1	T2	<b>AUGUSTINE -</b>	T2	IOHNS	COUNTY	AIRPORT	AUTHORITY
1	$\mathbf{o}_{\mathbf{I}}$ .	TOOUSILLE -	OI.	JOILING	COUNTI	лич окт	лония

2	Regular Meeting
3	held at 4796 U.S. 1 North
4	St. Augustine, Florida
5	on Monday, July 17, 2006
6	from 4:01 p.m. to 6:43 p.m.
7	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
8	BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:
9	BOB COX, Chairman
10	WAYNE GEORGE, Secretary-Treasurer RANDY BRUNSON
11	JOHN "JACK" GORMAN
	BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:
12	SUZANNE GREEN
13	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
14	
	ALSO PRESENT:
15	
16	DOUG BURNETT, Esquire, Rogers, Towers, Bailey, Jones & Gay, P.A., 170 Malaga Street, St. Augustine,
	FL, 32084, Attorney for Airport Authority.
17	EDWARD WUELLNER, A.A.E., Executive Director.
18	BRYAN COOPER, Assistant Airport Director.
19	

G. Mr. David Knight - ATCT Tower

12 7. MEMBER COMMITTEE REPORTS

13	A. MPO	11
	B. EDC	13
14	C. Intergovernmental	13
15	8. PROJECT UPDATES	14
16	9. ACTION ITEMS	
17	A. Budget Discussion & Se B. EDC & IDC - Public Indu	
18	C. T-Hangar Design - Passo	
	D. Resolutions 2006-03, 04,	& 05 FDOT JPA's 75
19	E. Terminal Rehab - Stair &	_
20	F. Executive Director's Perfo	ormance Review 92
20	10. HOUSEKEEPING ITEMS	148
21	10. HOUSEREEI HOUTENIS	140
	11. PUBLIC COMMENT	149
22		
23		
24		
25		
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REC	GULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
		3
		-
1	INDEX (Cont'd.)	
2		PAGE
3	12. AUTHORITY MEMBER I	REPORTS:
4	A. Mr. Randy Brunson	149
	B. Ms. Suzanne Green	Absent
5	C. Mr. John Gorman	149
	D. Mr. Wayne George, Secre	etary-Treasurer 150

6	E. Mr. Bob Cox, Chairman	151	
7	13. NEXT MEETING DATES	& ADJOURNMENT	152
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	CHAIRMAN COX: Ladies and gentlemen, like to
3	call this meeting to order, the July 17th regular
4	Airport Authority meeting.
5	Our first order of business, please, will be
6	the Pledge of Allegiance.
7	(Pledge of Allegiance.)
8	CHAIRMAN COX: Thank you.
9	3 APPROVAL OF MINUTES
10	CHAIRMAN COX: Approval of the minutes for
11	the last meeting. Are there any exceptions to the
12	minutes of the last meeting?
13	MR. BRUNSON: I move we approve.
14	MR. GEORGE: I moved, also. I second.
15	CHAIRMAN COX: Meeting minutes approved from
16	the last meeting, hearing no hearing no
17	objections. Financial report for June.
18	4 APPROVAL OF FINANCIAL REPORT
19	MR. GEORGE: From the secretary from the
20	treasurer's standpoint, it looks fine to me.

21 CHAIRMAN COX: They look fine? Okay. We 22 will consider those approved, financial reports 23 approved for June. 5. - APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA 24 25 CHAIRMAN COX: Agenda approval. Any AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006 5 1 exceptions or additions to the agenda for this 2 meeting? 3 MR. WUELLNER: I -- I have a request by one of your board members, Mr. Gorman, who is going to 4 5 be delayed in getting here, to move the item 6 pertaining to the T-hangar layout to the last 7 item. 8 CHAIRMAN COX: T-hangar to the last. 9 MR. WUELLNER: It is currently the third 10 item. MR. GEORGE: I'd like to move it to the first 11 12 if he's not going to be here.

MR. WUELLNER: Well, that's up to you guys,

- but I -- I promised I'd ask.
- MR. BRUNSON: I have no problem with that.
- 16 CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. We'll move that down
- one, if you will remind me, Mr. Director, because
- 18 I'm -- I've got some other notes here on this
- agenda that I have. So, we'll move that down to
- the last item.
- MR. WUELLNER: Okay. It's not in order on
- 22 the slides, either, so that will help.
- 23 CHAIRMAN COX: Actually, you can switch it
- around real quick on the slide -- no.
- 25 MR. WUELLNER: I can, actually.

- 1 CHAIRMAN COX: Agenda approval. Okay. So,
- 2 the agenda is approved with one -- one movement,
- 3 then.
- 4 Reports. Mr. Bryant?
- 5 6.A. COUNTY COMMISSIONER
- 6 MR. BRYANT: No report.

7 CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. Thank you very much. 8 Mr. Slingluff? 9 6.B. - GALAXY AVIATION 10 MR. SLINGLUFF: No report. 11 CHAIRMAN COX: Thank you. Mr. Nehring? Northrop Grumman? 12 13 6.C. - GRUMMAN ST. AUGUSTINE 14 (Representative not present). 15 CHAIRMAN COX: Mr. Roderick? 16 6.D. - S.A.P.A. 17 MR. RODERICK: Mr. Chairman, I have two 18 items, and members of the board. We held a 19 S.A.P.A. quarterly dinner last Saturday night to honor the air show performers. It was a good 20 party. And needs to be noted that they donated 21 22 their time, talent to ensure the success of the 23 air show. And they duly deserve that honor. 24 Number two, I want to reiterate that the 25 position of the club is to preserve the trees in

### AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006

1 the T-hangar area. If it -- if it comes push to 2 shove to -- to add two or three hangars and tear 3 down a tree, or even move it at this late point, 4 our position is save the tree. Thank you. CHAIRMAN COX: Well taken, sir. Thanks very 5 6 much. Mr. Ottesen? 7 6.E. - F. A. C. T. 8 (Representative not present.) 9 CHAIRMAN COX: Not in attendance. 10 Mr. Burnett? 11 6.F. - AIRPORT ATTORNEY MR. BURNETT: A couple of things very 12 briefly. 13 One, we -- we've worked on a couple of issues 14 15 involving the County this month, and I just wanted to let you know -- and I probably should have done 16 17 it last month, at last meeting, as well. Our 18 County liaison, Jim Bryant's been very helpful in getting us information and working through some 19

issues with us. So, I figured I'd make y'all

21	aware of that.
22	And another matter that I have been working
23	on is there's a development of property owned by
24	Flagler Development that they are looking to
25	develop property to the west of U.S. 1 and north
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
	8
1	
1	of here north of the airport's industrial
2	property. It's designated under the Comprehensive
3	Plan as a it has a commercial designation.
4	I'm not sure exactly what the plan of
5	development is. But one thing that they have
6	approached us with, I think myself and and Ed
7	Wuellner, on a staff level, is for us to take a
8	look at an avigation easement that they would
9	probably be proposing as part of their
10	development.
11	It is going to be a large development, as it
12	will be a DRI, Development of Regional Impact.
13	And there's one small access issue that they may

14	need related to obtaining access to their site
15	through airport-related property, not a long-term
16	access, but potentially a temporary access.
17	CHAIRMAN COX: Construction access or
18	something?
19	MR. BURNETT: And so, I I don't have much
20	detail other than that issue probably will be
21	coming before you at some point in time in the
22	future, those two things, the avigation easement
23	and this access issue.
24	MR. GEORGE: How many houses are they or
25	whatever they're planning up there?
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
1	MR. BURNETT: Honestly, I don't know the
2	details on the development.
3	MR. GEORGE: To become a DRI, it's got to be
4	more than a thousand or more than
5	MR. BURNETT: Well, it it you have

different thresholds. It could be more than

7	400,000 square feet of commercial space, and then
8	it trips the DRI threshold, or rooftops for houses
9	trips the DRI threshold, or a combination of the
10	two.
11	CHAIRMAN COX: Can you keep us in the loop
12	when you get information on it?
13	MR. BURNETT: Absolutely. And I would
14	CHAIRMAN COX: Because that will be
15	MR. BURNETT: I would think, based on recent
16	discussions with their lawyer, that we'll probably
17	have something to you next month.
18	CHAIRMAN COX: All right. Very good. Is
19	that it for you?
20	MR. BURNETT: That's it.
21	CHAIRMAN COX: Okay.
22	MR. BURNETT: Yes, sir.
23	CHAIRMAN COX: Mr. Knight?
24	6.G ATCT
25	MR. WUELLNER: Not here, but we have his

- CHAIRMAN COX: There's Buzz's chart.
   MR. GEORGE: Yeah.
- 3 MR. WUELLNER: Last month, it was 8857, in
- 4 terms of ops. You can see how that compares to
- 5 2003, '04, '05 and '06; more than '03, less than
- 6 2004 and 2005. General consensus is it still has
- 7 a lot to do with the overall price of fuel and
- 8 reduction of general aviation activity, especially
- 9 the avgas side of it, which is doing touch-and-go
- 10 kind of traffic.
- MR. GEORGE: But you need to also point out
- that it is in line with the forecast that we put
- in the Master Plan.
- MR. WUELLNER: It's --
- MR. GEORGE: Even though it's off a little
- bit, it's in line with that, right?
- MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. It's still at or above
- the 2008 forecast numbers --
- 19 MR. GEORGE: Yeah.
- MR. WUELLNER: -- so you're still two years
- 21 ahead of --

- 22 CHAIRMAN COX: Very good. Is that all he
- 23 has?
- MR. WUELLNER: Yes.
- 25 CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. Let's go to --

- 1 MR. WUELLNER: I think we also just -- we
- 2 gave you -- as a part of your package, we give you
- 3 the activity summary. The FAA form gets copied
- 4 into your agenda packages, which shows the
- 5 day-by-day activity of the --
- 6 CHAIRMAN COX: Oh, fine.
- 7 MR. WUELLNER: -- of the tower, and breaks it
- 8 down by aircraft type. It's just a copy of what
- 9 he submits to FAA monthly.
- 10 CHAIRMAN COX: I kind of like the way Flagler
- 11 airport --
- MR. WUELLNER: I can get you directions.
- 13 CHAIRMAN COX: Member committee reports.
- 14 MPO, please.

15	7.A MPO
16	MR. BRUNSON: MPO, we had a special meeting
17	early this morning in Jacksonville with the MPO,
18	and mainly, the large team that staff lists the
19	priority projects for the next five years. And
20	instead of boring everyone with going over these
21	things, this is available (indicating), if anyone
22	would like to know the list of priorities for the
23	surrounding counties and including St. Johns
24	County. It's very interesting.
25	And also, it lists that they allowed the
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
1	Aimont Authonity and the board and Ed to list our
1	Airport Authority and the board and Ed to list our
2	priorities locally of what we think we need to do
3	next, and that could change daily, almost.
4	The other thing is that we'll you'll start
5	hearing more about with the MPO is the
6	transportation system that we continue to work on
7	through Jacksonville Transit Authority in

23

24

8	surrounding counties.
9	So, MPO is doing well and and has a lot of
10	support from the Department of Transportation, and
11	taking our recommendations, and am really pleased
12	to say that it's well worth our money to belong to
13	that. That's about it for the MPO.
14	CHAIRMAN COX: Yes, sir.
15	MR. GEORGE: How well do our priorities stack
16	up to the other counties? You know, that was one
17	of the concerns
18	MR. BRUNSON: Yeah. Even even that was
19	mentioned today, that we haven't got some like
20	grants for greenway, bike paths, and maybe as some
21	other people have. And so, we're on the agenda to

receive those fundings. And we're well in line,

thanks to -- thanks to Bruce Maguire and you and

MR. GEORGE: Sounds good.

me and in -- in the past years.

## AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006

I	CHAIRMAN COX: Very good. EDC, please.
2	7.B EDC
3	MR. GEORGE: EDC is going to be making us a
4	presentation. It's on the agenda item, so we'll
5	just let them
6	CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. That's fine.
7	Intergovernmental.
8	7.C INTERGOVERNMENTAL
9	MR. WUELLNER: I attended Intergovernmental
10	since the elected none of the elected officials
11	showed up. The
12	MR. GEORGE: Oh.
13	MR. BRUNSON: No.
14	MR. WUELLNER: I have no vote on that
15	committee, because I am not elected. But the
16	CHAIRMAN COX: I didn't remember appointing
17	you. That's
18	MR. WUELLNER: Exactly. But since they hold
19	the meetings here, it was it was easy.
20	CHAIRMAN COX: Okay.
21	MR. WUELLNER: I can't think of a thing that

22	was accomplished. They they
23	CHAIRMAN COX: Well, then we'll move forward
24	into project updates.
25	MR. BRUNSON: We needed to have some elected
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
	14
1	officials here and we could have really done
2	something.
3	MR. WUELLNER: That's what I'm thinking.
4	CHAIRMAN COX: Thanks, Ed. Project updates?
5	8 PROJECT UPDATES
6	MR. WUELLNER: Yes, sir. Projects that
7	that we have on the list to talk about today, some
8	of which are additional agenda items later, is the
9	south hangar development area; the T-hangar
10	development; hangars 8, 9 and 10; marketing and
11	public relations; and airport leasing activities.
12	First project is Taxiway F and the apron,
13	which is the heart and soul, for lack of better
14	terms, of the south development area. And I do

15	have the pleasure of telling you today that they
16	have identified at this point, "they" being FAA,
17	approximately \$1.5 million to begin the
18	construction of the access down there that will
19	eventually provide the T-hangar access and lead
20	to, long term, maybe, the development of a second
21	FBO and additional types of hangars.
22	This is the kind of launch project for being
23	able to build T-hangars and and the like. This
24	is substantially short. In fact, it's about 33
25	percent of the total requested of FAA. We are
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
	15
1	being told that by the end of August, the balance
2	of the funds should be made available to us.
3	At this point, we are not executing or
4	anticipating executing the grant with FAA until
5	toward the end of August. It's FAA's preference

that we wait until all of the money is there and

then execute a single grant, rather than open up

6

- 8 multiple grants for smaller amounts. It just
- 9 saves a lot of paperwork and commingling of
- project elements.
- So, with any luck toward mid-September, we
- should be in a position to begin construction down
- there. So, that's the time line that's on right
- 14 now.
- MR. GEORGE: How long -- once we start
- 16 construction, how long are you looking at?
- MR. WUELLNER: It is a six-month contract
- 18 period.
- 19 MR. GEORGE: Okay.
- MR. WUELLNER: So, the infrastructure should
- be done within six months. If you get August,
- that's what, the end of February?
- MR. GEORGE: So, we'll have it by Super Bowl.
- MR. WUELLNER: I'm sorry. August --
- 25 September, when -- if you start -- Super Bowl --

1	MR. GEORGE: Everything seems to tie around
2	the Super Bowl or the PGA.
3	MR. WUELLNER: Some Super Bowl, yeah. You
4	should be usable by the
5	CHAIRMAN COX: By the next Super Bowl.
6	MR. WUELLNER: Next Super Bowl, yeah.
7	T-hangars related to that, as we as I
8	mentioned, we've got an agenda item related to
9	that. Engineering is underway. At your request,
10	we're bringing back the 10 percent plans, which is
11	basically the site layout plan related to that,
12	and for your concurrence today, and that will be,
13	again, the item we moved to the end of the agenda
14	today.
15	CHAIRMAN COX: Right.
16	MR. WUELLNER: And, of course, the schedule
17	for developing that is somewhat tied to the FAA
18	job, but because we took the initiative with your
19	approval, we have and begun the engineering on
20	the infrastructure, as well as the hangars
21	themselves. We're optimistic that within a month
22	or two of beginning the physical construction down

- 23 there of the taxiway, we should be in the same
- kind of position with the T-hangar buildings
- 25 themselves, so --

- 1 MR. BRUNSON: That'd be great.
- 2 MR. WUELLNER: -- we'll -- we'll have
- 3 shortened the time line I think significantly in
- 4 getting into hangars at the -- at the conclusion
- 5 of the taxiway back there, taxiway and apron. And
- 6 we'll update those schedules as -- as the dates
- 7 get really certain here in the next six to eight
- 8 weeks.
- 9 And next project to talk about is 8, 9, and
- 10 10. It's my understanding the permits are final,
- finally. And the site work is in a limited
- fashion underway. We're basically awaiting FPL at
- this point, which is supposedly about a two-week
- or less lead time at this point, to relocate a
- transformer or two out there on that job site.

16	Once those are relocated, then construction will
17	begin in earnest and we'll see things happening
18	pretty rapidly there to conclusion.
19	That's also a six-month construction time so,
20	you know, I would think not too long after the
21	first of the year, that should be in a position to
22	be occupied. And that's the three three-unit
23	single building over between the PGA hangar on the
24	eastside and the Sheriff's hangar facility there.
25	So, if you're trying to orient yourself, it's off
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
1	of Taxiway Alpha 2 in the eastside corporate
2	hangar back by Southeast Aero.
3	Marketing and public relations?
4	MR. BRUNSON: Mr. Chairman?
5	CHAIRMAN COX: Yes, sir.
6	MR. BRUNSON: Just curious and I have the

opinion, what was the major delay of finally

9	getting building permits for these simple hangars?
10	MR. WUELLNER: To be perfectly blunt, the
11	difference between what DRC approves and what a
12	building permit requires in that they're seems
13	continually at odds with what the final product
14	is. You almost get the feeling that DRC is, you
15	know, "my fingers are crossed" kind of an answer
16	with the county. And then when you actually apply
17	for the building permits, which as you know is a
18	separate process
19	MR. BRUNSON: Right.
20	MR. WUELLNER: the gloves come off and
21	they they almost you almost feel like you're
22	being held hostage at that point to get your
23	project out.
24	MR. BRUNSON: Exactly. What a shame.

MR. WUELLNER: And it's painfully slow. And

19

1 unfortunately, the -- the process is a very linear

2	process in that until each item gets completed,
3	you're required to resubmit each time and to get

- 4 the next level of look, and -- and that process
- 5 being kind of iterative in nature, takes a long
- 6 time to get through.
- 7 It's -- it's a shame it takes -- we were
- 8 literally talking in the last few weeks that it
- 9 takes as long now to permit a six-month project as
- it does to build a six-month project. So,
- 11 you're -- you're staring at those kind of lead
- times.
- MR. BRUNSON: Yes. And -- and I had a reason
- for asking. And it really needs to change. Thank
- 15 you.
- MR. WUELLNER: I think a lot of redundancies
- in it, too.
- Next item I have is marketing and public
- relations. The only thing really on the
- short-term horizon here is the MS 150 Bike Tour,
- which we'll be hosting. And that's the weekend of
- September 16th and 17th. And they'll stage that

- event out of here and conclude the event on Sunday
- out of here, also. Minimal operating impact on
- 25 the airport. And expect to --

- 1 CHAIRMAN COX: A little air show at the end
- 2 of the race there.
- 3 MR. WUELLNER: You know, they'd love anything
- 4 like that, so... I'm sure anything like that
- 5 would be just icing on the cake with this. So,
- 6 I -- I'm very impressed with this organization in
- 7 terms of how they put these events on. It's -- I
- 8 don't know how to describe it. It's just
- 9 incredibly well organized.
- The same people do the same functions year
- after year after year, and they're quite good at
- it. And makes it go a lot -- lot smoother than
- first-time events where everybody's learning the
- ropes. So, it's something to be said about a
- 15 20-year event where you can keep the same people

16	doing the same things.
17	And leasing activities, currently there's
18	nothing new to report. I think until 8, 9, and 10
19	are concluded, we're probably not going to be
20	anything, unless something catastrophic happens at
21	this point.
22	CHAIRMAN COX: All right. That concludes
23	project updates, I think. We'll go into action
24	items.
25	9.A BUDGET DISCUSSION & SET TRIM
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
1	CHAIRMAN COX: And the first item under
2	action items is budget discussion and to set TRIM
3	millage. We have a handout.
4	MR. GEORGE: I thought that had to do at 5
5	o'clock.
6	MR. WUELLNER: No. The the budget
7	discussion you're going to have is in is
8	workshop in nature. It's not public hearing in

'	
9	nature. So, you can have it anytime you want.
10	Same with the TRIM millage; you can set that at a
11	normal business meeting of the Airport Authority.
12	MR. GEORGE: Okay.
13	MR. WUELLNER: In fact, it needs to be done
14	during the month of July in order to stay in
15	compliance.
16	Now, moving into September, there are two
17	mandatory public hearings that cannot begin until
18	after 5 p.m. That's probably what you're
19	CHAIRMAN COX: Yeah.
20	MR. WUELLNER: probably what you're
21	thinking of. Let me find my
22	The budget discussion, as I envisioned it
23	today and I'm not sure I have that, at least
24	where I thought it would be here, but the was
25	to review the capital capital development

22

1 projects.

2	You've had about five or six weeks now with
3	that information and that list of projects as they
4	were presented to you at your your first
5	workshop. And we kind of wanted to review those
6	items and see what is to remain in there and
7	and what would likely come out.
8	You've also been provided a copy if I
9	could grab that from you, Doug, here. For some
10	reason, I don't have those things. But the copy
11	of the DR 420 form. But, actually, it's our
12	version of it. It's a much more computer-oriented
13	form than than what is there. That's where it
14	is. Thanks.
15	The it has been updated with the
16	information provided by the the Property
17	Appraiser's Office. So, this is the information
18	that all of the taxing authorities in St. Johns
19	County are operating off of.
20	The top section, the blue section of that
21	form, is the information we get from the Property
22	Appraiser's Office. And you'll you'll notice
23	that there's a significant increase in the taxable

- value of property in St. Johns County from last
- year to this year. And there are varying reasons

- 1 for that, but primarily it's tied to residential
- and the revaluation of nonhomesteaded ad
- 3 valorem -- or nonhomesteaded real property in St.
- 4 Johns County.
- 5 But you can see it's jumped from
- 6 \$17,400,000 -- -400 million in taxable value to --
- 7 this year to almost \$22 billion in taxable value.
- 8 So, it's a significant increase, and as a result,
- 9 provides a significant increase in the ad valorem
- proceeds for a given millage rate as -- as a
- 11 function of that.
- In fact, it's about a 7 -- in our case, the
- difference between the tax values, which is
- effectively the difference between your
- rolled-back rate and holding the millage, is a --
- is a net difference of about \$730,000 this year.

8

9

- 17 So, it's -- it's a major number this year. Which 18 works out to about a 19.76 percent increase over 19 the rolled-back rate. And you could see that it 20 would generate about \$4.5 million this year if the 21 ad valorem millage rate were held the same. That's that .2055 number that was approved last 22 23 year, would generate \$4.5 million instead of \$3.7 million, to give you an idea where --24
  - AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING JULY 17, 2006

CHAIRMAN COX: Say -- say those two numbers,

24

1 again, please? 2 MR. WUELLNER: 4.5 million dollars is 3 approximately the ad valorem projections for next 4 year, if the millage rate were held at .2055, 5 versus I believe it was \$3.7 million last year --6 CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. 7 MR. WUELLNER: -- would have been -- was the equivalent number based on the tax -- tax base.

CHAIRMAN COX: Right.

10	MR. WUELLNER: As as I said, what I
11	really we we have adjusted the front page.
12	We gave you the I'm going to try and bring
13	those up here, but I didn't do it in advance, so
14	it may take me a half a second here.
15	MR. BRUNSON: Mr. Chairman.
16	CHAIRMAN COX: Sir.
17	MR. BRUNSON: I'd like to ask a question.
18	Ed, this monies, what's the time frame for
19	receiving our the tax dollars?
20	MR. WUELLNER: Ad valorem literally comes in
21	throughout the year.
22	MR. BRUNSON: That's what
23	MR. WUELLNER: It peaks in the period between
24	about the second week of December through about
25	the first or second week of March. That's where

- 1 probably 80, 85 percent of the money arrives, in
- 2 that short window.

3	Shortly after Thanksgiving, if we begin to
4	see proceeds as the typically the escrow agents
5	for homes begin to pay and take advantage of the
6	discounts in ad valorem the tax bill. But then
7	those who are in a nonescrow position or paying
8	their own taxes many times wait and keep their
9	money until they approach the tax deadline in
10	April. But it peaks during that time.
11	We have virtually nothing until Thanksgiving,
12	for the first six or eight weeks of the tax year,
13	and then it really drops off dramatically after
14	after April. It's it's really then the results
15	of contested taxes or estate settlings. It's I
16	mean, it can literally drop down to a couple
17	hundred dollars a month.
18	MR. BRUNSON: But, Ed, isn't it also true
19	that in this county, we collect about 99 percent
20	of the taxes?
21	MR. WUELLNER: It's a significant number, I
22	know that. There's very little that gets adjusted
23	outward.

- MR. GEORGE: So, whatever we budget, you're
- saying we typically wind up receiving 99 percent

- of that.

  MR. WUELLNER: Pretty much. We -- we get -
  they collect 99 percent of the taxes assessed.
- 4 But you also have to shave off about two, two and
- 5 a half percent of the total ad valorem that goes
- 6 with the collecting agency, so remains with the
- 7 Tax Collector's Office.
- 8 Plus, you're also -- if you -- if you pay
- 9 attention to the budget details, you also pay a
- 10 fee to the Property Appraiser's Office for their
- services in the -- the ad valorem mechanism, for
- lack of better terms. So, you don't get quite the
- whole number. It's --
- MR. GEORGE: Is our budget representative --
- represents what we anticipate receiving --
- 16 MR. WUELLNER: Yes.

