine that.

17 And secondly if the time came similar to your
18 previous hotel developer, if they came to the
19 Airport Authority and wanted to develop that on
20 your land it would most likely still be that the
21 Airport Authority was going to be the entity going
22 to the wetland mitigation bank and try to get the
23 mitigation access to the credits, but they would
24 pay the bill. You have a little more standing with
25 the mitigation bank where you might be able to get

1 the credit easier than they could. But they would
2 have to pay the bill.

3 MR. LIOTTA: I think it may be useful to just
4 gaging wise, because these things also impact each
5 other, like how much mitigation is needed because
6 if it's -- where is it to the point where that may
7 actually impact where the road should go because if
8 that's something really not so developable maybe it
9 makes sense to maximize land use somewhere else in
10 that constrained area. So I really, you know, if
11 we decide where to put the road not understanding
12 what we can build on either side of it or what's
13 likely to be buildable we may miss an opportunity
14 to get the best placement.

15 MR. HOLESKO: I think that's one of the tasks
16 we need to do then is identify the mitigation
17 credit specific value. And that will assign the
18 dollar value also.

19 MR. CLARKE: Just one more question. Do we
20 have -- can we mitigate ourself, self-mitigate by
21 finding another area that we own?

22 MR. HOLESKO: You can, Dennis. But we talked
23 about that in the past. The amount of land that --
24 the amount of land, the ratio that you have to give
25 up to get the wetland mitigation credit it's just

1 such a large ratio. And, again, we are still
2 talking east of U.S. One.

3 MR. CLARKE: Right.

4 MR. HOLESKO: So we are not on the west area
5 of Big Oak. We're still on that same basin, the
6 east side of the runway. We're east of U.S. One.
7 You just have limited land value. You are not --
8 we don't believe give up something with a high,
9 high ratio development. Probably not feasible.

10 MR. CLARKE: I have to agree. Mr. Olson did a
11 good job in explaining the tax implications, the
12 marginal tax. It works -- if any of us live in
13 Community Development Districts. I know Jose lives
14 in one. I live in one. The CDD works the same
15 way. It's a tax. But it's calculated. So if we
16 know what the costs are we could build it into our
17 ground waste as a line item on what we charge.
18 There would be a component for debt service. There
19 could be a component for wetland mitigation. And
20 maybe the cost goes from a dollar per square foot
21 to two dollars per square foot, or whatever that
22 is. But that could be built into the calculations.

23 MR. OLSON: The only difference between the
24 tax increment financing and the CDD, the big
25 difference is that the CDD the end users pay for

1 the bonds.

2 MR. CLARKE: Right. Passes through.

3 MR. OLSON: With tax increment financing there
4 is no additional levy against end users. It's
5 simply paid out of the tax revenue for the county.
6 In the practice of Vilano Road they accept the
7 difference until the taxes are sufficient to fully
8 pay them.

9 MR. CLARKE: We would have to build it into
10 what we charge the tenant, you know, the lessee.
11 And then if it would come in as revenue and be
12 passed on pay the debt service.

13 MR. OLSON: The new hotels along Vilano Road
14 are not paying an additional levy under tax
15 increment financing. But, you know, it's the same
16 concept for us.

17 MR. CLARKE: Yeah, it can be worked out.

18 MS. LIOTTA: I have got one more question or
19 maybe it can't be answered today. But my
20 understanding is that mitigation credits are
21 extremely limited. So even if you have the funds
22 you may have to wait to be eligible to buy them.
23 So we've got this hotel plot, you know, for
24 shorthand, that area where we now know it's 2.5
25 acres.

1 MR. HOLESKO: Some on the other side, too.

2 MS. LIOTTA: But we don't know exactly what
3 that takes credit wise, the value of that
4 mitigation credit is.

5 Do we know what the mitigation total value is
6 for the north side because it's like may also be
7 like when we're trying to determine which project
8 to do first, you know, even if we had all the
9 money, are we going -- should we be planning things
10 based on timeline of when we can even get the
11 credits to do the project.