A /MTG071706.txt		
17	MR. GEORGE: or is that the gross amount?	
18	MR. WUELLNER: We changed we changed last	
19	year to reflect the adjustment, but we were told	
20	at the time of audit that we we were we need	
21	to show it the other way now. So, we will now be	
22	showing the gross amount, but then under fees to	
23	outside agencies and commissions to the Property	
24	Appraiser's and Tax Collector's Office, you'll now	
25	have a line there that shows what those numbers	
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17,	
	27	

1	are.
2	MR. GEORGE: Okay.
3	MR. WUELLNER: So, it it's the same at the
4	end of the day. We're working off the net, not
5	the gross. You just can't get there that fast.
6	All right. This is this is the revised
7	pulling my headings off the top here. But these
8	are the revised summary sheet for the budget.

Now, this -- this makes several assumptions. One

10	is we've got the ad valorem plugged in. We assume
11	the rolled-back rate as as we did in the last
12	budget iteration, which right now looks like it
13	would would net about \$3,721,390.
14	It would reduce the millage rate as it stands
15	today from .2055 down to .1716. So, you're
16	reducing the millage rate, but yet I know this
17	is mirrors and magic, but you literally end up
18	with additional ad valorem proceeds, part of which
19	I just explained as being commissions that are
20	back in the equation.
21	MR. GEORGE: Okay.
22	MR. WUELLNER: Part of which is the Value
23	Adjustments Board doesn't meet until after the ad
24	valorem proceeds are budgeted. So, it's
25	adjustments made at that point, too.
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 200

## )6

- MR. BRUNSON: Mr. Chairman, are we going to 1
- address the millage rate separately or are we 2

going to talk about it as a budget or --3 4 MR. WUELLNER: You will have to today. 5 CHAIRMAN COX: I think we need to discuss 6 millage rate, yeah. 7 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. You have got to do that today. 8 MR. BRUNSON: Okay. 9 10 CHAIRMAN COX: Absolutely. MR. BRUNSON: I think I would have preferred 11 12 to do that first, but we can --13 CHAIRMAN COX: Yeah. We can -- how much are 14 you --MR. WUELLNER: I'm really -- all I was 15 16 pointing out were where the adjustments were made 17 on the front sheet, and then I intended to just go 18 to capital. I'm not going through anything like 19 we did in the workshop. 20 MR. BRUNSON: Okay. 21 MR. GEORGE: Why not? MR. WUELLNER: And then -- I can, if you 22 23 want, but I can't imagine you --

CHAIRMAN COX: No.

# MR. WUELLNER: You've got enough eyes rolled

## AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006

1	back in your heads.
2	CHAIRMAN COX: Right. And your point's well
3	taken. And we'll and this you know, if you
4	can make it as abbreviated as you know,
5	without
6	MR. WUELLNER: The only other item I need
7	to I need to point out is that debt service
8	or not debt service the reserve line item as
9	forecast for next year would be \$973,000.
10	CHAIRMAN COX: At that
11	MR. WUELLNER: At taking the rolled-back
12	rate, we would have a reserve at the end of next
13	fiscal year of approximately \$973,000.
14	Okay. And then the other items we were going
15	to talk about, I told you we'd try to we had
16	found a small was a \$5,000 line, if you recall
17	in there, that we couldn't explain. Well, we've

18 removed it, so it's no longer in there. It was 19 a -- hadn't gotten taken out from the year before, 20 is what -- near as we could tell. So, we -- we 21 did correct that. 22 You see the capital budget, as it's proposed right now for construction and planning, is about 23 \$9.5 million, and about \$175,000, slightly over 24 \$175,000 budgeted in nonconstruction capital, 25

#### AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006

- 1 which is typically equipment and those kinds of
- 2 things.
- Now, this is where last -- at the end of --
- 4 this is what you've had about five or six weeks to
- 5 think about relative to whether you want to
- 6 continue to budget at this point all these --
- 7 these capital projects as we've proposed it or,
- 8 you know, you've got input about what you want to
- 9 do, if you've got thoughts about where you want --
- 10 how you want to treat ad valorem moving forward

11	this year.
12	We need to make, you know, overall budget
13	changes during this period between now and the
14	first public hearing, the first week of September.
15	So, if you've got questions about line items or
16	the like, this five- or six-week period here is
17	the ideal time to get those on the on the
18	table, get them discussed, this month and next
19	month's regular meeting
20	CHAIRMAN COX: Right.
21	MR. WUELLNER: so that by the time we hit
22	the public hearing cycle early September, that
23	largely the questions and issues and and
24	comments are are pretty well flushed out and
25	and addressed. Because we do not have a lot of

- 1 reaction time at the point of going to public
- 2 hearing because of the notification and
- 3 advertising requirements. We keep that -- that

4	schedule's fairly tight.
5	So, with that, you you have these items.
6	If if there's nothing that particularly gives
7	you heartburn or you want to adjust or or make
8	changes to, we'll assume that's what you want to
9	work off of, at least moving forward.
10	The next then big issue I need to just get
11	a get input on is what you want to do relative
12	to ad valorem in terms of plugging it into the
13	budget. You want to leave it at the rolled-back
14	rate as it's here? Do you have another number in
15	mind?
16	Now that we have the new tax base number,
17	it's a fairly simple exercise to plug in any
18	adjustments you want to do on millage rate. We
19	didn't have that when we first brought it to you,
20	so it was a lag from moving forward.
21	MR. BRUNSON: And, Mr. Chairman, I have some
22	thoughts on that when you're ready.
23	CHAIRMAN COX: All right. Stand by. Buzz,

go ahead.

MR. GEORGE: I'm ready to throw my thoughts

## AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006

1	out right now.
2	CHAIRMAN COX: Let's just open the table up
3	to discuss for the millage rate.
4	MR. GEORGE: Sounds good. The concern I have
5	is when we go through and we do a budget, if you
6	go back and look at it at the end of the year,
7	we've got X number of hundreds of thousands of
8	dollars we didn't receive in revenue, and then
9	we've got X number of dollars of expenses that we
10	didn't anticipate, you know, coming along.
11	And and I would like to propose that
12	that we try to give ourselves some insurance that
13	these numbers are actually going to be true. And
14	a lot of companies do that by having a bonus on
15	the executive director's compensation plan, that
16	in the event that you hit these numbers, that
17	there is a bonus paid to him for that.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

:///A /MT	G071706.txt
18	Because every year, we're short here, we're
19	over here, and we can always go back and look at
20	it and say, well, the insurance went up, you know,
21	\$80,000 that we didn't have planned on, and things
22	like that.
23	But every time we spend more of our money for
24	operations, we always shortchange something in the
25	capital.
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
1	I've been on this board now for four years,
2	and I think we've talked about the firefighting
3	facility for four years. You know, it's the

money just doesn't seem to be left there. So,

that's one concern and -- and a potential help,

The second concern that I have is that I

think all of these projects here are what we had

getting off the tax rolls. Guys, we've had a lot

envisioned in our 10-year financial plan for

you know, in solving that.

1/ IVI I (	00/1/00.txt
11	of changes and now I'm talking millage. We had
12	a lot of changes in the last couple of years.
13	Concrete cost is up from \$48 to you know, to
14	\$160 or whatever it might be. Contractors are
15	getting more to build the same thing.
16	Typical example is the three hangars that
17	we're building, we had estimated for that square
18	footage \$1.2 million to do it, and the price tag
19	came out to \$2.1, and we started cutting our
20	requirements back, and we got it at \$1.9.
21	But we need to start planning for those
22	numbers down the road. So, from my standpoint, to
23	look at a millage reduction back to the roll back
24	is really going to be saying, if I look at the
25	roll back, then I'm saying to the public, I don't
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 200

### 06

- want to get off the tax rolls. 1
- If I take the -- the increase in the millage, 2
- then it's, I'm working toward getting off the tax 3

- 4 rolls, and based on our experience this year,
- 5 that's what it's costing. That's my comments.
- 6 CHAIRMAN COX: But it's not really an
- 7 increase in the millage; it's just maybe keeping
- 8 it the same.
- 9 MR. GEORGE: Well, it's an increase in
- revenue --
- 11 CHAIRMAN COX: There you go.
- MR. GEORGE: -- to us. Yes.
- 13 CHAIRMAN COX: Exactly.
- MR. GEORGE: You're right. It's not an
- increase in the millage, so there's no increase in
- millage.
- 17 CHAIRMAN COX: Yeah. Make sure everybody
- 18 understands that.
- MR. GEORGE: But it's increase in revenue
- coming to us, which hopefully gives us --
- 21 CHAIRMAN COX: Right.
- MR. GEORGE: -- the ability to do that.
- 23 CHAIRMAN COX: Very good point. Mr. Brunson?
- MR. BRUNSON: Here's my thoughts: And this
- is just not a thing I'm going to say just because

1	what I've seen today. But, when you start running
2	a business or helping run a business, you think
3	you know what needs to be done.
4	Once you get into this company, then you find
5	out some things, and sometimes you have to change
6	your mind how you approach this company.
7	The Airport Authority is this company. And
8	what I am thinking about and and want to hear
9	more discussion is, Ed, could if we accepted
10	the present millage rate, and as these monies come
11	in, I would like to see these monies go into the
12	reserve and not become a part of the operating
13	CHAIRMAN COX: Capital.
14	MR. BRUNSON: income.
15	CHAIRMAN COX: Uh-huh.
16	MR. BRUNSON: And this is just more assurance
17	of being strong to be able to get off the tax
18	rolls and make sense businesswise what we're

And I'm all -- going to also say that we are
trying hard -- I know personally that Ed Wuellner
last year tried to take this budget and -- and
reduce it 10 percent, which he put in that
equation insurance and some other things that he
could not control.

### AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006

1	But what my thinking is that I'm going to
2	ask, I think, and make a motion, that we that
3	we accept the present millage rate, that this
4	these additional monies, the difference between
5	the rolled-back rate and the present rate go into
6	reserves, and there would have to be a special
7	board to do anything different.
8	I'm also going to ask that we take out the
9	equation of insurance and what's the big
10	other big item that we can't control too much?
11	Attorney fees.

12	MR. WUELLNER: Legal was the other two.
13	MR. BRUNSON: Legal? Which, I know at least
14	one board member won't agree with me that we
15	can't but you never know what what we've got
16	coming up in in litigation.
17	So, I'm saying that those two equations,
18	insurance and attorney fees, should be thrown out
19	as far as asking Ed to to officially try to cut
20	back on expenses five percent, is what I'm
21	thinking, and with those two items, is what I'm
22	going to be thinking about after discussion.
23	CHAIRMAN COX: All right. Ed, what's the
24	difference, again, between the two rates as far as
25	dollars to the airport, 700 and some thousand, you
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
	37
1	think?

MR. WUELLNER: I want to say \$730,000. That

CHAIRMAN COX: So, at .2055, it's 1 --

sounds --

2

3

5 MR. WUELLNER: I think I have it -- I think I 6 have it written down on this one or on --7 CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. I don't see it on the 8 sheet here. I see the --9 MR. GEORGE: On the summary sheet? 10 CHAIRMAN COX: -- amount for the rolled-back 11 rate. 12 MR. GEORGE: What Mr. Brunson is saying is that if we have a \$900,000 reserve, based on this 13 budget using the roll-back, that if we keep the 14 millage the same, then we would expect to see a 15 16 -- \$1.6 million reserve and not start 16 allocating that money to a new project unless it 17 is cost justified. 18 19 MR. WUELLNER: Correct. It would be -- it 20 would be -- require Authority approval to remove 21 from reserve. 22 CHAIRMAN COX: Right. To go into that. 23 MR. BRUNSON: And strongly to say that this is for reserve. 24 25 MR. GEORGE: Yeah.

1	CHAIRMAN COX: That's a very good point,
2	because both of your points are very well
3	taken. And I and I don't disagree that, you
4	know, keeping the rate where it is now is going to
5	move the airport much more quickly toward getting
6	off the
7	MR. WUELLNER: Well, you know, if if I
8	could get a half second here, I think we're
9	getting two things I don't want to have have
10	any anything the appearance of being
11	misleading here, because I think you've you've
12	got to understand that the your point about the
13	fire station, as an example, yeah, indeed, we've
14	had that project shows up every year in the budget
15	and, you know, for whatever reason has not has
16	not ended up being constructed at this point,
17	although we're probably closer today than we've
18	ever been in most respects.