12 MR. HOLESKO: You know the total number on the
13 east side, right?

14 MR. SINGLETARY: We do. That was basically
15 twelve and a half, twelve and a third, twelve
16 seventy-five. Something like that. I think it was
17 twelve and a half.

18 MR. HOLESKO: We know the total number for the
19 east side of runway, everything you see on the
20 screen. We could talk to the mitigation bank and
21 find out when is their ability to produce the
22 balance of the credits for the east side and come
23 back and give you -- and let you know the answer
24 for that, as well as the mitigation credits that we
25 need for that site, that would give us guidance on

1 what type of timeframe are we talking about.

2 MR. OLSON: How far north does our drainage
3 basin go?

4 MR. HOLESKO: All the way to, I believe, Ponte
5 Vedra, really far.

6 MR. OLSON: Okay. The other thing we can do
7 is hope that someone else gets into this mitigation
8 credit creation business other than one bank, one
9 bank. I put quotes around it.

10 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Anything else? We are right
11 on time. We are two hours.

12 MR. SINGLETARY: We just want to ask one more
13 time if anybody has any thoughts on, you know, the
14 two lanes simpler basic option versus the
15 roundabout.

16 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Okay.

17 MS. LIOTTA: I think --

18 MR. SINGLETARY: Kind of what you already
19 said?

20 MS. LIOTTA: Yeah, I think I've already
21 expressed my anxiety about the whole wetland issue.

22 MR. SINGLETARY: Yeah.

23 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Thank you, Matt. That was
24 very good.

25 MR. SINGLETARY: Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Any others questions?

2 So we can have brief board comments. So I
3 don't have any comments because -- actually our
4 comments are did we participate in any board --
5 public comments, Matt.

6 MR. LIOTTA: You didn't do public comment yet.

7 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Would like to do public
8 comment?

9 MR. LIOTTA: I would.

10 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Okay. Please do.

11 (Agenda Item - Public Comment)

12 MR. LIOTTA: The board wouldn't mind if we
13 could pull up one of those maps about the east side
14 plan it might be easier to have context visually.

15 While that's happening. I do want to say what
16 both Mr. Clarke and Mr. Olson were saying the about
17 tax credits, while those are different, the great
18 thing is that either way the airport doesn't have
19 to pay for it and gets the benefit. So let's
20 definitely find a way to do that.

21 We need something with the future development
22 of the east side. That one -- maybe you know which
23 slide it is.

24 MR. HOLESKO: Bottom DEO one. Next one.
25 There you go.

1 MR. LIOTTA: So when you look at this you'll
2 see that there is this new structures that are
3 listed here. One thing I want to point out is that
4 this stuff and I know it was all conceptual and not
5 final, is going over an existing ground lease that
6 is with the airport until 2034. We as in Modern
7 Air recently acquired that parcel, the ground
8 leases, et cetera, and so there has been a history
9 at the airport, I think it affected Atlantic before
10 like where the commercial hangar got developed on
11 top of a ground lease and then there was issues.
12 And, you know, ultimately it kind of ended up in a
13 situation with Atlantic getting control over the
14 commercial hangar and this, you know, Roberts over
15 on the east side. And from my point of view I just
16 want to like sure that we're making sure that any
17 commitments that the airport already has in terms
18 of leases are, you know, brought in as a
19 stakeholder to help work together, because, you
20 know, we're not necessarily stuck on that
21 particular ground lease as it's done now. We see
22 the opportunity to make some changes, maybe even
23 build some additional structures in different
24 places. And I think that not only can we be
25 helpful in terms of moving things around to achieve

1 the best result of the airport but I think there is
2 opportunity for us to improve the amount of square
3 footage that we would have under lease from the
4 airport.

5 So I just wanted to make sure everybody is
6 aware that these ground leases do exist in a
7 previous photo like if you see where that straight
8 line is right now I think that's depicting a
9 roadway from the new road with a pipe you go like
10 over to the wetland mitigation slide what you'll
11 see is an aerial -- the wetland slide, yes. Yeah,
12 so when you look at the aerial you see there is
13 actually, you know, stuff there. That's actually a
14 parking lot, an office, et cetera, right where
15 there is this proposed access way in there. So,
16 again, we want to be helpful. We want to work with
17 the airport and help develop the east side. We all
18 benefit from more developed east side. And, you
19 know, we just want to make sure we're participants
20 in this process. Thanks.