19	But the reality is the money moves forward at
20	the conclusion of a fiscal year as your cash
21	forward and is reappropriated each year. It
22	doesn't tag with the item unless you choose to
23	keep that capital project year after year, so
24	MR. GEORGE: And, Ed, just as a point of
25	clarification, you know, my point is because
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
1	expenses go up, be it insurance or whatever, and
2	because revenues came down because we didn't get
3	this contract signed, we usually take that cash to
4	meet the expense roll and everything.
5	I think what Mr. Brunson is saying is, that's
6	the way we've done it in the past. If we approve
7	this increase, that has got to be hard firm, you
8	know, harder than the operating expense, and it's
9	got to go into a reserve.
10	MR. WUELLNER: I don't I'm not disagreeing

on the principle he's saying. And I'm not really

A/MT	G071706.txt
12	disagreeing at all. I'm just trying to explain
13	that, you know, you had no reserve budgeted for
14	this current fiscal year. And and literally
15	you're going to move ahead almost \$900,000 into
16	next year.
17	MR. GEORGE: Yeah.
18	MR. WUELLNER: That is the the match that
19	you had previously allocated this year to capital
20	development projects that were not completed that
21	are being moved forward into another fiscal year.
22	So, it's not new money that's being appropriated
23	for the same project year after year after year
24	and we're spending the money somewhere else.
25	It it is moving forward in most cases. Not
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 200

### )6

- necessarily the penny. And we do not track it by 1
- project, because this is just simply not how it's 2
- done. It's done by a cash forward number. 3
- 4 The other only comment item was, the blanket

A /MTG(	071706.txt
5	statement that revenues didn't meet expectations,
6	I mean, you're within less than one percent of
7	revenue expectations for the year. I mean, it's
8	not off by you know, it's \$11,000 annualized,
9	is the total difference in projected revenue
10	versus what what's expected to be collected.
11	So, it's not significant. It is on the expense
12	side.
13	MR. GEORGE: Revenue or expenses?
14	MR. WUELLNER: No. Expense side is
15	different. I mean, it is off substantially.
16	MR. GEORGE: Yeah.
17	MR. WUELLNER: But there you know, we
18	we can easily point to three to four line items
19	and and show you that we would have met or done
20	better and that those items are exactly as as
21	Mr. Brunson pointed out
22	MR. GEORGE: And I think some of the steps
23	you've taken to get us more realistic numbers to

put into this budget, you know, will show up at

the end of next year.

24

1	MR. WUELLNER: Absolutely. I think so.
2	Plus, you know, the way we're forecasting revenue
3	in particular, you know, we're now set up to deal
4	with the partial year adjustment. So, this
5	\$11,000 is largely trying to take you know, in
6	the past, we didn't take each piece of property,
7	each lease, and figure when the adjustment takes
8	place in the fiscal year.
9	You know, if it was a three percent
10	adjustment going to be made or estimated for the
11	year, we'd make a three percent adjustment and it
12	would hold for the year.
13	Well, if your rent doesn't change until
14	March, obviously I don't get a year's worth of
15	three percent. So, that's where the variance
16	comes in. It should be more accurate because the
17	model's now more accurate.
18	CHAIRMAN COX: Let me move to public
19	discussion and open it up to the public.

20 Any public comments on this particular agenda 21 item? 22 MR. MARTINELLI: I've got one. 23 CHAIRMAN COX: Yes, sir, Mr. Martinelli. 24 MR. MARTINELLI: Oh, boy. Big John. MR. BRUNSON: Little Vic, can't take him 25 AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006 42 1 anywhere. 2 MR. MARTINELLI: Okay. Victor Martinelli, 3 Ponte Vedra Beach. Two comments, one on the 4 TRIM -- TRIM rate, and two, on going forward. 5 The -- as Ed said, you really don't carry 6 forward a reserve; you carry forward cash to the 7 following year's budget. And with the times as 8 uncertain as they are, and with fuel costs being 9 what they can and will be, probably, it's almost advisable to do a future value budget, even within 10 11 the year coming forward, because today, you don't

know what you're going to be paying six months

13	from now.
14	And so, that's one suggestion that you might
15	look at for projecting your budget. And the
16	other, of course, is that you're riding the crest
17	of a wave now with the property values going up,
18	up, up. But what goes up eventually has to come
19	down. And if you don't take advantage of the up
20	cycle, you're going to lose big time on the down
21	cycle. And so, my suggestion is you take the TRIM
22	rate, take the additional monies, and and use
23	it wisely.
24	One thought there, you can, as a board today,
25	decide what you want to do with that, quote,
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
1	reserve, but you can't commit a future board. And
2	so, a future board may not take that same action.
3	So, please be aware of that as well.

CHAIRMAN COX: Very good point. Any other

public comment? Yes, sir.

4

6	MR. HICKOX: Wayne Hickox, 881 Queen Road.
7	Actually, a question, if I may, to to Buzz. I
8	notice that you had used the reference in talking
9	about the tax roll thing and understand, I
10	think the tax roll issue is a red herring. I
11	don't think it's that important that the airport
12	get off it.
13	But my question is, what started out at five
14	went to seven in the planning, and I think I heard
15	you mention a ten-year plan now. Is that accurate
16	or did I hear wrong?
17	MR. GEORGE: The document itself is a 10-year
18	plan.
19	MR. HICKOX: Okay.
20	MR. GEORGE: It showed originally that we
21	could get off the tax rolls in seven years.
22	MR. HICKOX: Okay.
23	MR. GEORGE: The update of that plan for last

year showed we can get off in six years.

MR. WUELLNER: Four.

# AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006

24

1	MR. GEORGE: Now, this year, we're talking
2	huh?
3	MR. WUELLNER: You're at four you have
4	four left
5	CHAIRMAN COX: Right.
6	MR. WUELLNER: including next fiscal year.
7	CHAIRMAN COX: Right.
8	MR. HICKOX: My reason to bringing it up is I
9	think you're putting a lot of pressure on
10	yourselves that you don't have to put on it.
11	The truth of the matter is, that you're going
12	through and I'm sure that Jim would back me up
13	on this something that everybody, as well as
14	every branch of government's going through,
15	everything you do like everybody else is going up
16	in cost. Every time you move a vehicle, it's
17	costing you more. Don't strangle yourself and
18	don't injure your operations.
19	I would go along with what Victor said and

file:///A|/MTG071706.txt 20 take advantage of what you've got sitting here. 21 CHAIRMAN COX: If -- Mr. Hickox, if you and Mark -- Vic wouldn't mind filling out one of these 22 23 for us just for public recordskeeping when you get a chance. Appreciate it. Yes, sir. 24 MR. GEORGE: Mr. Hickox, that's basically 25 AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006 45 what I was saying, is that because of all these 1 2 costs going in, let's don't cut our nose off to 3 spite our face by looking at a -- at a rollback. 4 We need to have --5 MR. HICKOX: Just reiterating it. MR. GEORGE: -- an opportunity to have that, 6 7 so... 8 MR. HICKOX: Just reiterating. But, also, 9 I'm saying don't put the pressure on yourself 10 unnecessarily --

file:///A/MTG071706.txt (59 of 203)8/22/2006 10:12:44 AM

MR. GEORGE: Yeah.

MR. HICKOX: -- because I don't think the

11

13	average citizen keeps
14	MR. BRUNSON: But but keep in mind, I
15	think we had our best year last year in a long
16	time, and we did take the rolled-back rate. And
17	Staff managed well and the board made the right
18	decisions.
19	But I agree with what I just said, that I
20	would like to while the tax values are up, I'd
21	like to take advantage of it.
22	MR. HICKOX: Absolutely.
23	MR. BRUNSON: And I would just say that I
24	probably spent more going to Jacksonville today in
25	some meetings that I went to than you paid on
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
1	CHAIRMAN COX: Taxes
2	MR. BRUNSON: ad valorem for the airport.
3	CHAIRMAN COX: We have some other public
4	comments.
5	MR. HICKOX: Keep in mind, though, we've got

- 6 people like Dan who pay big taxes, not like us.
- 7 MR. BRUNSON: Well, that's right.
- 8 Mr. Holiday.
- 9 MR. HOLIDAY: Dan -- Dan Holiday,
- 10 St. Augustine. From my figures, just sitting here
- scratching it without a computer, it's an increase
- of one-fifth. Am I right or wrong? I don't want
- to open my mouth and remove all doubt here.
- MR. WUELLNER: That's approximately right.
- That's almost 18 percent.
- 16 MR. GEORGE: I got 3.4 for 7 --
- MR. HOLIDAY: Roughly -- roughly one-fifth.
- MR. GEORGE: Twenty percent.
- MR. HOLIDAY: I'm going to play the devil's
- advocate. If you peel off a very, very small
- reduction, it would look a lot better than to hold
- the line, and you would still have your cake and
- eat it, too.
- 24 If it's a one-fifth increase, take less, not
- 25 much less, but take less so it would look like at

- least you're giving somebody some lip service.
- 2 Otherwise, it's going to look bad for the people
- 3 that are looking to say not in favor of having
- 4 their taxes increased.
- 5 CHAIRMAN COX: We're not increasing the
- 6 taxes.
- 7 MR. HOLIDAY: You aren't.
- 8 CHAIRMAN COX: By any means.
- 9 MR. HOLIDAY: You're holding them. But they
- 10 are going --
- 11 CHAIRMAN COX: Which is actually --
- MR. HOLIDAY: Your revenue's going up.
- 13 CHAIRMAN COX: -- a tax reduction now if you
- get into it.
- MR. HOLIDAY: It's a dog and pony show.
- 16 CHAIRMAN COX: I agree with you.
- MR. HOLIDAY: Thank you.
- 18 CHAIRMAN COX: Any other public comments?
- 19 (No further public comments.)
- 20 CHAIRMAN COX: All right. Let's move to the

- board and further discussion and be -- I'll
- 22 entertain motions as to what you guys would like
- 23 to do.
- MR. GEORGE: Mr. Chairman.
- 25 CHAIRMAN COX: Yes, sir.

- 1 MR. GEORGE: Ed, how did the -- the revision
- 2 to the 10-year plan that showed we could get off
- 3 the tax rolls in six, with cranking in these new
- 4 construction costs, and therefore, the need for
- 5 funding, be it from the state, from wherever, and
- for us, how much did that, you know, impact our
- 7 overall plan?
- 8 To me, the -- the impact was coming out of
- 9 the reserve. The -- you know, the reserve had to
- 10 come down, and then at the end of that five-year
- period, we're sitting there with just like we were
- two years ago.
- MR. WUELLNER: Your -- actually, when we

14	presented it last month, your numbers were still
15	quite strong for your for your four-year
16	threshold, as it were. And that, of course, still
17	just considered, because we've not made any
18	adjustments in the context of what the millage
19	rate or net to the Airport Authority would do,
20	which is is going to change a little no matter
21	what, I see it just continuing to improve.
22	We've factored in those. Those projects are
23	still in there. We you know, we've reforecast
24	the revenues. We've made the adjustments on the
25	expenditure side or the capital expenditure side
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
1	based on the latest information we could get from
2	our engineering folks.
3	You know, I still believe it's a fairly
4	reliable result, and I I think where you

5

6

where the rubber's going to hit the road is out

there in years 8, 9, 10 and beyond, where the

- 7 Authority will have to make decisions relative to
- 8 exactly what capital projects make annual budgets.
- 9 You know, it won't be a case of where you can
- just jump or -- or would desire to jump back in
- the -- the tax arena and just assess what's
- necessary to get there. It -- you'll have to be a
- little more aggressive in the capital programs
- moving forward.
- But I -- I think it's -- it's strong, it's
- legitimate. It ends up with a reasonable reserve
- that gives flexibility each year. You know, it's,
- of course, subject to economic upturns and
- downturns but, you know...
- MR. GEORGE: The -- to continue my question,
- you know, I think I heard you say that you have
- adjusted the revenues for over the 10-year plan.
- What I didn't say that you had -- didn't hear you
- say, that you had adjusted the construction cost.
- MR. WUELLNER: Yes, we have.

1 MR. GEORGE: And -- okay. It has been. 2 MR. WUELLNER: Yes. Those were all done 3 before you got it last time. The only thing 4 that's not been done to date is to plug in the new ad valorem-related numbers that we just got. I 5 did not have a chance to update the model, since 6 we've only had that information a very short time, 7 and to -- actually, I think that's it. And to 8 9 adjust the reserve number to the \$900,000 number. That's not been -- that adjustment's not made. 10 But I don't think the bottom line's going to 11 change substantively either way. Again, I 12 think --13 MR. GEORGE: I'm sorry, I was not aware that 14 the -- that you had -- like we just had a 60 15 16 percent increase in our estimate for these three 17 hangars that's over there, so I assume you 18 increased all of the other costs by --19 MR. WUELLNER: No, we did not increase them

60 percent. What we did do is ask our engineer to

21 review those projects, going out, I believe it's 22 about five years. And we have -- we restated what 23 those project construction costs are, based on what's gone on in recent --24 MR. GEORGE: And how much of an increase was 25 AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006 51 1 that? I know we haven't --2 MR. WUELLNER: I don't have it as a 3 percentage. 4 MR. GEORGE: It's kind of like, you know, trying -- what's the value of my property? I 5 don't know. What's the last one sell for? You 6 know, what's the value of a new three-bay hangar? 7 Well, the last one sold for \$1.9. And so, if we 8 9 still have in the budget that it's \$1.3, then 10 we've got our head in the sand. 11 MR. WUELLNER: No, we had made those -- we 12 have made the adjustments on a project-by-project

basis, based on the engineering information and --

14	which included the newest cost information we've
15	got.
16	MR. GEORGE: Yeah.
17	MR. WUELLNER: So, it's as it's again as
18	reliable as this year's numbers are.
19	MR. GEORGE: So then then what you're
20	saying is we could take Mr. Holiday's comment, and
21	based on the rollback rate, we could still get off
22	the tax rolls as we had been forecasting from last
23	year.
24	MR. WUELLNER: Yes. It holds this year's
25	total ad valorem dollars for the next four years
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006 52
1	and then stops. The model still does that.
2	So, all you're doing is by by doing
3	what Mr. Brunson's suggesting, is you're
4	increasing the amount of money that ends up in the
5	reserves, if nothing else changes during the
6	amount of time, which improves the strength of the

- 7 financial -- of the overall financial position.
- 8 Because you do go through periods here where
- 9 you're going to have to make capital decisions
- after year six or seven, I think it is.
- MR. GEORGE: At which workshop do we go over,
- you know, the model again?
- 13 MR. WUELLNER: At your --
- MR. GEORGE: If the model -- if the model is
- still saying -- and we're seeing 60 percent
- increase in construction, and the model is still
- saying that we can do the same dollar amount, I'm
- saying that there's got to be something --
- MR. WUELLNER: It doesn't.
- MR. GEORGE: -- wrong with the model.
- MR. WUELLNER: It doesn't say that. The --
- 22 the capital projects that are in this six-year --
- or in the ten-year model have been adjusted to
- reflect new estimated construction dollars for
- 25 those same projects. So, they have -- they have

- given us new data. That data is in the six-year
- 2 model that you already have.
- 3 MR. GEORGE: So therefore, you had to adjust
- 4 the anticipated revenue from that investment up to
- 5 offset the construction cost.
- 6 MR. WUELLNER: We -- we adjust it based on
- 7 what market was, or anticipated market is, for the
- 8 next few years. We -- we have no way of -- you
- 9 know, you've got --
- 10 MR. GEORGE: Okay.
- MR. WUELLNER: -- a lot of variables out
- there.
- MR. GEORGE: That's fine. Yeah. So, at the
- next workshop is when we'll go over the --
- MR. WUELLNER: We actually went over, at the
- workshop, this last workshop, but we can certainly
- go over it again. I'll plug in the -- the -- any
- adjustments you make today, and we can look at it
- 19 again. It's not --
- 20 CHAIRMAN COX: Thank you, sir.
- MR. WUELLNER: -- particularly tricky. Be

- happy to do it again.
- MR. BRUNSON: And -- and also, how much it
- 24 went up from \$1.3 to \$1.9, we're still going to
- require that we get the return on investment.

- 1 MR. WUELLNER: Exactly.
- 2 MR. BRUNSON: And so, it's just the income
- 3 variance. And when you're ready, I'm ready to
- 4 make a motion.
- 5 CHAIRMAN COX: We'll entertain a motion
- 6 anytime.
- 7 MR. BRUNSON: Okay. That's true. I'd like
- 8 to make a motion that we adopt the present tax
- 9 rate and not the rollback rate. I -- I think
- to -- that's comment. Let me make the motion.
- But with the stipulation that this money be in a,
- even a special reserve.
- 13 MR. WUELLNER: You can do that.
- MR. BRUNSON: If we've got reserve now of

15 \$900-, that this additional \$700- be in a special 16 reserve. And -- and that's a simple motion, but 17 that's the -- that's the motion I'd like to make. 18 CHAIRMAN COX: We have a motion on the table. 19 Any discussion on the motion? MR. GEORGE: Do you want a second before you 20 get to discussion? 21 CHAIRMAN COX: I'll take -- yeah. Okay. Go 22 ahead. Thank you, sir. 23 24 Do we have a second? MR. GEORGE: Yes, you have a second, and I'll 25 AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006 55 1 explain that when we get to discussion. Can I 2 discuss? 3 CHAIRMAN COX: You can discuss now. 4 MR. GEORGE: The millage that we're setting

now is the maximum millage, so we're not really

sitting here and saying we are going to take

that --

5

6

- 8 MR. WUELLNER: Correct.
- 9 MR. GEORGE: -- millage.
- MR. WUELLNER: This is not to exceed.
- MR. GEORGE: We have two other public
- hearings, and the millage cannot go above --
- MR. WUELLNER: What you set today.
- MR. GEORGE: -- what we're saying. So, with
- that understanding, that's the way I second that.
- MR. WUELLNER: That is correct.
- 17 CHAIRMAN COX: All right. Motion on the
- table that's been seconded. All in favor, say
- 19 aye.
- MR. BRUNSON: Aye.
- 21 CHAIRMAN COX: Aye.
- MR. GEORGE: Aye.
- 23 CHAIRMAN COX: All opposed?
- 24 (No opposition.)
- 25 CHAIRMAN COX: The ayes have it. Motion is

1	passed, and that will be written into the
2	comments.
3	9.B EDC & IDC - PUBLIC INDUSTRIAL PARK STUDY
4	CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. That moves us on to the
5	next agenda item, I guess. We have a EDC and an
6	IDC presentation; is that correct?
7	MR. WUELLNER: Yes. I believe Nick is
8	Nick here?
9	MR. SACIA: Yes. Nick Sacia with St. Johns
10	County Chamber EDC. I'm coming back to report to
11	you on the report we made last month on the study
12	that the IDA is proposing to study the how to
13	move forward in the preservation of workforce
14	sites and business sites so that the residential
15	growth doesn't consume all the land so that we run
16	out of places to employ the residents of St. Johns
17	County.
18	And several counties in Florida, more than
19	half, almost three-quarters of the counties in
20	Florida, have publicly owned business sites,
21	industrial sites that they prepare in advance

'	
22	for for clients that may come in the future so
23	that it's ready to go when the client's ready,
24	because of the costs that's prohibiting the
25	private sector from getting those sites ready in a
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006 57
1	timely manner.
2	But the study is not to determine that
3	publicly owned land is the only way to go. It's
4	to determine what's the best way to go. Is it
5	publicly as well or private/public partnership?
6	Or maybe it will come out that it's just private.
7	But the study will show us what steps we need
8	to take, what sites would be best to work on, what
9	management method would be best, sale or lease
10	strategies, depending on the site.
11	And we're before the Airport Authority
12	because of the Airport Authority's unique position
13	of already holding public lands that can be used

14

for workforce opportunity sites.

15	Now, as of last report, last month, we were
16	going to the County to ask that they participate,
17	as well. And the IDA has committed \$25,000 to the
18	study. Now St. Johns County, as well, has
19	committed \$25,000 to the study. The St. Johns
20	County Chamber EDC is committing time and
21	resources to the amount of \$25,000. And we're
22	here to ask the Airport to participate at a
23	maximum level of \$25,000, so we can have a
24	complete study that we we believe will benefit
25	your goals of being removed from the tax rolls as
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
	58
1	you develop the land in a way that benefits not
2	only the Airport Authority but the residents of
3	St. Johns County.
4	CHAIRMAN COX: Very good. Is that no
5	no other information you know, no slides or
6	anything?

7

MR. SACIA: The slides --

8	CHAIRMAN COX: That's fine. I just wanted
9	MR. SACIA: hadn't changed since last
10	month.
11	CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. Great.
12	MR. SACIA: But if you do have any questions,
13	I'd be happy to answer them, or discussion.
14	CHAIRMAN COX: I'll comment on what you have
15	to say. And I'm a very strong believer in in
16	what they're trying to do with the in their
17	study.
18	And I'd I'd really like to see the Airport
19	step forward at some commitment level to you
20	know, to on one hand to show the public that
21	the airport's committed to helping out the
22	community and moving toward and creating jobs
23	and and let's get the you know, we've got
24	some property over here that we can use that would
25	be a perfect area for the industrial park before

- 1 in fact it is maybe -- use the term "swallowed up"
- 2 by development, commercial development of one type
- 3 or another, and condos or homes or whatever it is
- 4 and happens to be.
- 5 But I'd like to see us step forward at least
- 6 at some commitment level. Discussion?
- 7 MR. BRUNSON: Yeah. I, too, support the EDC
- 8 and am excited about the study.
- 9 I do have some comments that in the private
- sector, we just raised \$60,000 to do the Fishkind
- study, who basically said that 80 percent of our
- tax revenue is coming from residential entities
- and that we had to find some way to increase the
- revenue to keep this county going, whether it be
- an increased sales tax of one percent, which is
- allowed.
- But I wonder, you know, that \$60,000 that we
- spent, was that well spent? And -- and I hope so,
- and I believe so.
- 20 MR. SACIA: That's --
- 21 MR. BRUNSON: Go ahead.
- MR. SACIA: That's a very good question. And

23 we believe it has. We're having a meeting 24 tomorrow to discuss what -- what steps to go 25 forward with. And not only are they looking at AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006 60 the one cent sales option that's been proposed, 1 2 but that will be -- there will be an ongoing 3 discussion. 4 But also, there's efforts to look at the way 5 impact fees are computed and the counts that are used to give the total impact fees for the 6 7 business and commercial entities so that that may 8 reduce their initial development cost to allow 9 them easier ways to enter into the St. Johns 10 County market. 11 MR. BRUNSON: And that's true. And 12 unfortunately, the residential, Dr. Fishkind has

seen that that was in line, but the industrial was

not, and so forth. So, I think some good will

come.

13

14

16 But what I'm -- what I'm getting to is that, 17 James, what is the budget of the county, this \$400 million, \$500 million? 18 19 COMMISSIONER BRYANT: This coming year? 20 MR. BRUNSON: What you proposed, or 21 somebody's --22 COMMISSIONER BRYANT: I think about \$700 million. 23 24 MR. BRUNSON: Pardon me? Seven hundred? 25 Seven hundred million? And they've committed AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006 61 1 \$25,000. 2 And I wouldn't -- what -- what I'm saying is 3 that I would like to commit, and I would like to 4 support, but it's -- as we look at MPO, what we do 5 there, and how much we pay to belong to them, I think that we might can do some in-kind, too, as 6 7 you have. And -- and -- but I'm not going to be

8

in favor of -- of spending \$25,000 in line with

9	the County and with Intergovernmental.	
10	Now, I don't know what that figure is, but I	
11	want you to know we're going to support you. And	
12	I will be at the meeting tomorrow with you at	
13	2 o'clock to work out all of these other things	
14	that we're working on.	
15	MR. SACIA: Yes. And and the IDA's budget	
16	is substantially smaller than both organizations.	
17	MR. BRUNSON: I know.	
18	MR. SACIA: And they're committing \$25,000.	
19	And and we really do believe that the Airport	
20	will be the main beneficiary of this study, as	
21	they already have the lands available.	
22	So, it's a study that you may have to do	
23	would need to do in the future, anyway, to develop	
24	those lands at a great at a greater cost than	
25	\$25,000 if you didn't do it jointly together with	

62

1 the IDA and the County.