21 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Thank you.

22 MR. PITTMAN: If I may, Madam Chairman, can I
23 respond?

24 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Yes please.

25 MR. PITTMAN: Hold on. Just one second,

1 Mr. Liotta.

2 All right. So speaking on what you just spoke
3 about. So I talked to a member of your staff last
4 week and we had that exact same conversation.
5 Where he talked about that parking lot that you see
6 over to the north side of it and we were in
7 discussions of making some moves. So those
8 dialogues have already begun. So we're not just
9 stepping over and just taking -- we're not in the
10 habit of taking somebody's land. That's not what
11 we are doing.

12 MR. LIOTTA: I apologize. I didn't mean to
13 imply that. I wanted to make sure the board were
14 aware.

15 MR. PITTMAN: So I'm making sure that everyone
16 is privy to what we have done as an airport
17 authority. So in reference to that land you are
18 referring to I talked to a member of your staff and
19 they were proposing an exchange. And so we are not
20 at a point where anything is in writing. Just a
21 preliminary conversation.

22 So, like I said, nothing -- no moves have been
23 made yet, but the conversation, the willingness to
24 talk are there.

25 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Thank you, Courtney.

1 Jose, yes.

2 MR. RIERA: Just a quick comment in the
3 interest of time and it has to do with the
4 executive search for the executive director. Do
5 you all like Hallmark Movies?

6 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Pardon me.

7 MR. RIERA: The Hallmark Movies. Do you know
8 what the premise of the Hallmark Movie is?

9 You have somebody looking for love, you know,
10 and looking for the person. In the meantime that
11 person is having some sidekick around here and then
12 when all is said and done they realize, oh, the
13 person they're looking for is really next to them.
14 So just remember that. Just remember that when
15 you're looking for an executive director, because
16 we've been doing a lot of work around here. So
17 Mr. Perfect might not be out there, but may be next
18 to you, you know. And this is not a bias opinion.
19 This is just my perception of what's going on.
20 Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Very good advice. Very good
22 advice.

23 Will there be any other public comment? Then
24 I will have board comment.

25 MR. PITTMAN: I wanted to acknowledge the

1 county that was here and they stepped out.

2 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: I know. I'm sorry we didn't
3 get Mr. Dean to talk or Scott Maynard. Did he
4 leave?

5 MR. PITTMAN: There is a reason why they were
6 here early to talk about the roads and everything
7 that we've been discussing today. They set up the
8 meeting on their one.

9 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Kim Kendall.

10 MR. PITTMAN: And the County is very willing
11 to help us. We have one sitting over there in the
12 corner. I didn't catch your name from earlier. So
13 they are willing to partner up with us.

14 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: That's good.

15 MR. PITTMAN: So as long as we drive the ship
16 the correct way.

17 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Well, we are looking for
18 love in all the right places.

19 (Agenda Item - Board Member Comments.)

20 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: All right. Briefly board
21 comment which is usually our meetings to report on.

22 I did not have a TPO meeting. So...

23 MR. OLSON: I just want to say that was a very
24 nice groundbreaking event. I know a number of
25 people were involved and supporting it. But it was

1 very nicely done. And my only disappointment was I
2 went by the site of the groundbreaking today and
3 the equipment was sitting idly. No construction
4 activity yet.

5 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: You wanted it to be
6 digging --

7 MR. OLSON: Yeah.

8 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: -- right now. You wanted to
9 break ground.

10 MR. PITTMAN: You and me both.

11 MR. OLSON: Construction is underway.

12 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Very good. Very good.
13 Thank you, Bob.