2	MR. BRUNSON: Who who does this study?
3	MR. SACIA: Well, the way we're proposing it
4	is we're doing an RFP that we're going to have
5	together by the end of the month. It's a request
6	for a proposal for a consultant that has the
7	expertise that we discussed last month, a GIS,
8	economic development, site planning, economic
9	trends, and ROI expertise. And we'll be
10	submitting a list of consultants that we'll submit
11	the RFP to, as well as publicly address that.
12	Then, as each stakeholder that has
13	contributed to the project, a member from each
14	stakeholder, we'll get together kind of as a
15	committee to review the applications for the RFP
16	and choose the consultant together so that
17	everything is looked at from everybody's
18	perspective so we don't leave anything out.
19	MR. BRUNSON: Okay.
20	CHAIRMAN COX: Sir?
21	MR. BRUNSON: Go ahead.
22	MR. GEORGE: My time now, right? Okay. If

- I'm not mistaken, this whole study is to look at
- the county and see where the best site available
- 25 is for --

- 1 MR. SACIA: Well, that's a minor --
- 2 MR. GEORGE: So, therefore, I can't -- so,
- 3 therefore, I can't understand how, you know, it's
- 4 going to benefit the airport more than anybody
- 5 else. Because if you pick a site out by 207, then
- 6 it doesn't benefit us -- benefit us at all.
- But, listening to what Mr. Burnett had to say
- 8 about a -- the railroad having a planned community
- 9 north of here, the thing that got my attention was
- the possibility of 400,000, or maybe something
- less, of commercial, you know, space, that takes
- away from our, you know, potential of -- you know,
- of an industrial park that we could have down
- here.
- When I look at the construction costs and

everything that's going on, I'm looking for added 16 17 ways to get revenue. And that, to me, says that, 18 yeah, we need to participate in this. And I'd like to make a deal with you that 19 we'll participate the \$25,000 -- this is my 20 opinion, not everybody else's. We'll participate 21 22 the \$25,000, but if the Airport's property is not selected as it, we want \$12,5- back. 23 24 MR. SACIA: Well, that -- we -- we would --25 we would understand that assuredly. And I think AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006 64 1 the -- the -- to keep in mind, too, the selection of the sites, that's just the minor part of the 2 3 study. It's almost a foregone conclusion that the Airport Authority's property, especially if they 4 5 want that considered, would be a frontrunner, 6 because it's already publicly owned. The majority --7

MR. GEORGE: Then let's make it a hundred

9	percent we get it back if it's not?
10	MR. SACIA: The majority
11	CHAIRMAN COX: We'll take the \$75,000.
12	MR. SACIA: And if it is, you're taking the
13	whole \$75,000? The majority of the study is going
14	to be the best way looking at giving options,
15	of the best way to plan that site, what you can
16	expect in return for the money you spend to
17	develop that site, what options are out there
18	through grants and other opportunities to build
19	that site without the local taxpayer monies being
20	involved, things like that.
21	CHAIRMAN COX: What's your your planned
22	your window of time assuming, blue sky effort,
23	everything goes the way you want it to, what's
24	your your window of time to start the study?
25	MR. SACIA: Well, we plan to submit review
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - IULY 17-200

65

the RFP at the end of July. 1

- 2 CHAIRMAN COX: Okay.
- 3 MR. SACIA: The RFP process will be anywhere
- 4 from three to four weeks. So, you're probably
- 5 looking at the first of December to make -- or
- 6 first of September --
- 7 CHAIRMAN COX: September.
- 8 MR. SACIA: -- to make a decision on a
- 9 consultant. And then, blue sky, a three-month --
- 10 CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. December.
- 11 MR. SACIA: -- period. December.
- 12 CHAIRMAN COX: Yeah. Mr. Brunson?
- MR. BRUNSON: I think I asked this question
- before, Nick -- and by the way, you're doing an
- excellent job of selling your product and --
- 16 MR. SACIA: Thank you.
- MR. BRUNSON: -- and we want to support you.
- And -- but the City of St. Augustine benefits
- greatly from anything the County does and that we
- do. And have they been approached to participate?
- MR. SACIA: The Industrial Development
- 22 Authority has approached the City of
- 23 St. Augustine. They've got the same problem that

- you're kind of talking about here, is they don't
- have any sites.

66

The sites that we're looking at are going to 1 be rather larger sites that you wouldn't 2 3 necessarily build the -- you know, compete with 4 the -- the private developer that might build the, 5 you know, 10,000 square feet flex space and things 6 like that. We're looking for where larger industries can settle that we might not have the 7 8 opportunity to gain that provide the higher wages, 9 the better benefits, and things like that. 10 MR. BRUNSON: But they're part of the 11 community and they --12 MR. SACIA: Right. 13 MR. BRUNSON: -- get the benefits. And if I was the mayor of St. Augustine, I would want to be 14

file:///A//MTG071706.txt (87 of 203)8/22/2006 10:12:44 AM

MR. SACIA: Right.

included.

15

25

- 17 MR. BRUNSON: And -- and -- and keep in mind, 18 having said that we want to support you, we have a 19 tremendous reason for trying to get off the tax rolls, and -- and -- but as I said earlier on the 20 21 tax rollback rate, sometimes you've got to spend money to make money. And that's the only reason I 22 can even justify what I'm thinking about. 23 24 MR. GEORGE: Let me quote you on that.
  - AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING JULY 17, 2006

MR. SACIA: And that's our -- you know -- and

67

1 that's to make -- not only does it -- it's almost 2 a win-win situation, because not only does it 3 provide revenue to the Airport Authority, provide 4 an opportunity to develop that land, but it also 5 provides the relief from the tax rate to the 6 taxpayer, which may be minimal, but everybody -everything helps these days, but also a place to 7 work and to -- to upgrade their employment, as 8

well.

10	CHAIRMAN COX: Based on that statement, do
11	you have any forecast yet as to how many jobs it
12	might create if you create it?
13	MR. SACIA: That's what the study's for.
14	CHAIRMAN COX: Well, I understand, but
15	MR. SACIA: Yeah. Not offhand.
16	CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. All right.
17	MR. SACIA: Because we haven't looked into
18	the the details yet.
19	CHAIRMAN COX: All right.
20	MR. SACIA: And think of it, when we look at
21	this type of situation, there's been comments
22	about the private sector and competing with the
23	private sector.
24	My best example that I could come up with is
25	a public golf course; it doesn't seem to be any
	AND DODE AND DODE AND DECLY AD A CEPTAGE WAY AS A SO

- 1 problem to buy property to build a public golf
- 2 course to be able to provide affordable golf for

3	the people in the community, yet there are private
4	golf courses that cater to different clientele.
5	And the same way, there's still private
6	developers, but they're going to cater to a little
7	different clientele. This offer is the public has
8	property that they can offer to create jobs to
9	benefit the people that may not be able to apply
10	to the other clientele.
11	MR. GEORGE: But in the example of building a
12	golf course, you're not asking local tennis courts
13	to put in money for the study to come up with a
14	golf course.
15	MR. SACIA: That's right. That's why I'm
16	here asking you.
17	MR. GEORGE: I was under the impression from
18	our presentation last month, that the overall
19	objective was to find a site. And that's what I
20	objected to last week (sic).
21	What I'm hearing you say now, Nick, is the
22	Airport Authority's physical site is what has
23	already been selected, then I can support this.

- MR. SACIA: Well, I can't say that it's
- already been selected, but I can say it's -- it's

69

1	on the top of the list, because no site's been
2	selected as of yet.
3	But part of the problem, when you do a study
4	or when you go to complete the recommendations,
5	when you have to deal with several landowners, and
6	there's easements and other things that are
7	involved, that makes it harder to acquire that
8	site more expensive.
9	With the Airport Authority already owning
10	that property, you've already cut out three or
11	four of those difficult steps. So, the priority
12	would be would naturally be a property
13	that's the furthest down the line would be the
14	first priority. And the Airport's property is
15	that property.

CHAIRMAN COX: Let's -- let's --

- MR. BRUNSON: Nick, one more comment and --
- so I can hear your answer. Might I -- might it be
- best that if the Airport would do their own study
- and -- and assured that our study would have the
- 21 industrial park here?
- MR. SACIA: I can -- it would cost you more
- to do it.
- MR. GEORGE: Don't use the word "guarantee."
- MR. SACIA: I cannot guarantee that it will

- be in the -- I can -- I'm 99.9 percent sure that
- 2 the airport property would be in the study and
- 3 probably a main focus of the study. And I -- I
- 4 think we could even write into the contract,
- 5 probably, that if it wasn't, you got some of your
- 6 money back.
- 7 CHAIRMAN COX: All right. I just want to
- 8 get -- I want to get public comments --
- 9 MR. GEORGE: Oh, okay. Fine.

11/1111007	1700kk
10	CHAIRMAN COX: before we get too deep in
11	it. And we've got valid points that you need to
12	make?
13	MR. GEORGE: No.
14	CHAIRMAN COX: No valid points? Okay.
15	MR. GEORGE: Right. Just rhetoric.
16	CHAIRMAN COX: Like to open up to public
17	comment on this agenda. Mr. Ciriello?
18	MR. CIRIELLO: Joe Ciriello, 5318 Shore
19	Drive. I just want to throw out a thought.
20	You're talking about this industrial development
21	and all.
22	If I remember correctly, I wasn't here at the
23	time, but between Fairchild and Grumman, when
24	Fairchild was on the airport doing airport
25	business, and they took off, before Grumman came

- in and -- and took over, I understand there was a
- 2 industrial development park right on this airport.

3	There was a machine shop and a lumber company and
4	a pipe company and all. And they only lasted
5	something like a few years and went all belly up,
6	and then Grumman come in and took over.
7	So, when you talk about what he's talking
8	about, looking into the thing, you might want to
9	find out, you know, why this other industrial
10	development that was right on the airport went
11	belly up.
12	CHAIRMAN COX: Thank you very much, sir.
13	Public comment, Mr. Slingluff?
14	MR. SLINGLUFF: The you creating the
15	industrial park area does increase the buffer zone
16	around the airport
17	CHAIRMAN COX: Good point.
18	MR. SLINGLUFF: which I think is critical.
19	CHAIRMAN COX: Very good point.
20	MR. SLINGLUFF: And in the next two days, I
21	think Wednesday morning in the newspaper, you will
22	see an article where the runway, the main runway
23	at Stuart airport will be shortened because the
24	lack of the buffer zone around the airport and

lack of planning. They've lost the fight. It

# AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006

1	will go to court now, but the public is winning
2	there. And they they're going to lose probably
3	close to a thousand feet of runway.
4	CHAIRMAN COX: Thank you very much, sir.
5	Mr. Martinelli?
6	MR. MARTINELLI: We, I think, are looking at
7	apples and oranges. And the reason I say that is
8	that for many years, we have thought about, talked
9	about industrial development here at the airport.
10	We've talked about multimodal. We've talked
11	about the advantages of multimodal, which are
12	unique. And they're unique to this airport. And
13	when I say "apples and oranges," the industrial
14	development property available for development
15	here is unique. And it's not the same. And I
16	don't know that it would even fit into the same
17	study that Nick is talking about. Look at Bartow.

18	Look at Van Nuys airport in California.
19	Look at the industrial development around
20	those airports, and they all have something in
21	common. Every industry that's there is
22	aviation-related. And it's aviation-related
23	because they need that kind of accessibility to
24	air travel, or in this case, rail travel, truck
25	travel, maybe even water travel here, if we ever
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
1	get multimodal off the ground.
2	
2	And so, I would be very careful about having
3	And so, I would be very careful about having somebody do a study that's so generic that it
3	somebody do a study that's so generic that it
3	somebody do a study that's so generic that it covers the entire county, and we might or might
<ul><li>3</li><li>4</li><li>5</li></ul>	somebody do a study that's so generic that it covers the entire county, and we might or might not fit into that, and not take full advantage of
<ul><li>3</li><li>4</li><li>5</li><li>6</li></ul>	somebody do a study that's so generic that it covers the entire county, and we might or might not fit into that, and not take full advantage of the assets that we have to attract bona fide
<ul><li>3</li><li>4</li><li>5</li><li>6</li><li>7</li></ul>	somebody do a study that's so generic that it covers the entire county, and we might or might not fit into that, and not take full advantage of the assets that we have to attract bona fide industrial development that's going to stick,

this community could probably support.

11	CHAIRMAN COX: Very good point. Further
12	public comment?
13	(No further public comment.)
14	CHAIRMAN COX: I just I'd like to pass
15	something on, just food for thought. I'd like to
16	see see us have the foresight to move future
17	boards into a situation where they have this
18	opportunity available to them; i.e., take
19	advantage of that industrial park area, as opposed
20	to not having it available and wishing we had it
21	available. You know what I'm saying?
22	So, in five years or ten years, man, I wish
23	that board had voted for the industrial park out
24	there, because now we've got condos or apartments
25	or whatever and we're getting lawsuits for noise
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
	74
1	and blah, blah, you know, whatever it is.
2	It's just I think we could take and and
3	Mr. Martinelli makes some very good points, some

4 very valid points, also. So, Mr. George? 5 MR. GEORGE: I make a motion we approve the 6 \$25,000 to give them, with the caveat that in the 7 event that the already owned St. Augustine airport 8 property is not selected, we get the \$25- back. 9 MR. SACIA: I think that's perfectly fair. 10 CHAIRMAN COX: I'll second the motion. Any 11 discussion? MR. BRUNSON: (Shakes head.) 12 13 CHAIRMAN COX: No? 14 MR. BRUNSON: No. CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. We have a motion on the 15 table. It's been seconded. All of those in 16 favor, say aye. 17 18 MR. BRUNSON: Aye. 19 CHAIRMAN COX: Aye. 20 MR. GEORGE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN COX: All opposed?

CHAIRMAN COX: The ayes have it. You've got

(No opposition.)

it.

21

22

23

MR. SACIA: Thank you very much. We'll get

# AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006

1	to work on that and get
2	CHAIRMAN COX: You better.
3	MR. SACIA: the RFP to include airport
4	industry in that study.
5	9.D RESOLUTIONS 2006-03, 2006-04 & 2006-05
6	FDOT JPAs
7	CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. Our next agenda item we
8	had moved to the last of the agenda items. So,
9	let's move to JPA grant resolutions, please.
10	MR. WUELLNER: Yes, sir. I've got the
11	privilege today of offering you money from the
12	State of Florida
13	(Whereupon, Mr. Brunson leaves the room.)
14	CHAIRMAN COX: Good. How much?
15	MR. WUELLNER: for three separate
16	projects, first of which comes in the form of
17	Resolution 2006-03, which is for south development

infrastructure, which is basically the T-hangar 18 19 taxiways and supporting drainage and infrastructure needs. It's an 80 percent FDOT 20 21 grant with FDOT's participation limited to 22 \$500,000, making it, I believe, \$625,000 of total project. Second --23 24 MR. GEORGE: What do we have budgeted for it? 25 MR. WUELLNER: Six hundred and twenty-five AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006 76 1 thousand. 2 MR. GEORGE: Okay. Fine. All right. 3 MR. WUELLNER: Whatever the number is. I knew I should have written this differently for 4 5 you. MR. GEORGE: No. It's just a point of 6 7 clarification. 8 (Whereupon, Mr. Brunson enters the room.)

MR. WUELLNER: I don't know what your

pleasure is, to adopt all three resolutions at one

9

11	time or to handle them individually. But the
12	resolutions basically authorize the executive
13	director to execute the Joint Participation
14	Agreements and commit you to the 20 percent share
15	of the grant up to the FDOT participation.
16	CHAIRMAN COX: Well, unless there are no
17	exceptions to doing it all at once
18	MR. GEORGE: I'd do it all at once.
19	CHAIRMAN COX: Then we'll just do it all at
20	once.
21	MR. WUELLNER: Okay. Then 2006-04 is for
22	T-hangars, is a 50 percent FDOT. It is generic in
23	terms of number. It is a function of the total
24	amount of money available. So, it will buy
25	whatever the money buys, whether that's two units
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
1	or 20 units. There's
2	MR. GEORGE: Based on your recent update of

the cost estimates, what do you anticipate --

4 MR. WUELLNER: Five hundred thousand dollars 5 is probably a 10-unit building at most. MR. GEORGE: Okay. 6 MR. WUELLNER: To give you an idea. Fifty 7 8 percent FDOT money. It is a multiyear funding, meaning there's \$200,000 available right now, or 9 10 upon the signature of the grant, and \$300,000 11 available next fiscal year of Florida DOT, which 12 is this time next year, July 1st, next year. So, 13 a total of \$500,000. So, it's a total of a 14 million dollars worth of T-hangars, which is probably more like 16 or 18 hangars in total when 15 you put our share in it. 16 17 The next grant is for 2000 -- is 2006-05 18 resolution, again for T-hangars. This is a 19 supplemental JPA, meaning it adds money to an 20 existing grant we have. It is at a ratio of 50 21 percent, also. They're adding \$200,000, making 22 their commitment to us in the T-hangar project now \$600,000, or a \$1.2 million total project for 23 24 T-hangars. 25 So, if you're really quick on the math, you

1	now know you have \$2.2 million of T-hangars
2	available to the Authority in the south hangar
3	area.
4	CHAIRMAN COX: Discussion.
5	MR. WUELLNER: Assuming you adopt these three
6	resolutions and I sign them.
7	MR. GEORGE: 05 says it's an additional
8	\$200 Is that in addition to the 04?
9	MR. WUELLNER: You already it's a separate
10	grant.
11	MR. GEORGE: But we already have the first
12	piece of it.
13	MR. WUELLNER: You already have \$400,000
14	under grant.
15	MR. GEORGE: Okay.
16	MR. WUELLNER: And they're adding \$200- more.
17	MR. GEORGE: All right. So, you're thinking
18	that both of those put together a mill point 2

- 19 is 2 point 4 --20 MR. WUELLNER: I'm not as sharp as you, but I know a million plus \$1.2- is \$2.2-, which is 21 22 where --MR. GEORGE: Fine. And \$2.2- will buy you 23 what? \$2.2- just got through buying us only three 24 hangars. 25 AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006 79 1 MR. WUELLNER: Yes, but they were 10,000 each, or what was it? 2 3 MR. GEORGE: Your most educated guess, how
  - MR. GEORGE: Your most educated guess, how
    many -
    MR. WUELLNER: We're going to build 36 for
    this, or 38.

    CHAIRMAN COX: Good. Send me a signed copy
    of that statement, please.

    MR. WUELLNER: It will be in the minutes next

CHAIRMAN COX: Thirty-six.

month.

10

25

- 12 MR. WUELLNER: Yes. 13 CHAIRMAN COX: All right. Somewhere between 14 30 and 36. 15 MR. WUELLNER: I'd say somewhere between 30 16 and 40. CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. I'll go you that. 17 18 MR. WUELLNER: Now, that's just buildings. 19 CHAIRMAN COX: Discussion? 20 MR. GEORGE: Sounds good. 21 MR. BRUNSON: No discussion. 22 CHAIRMAN COX: Public comments on this agenda item, please. Any public comment? 23 24 (No public comment.)
  - AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING JULY 17, 2006

CHAIRMAN COX: I'll entertain a motion.

- 1 MR. GEORGE: Make a motion we accept them as 2 presented.
- 3 MR. BRUNSON: Second.
- 4 MR. GEORGE: In their entirety.

5	CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. We have a motion on the
6	floor and a second. I don't think there's any
7	discussion; there wasn't previously. All of those
8	in favor, say aye.
9	MR. BRUNSON: Aye.
10	CHAIRMAN COX: Aye.
11	MR. GEORGE: Aye.
12	CHAIRMAN COX: All opposed?
13	(No opposition.)
14	CHAIRMAN COX: Ayes have it. Motion passes.
15	9.E TERMINAL REHAB - STAIR & TILE REPLACEMENT
16	MR. WUELLNER: Next item I have is the
17	if if you recall during the budget workshop, we
18	mentioned that there were several projects in the
19	terminal complex that needed our attention, and we
20	were directed to develop the cost estimates for
21	those projects and bring it back to you for
22	consideration of funding immediately; i.e., this
23	fiscal year, getting the work accomplished rather
24	than defer it until October.
25	Those two projects primarily were the stairs

1	replacement on the back side of the terminal that
2	has largely rusted through and and needs
3	significant work, and is probably beyond the cost
4	of repairing.
5	And we're proposing we remove those concrete
6	and steel structure that's there and replace it
7	with a structure that's very similar to the stairs
8	that exit onto the airside of the new terminal
9	building B, or the office building, which is a
10	galvanized and aluminum structure that will in
11	theory not rust at anything near the rate the
12	original straight steel straight steel-type
13	structure was.
14	Engineer's estimate Passero did the
15	layout. It slightly reconfigures it to a little
16	more usable orientation there. But it looks
17	the engineer's estimate puts it at about \$65,000
18	to do the removal and replacement of that stair

19	structure.
20	The other piece of the puzzle is the main
21	public restrooms, lounge, or the main terminal
22	floor area, including the fountain and the pilots'
23	lounge restroom and the porch area on the second
24	floor of the restaurant, is tile removal and
25	replacement in those areas.
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
	82
1	You may recall you may recall
2	conversations from quite a while ago the problems
3	with the tiles and the carpeting at that point
4	that were put down when the terminal was
5	originally built. The order of placing those
6	things in the terminal have had created a
7	long-term maintenance problem that we're trying to
8	finally just get rid of and replaced.
9	The tile was placed before the completion of
10	construction and so was the original terminal
11	carpeting. And as a result, all of the Drywall

12	finishing and all of that was was literally
13	done on top of the tile work and during the time
14	the tile work was done. The grout infiltrated
15	or was infiltrated in the grout all of the Drywall
16	compound. It has been a continual maintenance
17	headache in that terminal.
18	And for approximately \$30,000, we can remove,
19	replace, put an appropriate type of tile down
20	and and redo those areas in the terminal.
21	So, where I estimated a hundred, we're at
22	\$95 So, with your indulgence, we'd like to go
23	ahead and gets bids procured. We've got our tile
24	bids because of the way we had to procure it. But
25	we would have to do a regular sealed bid for the
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
	83
1	stair work.
2	But we'd like to move to final drawings with

Passero and get that -- get that out on the street

and get it -- get the work done.

3

5	CHAIRMAN COX: So, the board action you're
6	looking for us today is just to approve Passero
7	moving forward?
8	MR. WUELLNER: Approve those items out of
9	this current year budget. The only thing it will
10	affect is roll forward, which will we pretty
11	much already accounted for in in moving the
12	budget.
13	CHAIRMAN COX: We don't need a motion on
14	this, do we?
15	MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, you probably should. Or
16	just approve those projects and we'll take care of
17	the rest. You don't need to formally amend your
18	budget, but I think you need to
19	CHAIRMAN COX: That's what I yeah.
20	MR. WUELLNER: approve the project work.
21	CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. Any discussion on it?
22	MR. GEORGE: Yes. How does this impact
23	CHAIRMAN COX: Galaxy?
24	MR. GEORGE: the forecast of your budget?
25	I don't know where where was this in last

1	year's budget?
2	MR. WUELLNER: It was not. They were not
3	items. The maintenance obligations on the on
4	the stairs in particular have come to our
5	attention over the last
6	MR. GEORGE: So, we're talking about spending
7	the hundred thousand in this year, not in
8	MR. WUELLNER: This current fiscal year.
9	MR. GEORGE: Okay. So, that will decrease
10	your forecasted cash?
11	MR. WUELLNER: Cash forward for next year,
12	yes.
13	MR. GEORGE: Has this has your budget
14	been we haven't approved it yet, so you
15	couldn't reflect it.
16	MR. WUELLNER: Correct. It does not reflect
17	it because you have not you have not approved
18	these yet. We'll make the adjustment
19	MR. GEORGE: Okay.

20 MR. WUELLNER: -- in the next iteration. 21 MR. GEORGE: So, our cash position going in will be a hundred thousand less. 22 23 CHAIRMAN COX: Right. 24 MR. WUELLNER: Instead of carrying \$960-some thousand, you'll get \$860-some thousand into next 25 AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006 85 1 year. 2 MR. GEORGE: I think this is one of the things that Mr. Brunson was concerned about, that 3 4 if we hold the millage the same, that this money 5 be put into -- because there's always going to be 6 some reason, you know, or something else that 7 comes up that says we need to spend that. 8 So, do you have anything in the budget for 9 next year of this type of an expenditure? In other words, this is not considered capital 10

wondering --

improvement or capital budget. So, I'm just

11

- MR. WUELLNER: It would be --
- MR. GEORGE: -- is the existing operating --
- MR. WUELLNER: It would be a capital item,
- technically. Let me look at it quick.
- 17 The only thing that comes anywhere close
- would be the -- the recoat of the T-hangar roofs.
- 19 That goes into the category of extending the life
- of an -- of an asset --
- MR. GEORGE: Right.
- MR. WUELLNER: -- so therefore gets
- 23 capitalized.
- MR. GEORGE: Okay.
- MR. WUELLNER: But that's -- you know, next

- 1 year's projection's only a \$15,000 expenditure in
- 2 that particular line item.
- 3 MR. GEORGE: Okay.
- 4 CHAIRMAN COX: Mr. Brunson?
- 5 MR. BRUNSON: This is kind of off the

- 6 subject, but keeping in mind here, I have concerns
- 7 about the restaurant and the -- you know, their
- 8 business and so forth.
- 9 MR. WUELLNER: Okay.
- MR. BRUNSON: Keeping in mind, if you're
- going to do this, I'd like the engineer to think
- about making it enticing for people on the runway
- side to know there's a restaurant there.
- MR. WUELLNER: Uh-huh. This layout --
- MR. BRUNSON: Signage or whatever, and really
- to steer people to -- to go up there and use it.
- 17 MR. WUELLNER: Okay.
- MR. BRUNSON: And this would be a perfect
- 19 time to do that.
- 20 CHAIRMAN COX: How much -- how much thought
- 21 are we giving, Ed, to the --
- MR. WUELLNER: You guys can --
- MR. HOLESKO: Well, we can -- we can
- certainly add signage to the stair replacement.
- 25 CHAIRMAN COX: How much thought are we