14 Jennifer, do you have any comments? Any
15 meetings that you've had?

16 MS. LIOTTA: Yes, I don't have any real
17 committees, but I do just want to reiterate that
18 looking forward to moving the process for the
19 executive director search along. I do think that
20 we're all stuck in a little bit of a limbo. You
21 know, it's going to be harder to recruit people, I
22 think, if someone is going to be coming in, well, I
23 could have a new boss in three months. Especially
24 I know Dennis here in particular really wanted, and
25 rightly so, you know, focused on the finances of

1 the airport. There are a lot of decisions to make
2 for years and years to come and being able to have
3 like that financial expertise in-house is, I think,
4 really vital. But, you know, I think we're -- the
5 dominoes are sort of lined up. And make no mistake
6 I would be fully supportive if, you know, the
7 consensus of the board was to offer the job to
8 Mr. Pittman. I think he has exhibited some grace
9 under fire, you know, as an interim director. And
10 I really, really appreciate the work he is doing
11 even though sometimes I get a little heated in my
12 calls and I apologize for that.

13 MR. PITTMAN: That's business.

14 MS. LIOTTA: And but I do think it's a
15 resolution and a clear timeline that we all agree
16 on and adhere to. Because I think we've had some
17 confusion, people having different understandings
18 of what the process is going to look like.
19 Different expectations of how long it should take.
20 And, yes, I think just being really clear with each
21 other and coming together to agree that this is
22 what we're going to do and hold ourselves
23 accountable to do it, I think, is in the best
24 interest of the staff, the airport, the community.
25 You know, we've had no long term executive

1 director. No -- you know, for like I mentioned
2 earlier in the meeting 600 days plus. I think that
3 it's to the point where it is detrimental to the
4 airport for us to become kind of stuck in that
5 situation regardless of who the executive director
6 ultimately ends up being. So I'm really excited to
7 see us move forward with that.

8 One last thing. We did agree on having a
9 special meeting for the executive director search
10 because I think we all agreed that was important.
11 And I think we voted on that and I know it got
12 canceled. Hurricanes do occur. But I think that
13 we should -- I believe we should either plan on an
14 extended regular meeting in lieu of rescheduling
15 that or rescheduling it so that we can give this
16 topic the time it deserves without taking away from
17 the rest of the business of the airport that we
18 also need to attend to.

19 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Good. Thank you.

20 We will come out with a notice on that.

21 Anything else, Dennis, briefly?

22 MR. CLARKE: Yeah, I would like to inform
23 Mr. Singletary I am in favor of the full build out.
24 I think we'll figure it out how to fund it after we
25 build it, you know. Don't worry about that. Let's

1 go for it.

2 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Thank you.

3 Ms. Cash-Chapman.

4 MS. CASH-CHAPMAN: I just want to make sure we
5 have on the next agenda that we are going to come
6 up with a way to instruct our engineers in which
7 options we want to move forward with. I just want
8 to make sure it makes it to the agenda so that we
9 don't lose it in the hustle and bustle of all the
10 wonderful things we are working on.

11 I think we did an awesome job. Staff did
12 amazing with the groundbreaking. I'm really happy
13 about it.

14 We are going to have to relive the moment
15 because we missed Jennifer and we also missed a
16 group picture of just the board. So we are all
17 going to dress the same.

18 MS. LIOTTA: Continuity.

19 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Yeah. Dennis, that's it?

20 MR. CLARKE: That's it.

21 CHAIRMAN LUDLOW: Okay. If there no other
22 comments then, yes, it is now 6:14. 15 minutes
23 over. So I will adjourn the meeting.

24 Meeting is adjourned.

25

1 (Thereupon, at 6:15 p.m. the meeting was
2 concluded.)
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

The State of Florida)
County of St. Johns)

I, Laura Dwyer Pierle, Court Reporter, do hereby certify that I was authorized to and did report the above meeting in stenotype; and that the foregoing pages numbered from 1 to 120, inclusive, are a true and correct transcription of my stenotype notes taken during said meeting.

I further certify that I am not attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel of party connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.

The foregoing certification of this transcript does not apply to any reproduction of the same by any means unless under the direct control and/or direction of the certifying reporter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 8th day of November, 2024.

Laura Dwyer Pierle, Notary
Public, in and for the State
of Florida at large.
My Commission Expires
10/26/28
My Commission #HH 053319