- giving, Ed, to the impact that it's going to have on air ops and -- and activity there at the
- 3 restaurant, Galaxy, the terminal, and all of that
- 4 that's going on?
- 5 MR. WUELLNER: Actually, we don't see any
- 6 short-term impact of it, because the -- the
- 7 activity's actually outside of the -- I mean,
- 8 you're -- you're looking at less than a week of --
- 9 of total construction --
- 10 CHAIRMAN COX: Oh, okay.
- MR. WUELLNER: -- time up there.
- 12 CHAIRMAN COX: Okay.
- MR. WUELLNER: Assuming the weather
- cooperates.
- MR. GEORGE: Ed, do you think it would be
- prudent on our part to add to the budget for this
- coming year something in this neighborhood for
- unforeseen, you know, improvements to property?
- MR. WUELLNER: Actually, I like the way

- file:///A|/MTG071706.txt you're going about creating a reserved line item 20 21 that's a restricted reserve line that, you know, 22 requires just this, that you -- you know, you deal with them -- if there's something of this order 23 that comes up that simply is not prudent to wait 24 on, we can bring that to your attention, you can 25 AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006 88 make the business decision necessary, you know, 1 2 relative to it, rather than just put another line 3 out there that's, you know, not necessarily an
  - expenditure tied to it. 4
  - 5 MR. GEORGE: But one of the problems I have
  - is we put together the budget, and then at the end 6
  - 7 of the year, the actual expenditures don't
  - 8 necessarily look like that budget, and there are
  - 9 2500 reasons why.
  - 10 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah.
  - 11 MR. GEORGE: Or maybe there's six reasons.
  - But if we see, because of the age of our 12

A/MTG0/	17/00.txt
13	buildings, we need to start making that
14	investment, I think we ought to identify it as
15	a as a capital expenditure, and if we don't use
16	it, guess what? It stays in the in the pot.
17	MR. WUELLNER: I I really don't have any
18	problem with that approach. The short-term issue
19	is you really have not funded a you know, that
20	repair and replacement, for lack of better terms.
21	We have we begin to to fund that, I believe
22	it's year after next, year after that? But it
23	begins to show up as a dedicated reserve line
24	item
25	MD GEODGE: Vach

- 1 MR. WUELLNER: -- in your -- in your
  2 forecast. It -- it's not funded yet because, you
  3 know, there really was no reserve funded through
  4 this fiscal year.
- 5 CHAIRMAN COX: When you -- so, we need --

6	MR. WUELLNER: So, you're just beginning to
7	get reserve money that you can allocate if you'd
8	like.
9	CHAIRMAN COX: We're getting kind of off the
10	topic here. Let's I need to open this up to
11	public comments on this particular agenda item.
12	Any public comments on this agenda item?
13	MR. MARTINELLI: Yeah.
14	CHAIRMAN COX: Mr. Martinelli?
15	MR. MARTINELLI: Just very quickly, I I
16	think Ed said it; it's a reserve, and and
17	that's the way you budget it, as a reserve.
18	Because you don't know when you're going to have
19	these things, and when you have them, the board
20	then authorizes it.
21	Also, Ed, is it still a requirement that at
22	year-end, the board approve the reallocation of
23	the actual funds to the budget funds, the
24	actual funds? In other words, so at the end of
25	the year, going forward, it's official what you
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006

1	actually incurred is what your budget was?
2	Basically.
3	MR. WUELLNER: They they do it
4	simultaneous with the approval of the audit.
5	MR. MARTINELLI: Yeah.
6	MR. WUELLNER: That
7	MR. MARTINELLI: Right. And so, to answer
8	your question, Buzz, going forward, what actually
9	happened this year is there now as conforming to
10	the budget.
11	MR. GEORGE: Understand.
12	CHAIRMAN COX: Thank you, sir. Any other
13	public comment?
14	(No further public comment.)
15	CHAIRMAN COX: Well, we're back to board
16	action. I'll entertain any motions for action on
17	that.
18	MR. BRUNSON: Well, I'll make a motion so it
19	doesn't die. I make a motion that we accept

Staff's recommendation to redo the back steps with

- 21 the -- with the condition that we put signage
- and -- attractive for the -- for the FBO side.
- 23 CHAIRMAN COX: I'll second the motion.
- MR. WUELLNER: Does that include the tile
- work? I just --

- 1 MR. BRUNSON: Yeah.
- 2 CHAIRMAN COX: I think he's talking about the
- 3 whole deal there.
- 4 MR. BRUNSON: Yeah.
- 5 MR. WUELLNER: Okay.
- 6 CHAIRMAN COX: There's a motion on the table
- 7 and a second. Any discussion on the motion?
- 8 (Whereupon, Mr. Gorman enters the room.)
- 9 CHAIRMAN COX: No?
- MR. BRUNSON: The only discussion, I will say
- that I agree with the reserve fund approach, that
- if we put \$60,000 over here for -- budgeted just
- out there, that not that Ed would do this, but he

14 says at the end of the year, we have to spend it, 15 so I'll buy two more cars or something -- just --16 so, I like the reserve approach. 17 CHAIRMAN COX: All right. 18 MR. GEORGE: Why can't the reserve have a 19 subcategory --20 MR. WUELLNER: It can. 21 MR. GEORGE: -- for improvements and stuff 22 like that? I'm just trying to get -- identify 23 what it takes to run, in some clear concise way, 24 what it takes to run the airport. CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. Wait. Guys, we're on 25

### AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006

- 1 an agenda item talking about this rehabilitation
- 2 program, not the budget discussion, okay?
- 3 MR. GEORGE: Right.
- CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. And we've got a motion 4
- on the table and a second. We're not discussing 5
- 6 the budget. So, let's move forward. There's a

7	motion on the table and a second. All of those in
8	favor?
9	MR. BRUNSON: Aye.
10	CHAIRMAN COX: Aye.
11	All opposed? Are you going to you need to
12	say something.
13	MR. GEORGE: I oppose.
14	CHAIRMAN COX: You oppose. Okay. The ayes
15	have it. Motion passes. You have the ability to
16	move forward with that now.
17	MR. WUELLNER: Thank you.
18	9.F EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S PERFORMANCE REVIEW
19	CHAIRMAN COX: We're moving on to the
20	director's performance review. And I got all of
21	the all of the ones that were handed in on the
22	request for the performance of the director, and
23	all were very favorable. There was very few
24	negative comments made. But this has has come

around since from two years ago when we discussed

1	the performance review for the director two years
2	ago.
3	He's he's got two years left on his
4	five-year contract. And at that time, two-years
5	ago, we told him we were going to wait one more
6	year and then discuss the issue again. So,
7	actually we're well beyond that.
8	So, we just need to open up and maybe discuss
9	his performance review and where you want to go
10	with it. I'm open to comments.
11	MR. GEORGE: I think he's done a heck of a
12	job. And just the knowledge and of how he gets
13	around in and out of the different grants and
14	things like that is shows his knowledge and
15	expertise in the area. And I think we ought to
16	give him \$5 raise. No.
17	I think we ought to give him a raise. But
18	how much that is, has anybody done any you
19	know, any analysis of what other executive
20	directors have been making?

21	CHAIRMAN COX: It's all over the ballpark, as
22	you might suspect. And, you know, just like the
23	airport's statistical analyses are, it's very,
24	very, very difficult to to gauge that. And you
25	almost have to go, as opposed to an airport
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
	94
1	
1	situation, and maybe by industry and what the
2	person that's managing in responsibility level, as
3	opposed to airport director of an airport
4	director.
5	I totally agree with Buzz, that I think the
6	director's done a tremendous job and has really
7	bought brought our the whole budget
8	scenario, the tax scenario, and come back around
9	into a realistic program of trying to move the
10	airport into getting off the tax rolls much
11	earlier than than we had forecast, even, when
12	you you know, we came on board here.
13	I would like to see I really want to see

//A /MT	G071706.txt
14	the director of our airport, because of the
15	utility of having the director close by and being
16	able to respond to anything that the airport
17	needs, I I want, or would prefer, to have the
18	airport (sic) on the airport property, period.
19	And that's another point for discussion also.
20	So, I agree; there's a percentage, and I
21	think we my opinion is I'd like to see him get
22	a raise and have a percentage. And I think that's
23	the discussion right now, is what percentage we
24	should move forward, at least in my opinion.
25	MR. BRUNSON: I Mr. Chairman?
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006

- 1 CHAIRMAN COX: Yes, sir.
- 2 MR. BRUNSON: I think, as you know, everyone
- knows, I agree wholeheartedly that Ed is doing a 3
- good job. There's a lot of things that he cannot 4
- 5 control.
- 6 CHAIRMAN COX: Right.

7	MR. BRUNSON: But I think the things that he
8	does control, he he does it in a very good
9	business way.
10	And I might just go ahead and peep under the
11	tent a little bit and let you know my thoughts,
12	that I think we need to look and see what the
13	state level has done with the state level
14	increases in in salary, and we need to look and
15	see what the County has done with their
16	percentages of increase, and and and that
17	would be some of my guidelines to go forward.
18	CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. It's going to be it
19	will be difficult to find a managerial level
20	that's analogous to what he's doing here.
21	And I don't disagree with you, but I'm I'm
22	trying to just think in my mind where you would go
23	with that, because as a government entity, there's
24	very few people in the position of responsibility
25	that in that manner that, you know, that Ed's

controlling and has at his disposal right now. 1 2 MR. BRUNSON: I agree with you. 3 CHAIRMAN COX: So, you had --4 MR. GEORGE: You can always go then -- no, 5 you can't. No. When you start talking about 6 looking at other airports, you know, we did this 7 nice comparative analysis --8 CHAIRMAN COX: Yes. 9 MR. GEORGE: -- and what it came up with is that there's differences, you know, all over the 10 place. So... 11 CHAIRMAN COX: That's why it's all over the 12 13 ballpark. 14 MR. GEORGE: It is. Ed, what was the salary increase that you had put in the budget for this 15 16 year and for last year, do you remember, for 17 the -- all of the employees? 18 MR. WUELLNER: We do a flat five percent

file:///A|/MTG071706.txt (127 of 203)8/22/2006 10:12:44 AM

MR. GEORGE: Do a flat five percent. And

what we're talking about, Mr. Chairman, is he

19

20

21

across.

- hasn't had a raise in two years.
- 23 CHAIRMAN COX: I understand that.
- MR. GEORGE: And that's what we're talking
- about.

- 1 CHAIRMAN COX: That's correct.
- 2 MR. GEORGE: Okay. I'd like to propose that
- 3 we give him a 10 -- 10 percent increase, because
- 4 that will cover the two years, or you could make
- 5 it five for the previous year and retroactive.
- 6 You know, you did that a couple of years ago.
- 7 CHAIRMAN COX: Right. Exactly. Right.
- 8 MR. GEORGE: Second thing is every time we go
- 9 over his salary, somebody throws a -- you know, a
- shotgun blast at, well, we've got a house that
- he's on. So, I'd like to see his contract, you
- know, put in there that says that we require him
- to leave on the property, just to get it out.
- We've all said that we require him on live on the

15 property, and that's why we give him the house --16 CHAIRMAN COX: Right. 17 MR. GEORGE: -- as part of his compensation. 18 CHAIRMAN COX: Right. 19 MR. GEORGE: And I also would like to see us, maybe not for this year, but for us to seriously 20 21 consider working into some sort of a bonus plan for meeting the financial objectives of this 22 board. I think that that's totally in line with 23 24 what other companies do. They do it through stock incentives and things like that. And it just --25 AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006 98 1 it is another way for -- for if we make out, he 2 makes out. 3 CHAIRMAN COX: Mr. Gorman, any comments? 4 MR. GORMAN: Again, I'm back to comparative analysis. I would like to see -- I do agree he 5 6 needs to -- to live in the area. I would like to

put the -- the subject to bed of that house of his

8	by renting it back to him, even if you want to
9	recompensate him for the amount, I'm just so tired
10	of of hearing that and and thinking about
11	it.
12	And but as far as his salary goes, I
13	really think that it should be based on a
14	comparative analysis of other directors of
15	airports of similar size, similar operations,
16	similar numbers of hangars, similar numbers of
17	businesses, and then just run into a ballpark as
18	far as I do think he does an excellent, really
19	excellent job on some things. On other things, of
20	course, I disagree with him quite vehemently on.
21	But some things, of course, he's really good at.
22	There's no doubt that he's certainly been in the
23	business a while.
24	But as far as that salary goes, I really
25	think it needs to be comparative. And it it

1	just because whatever exists now doesn't
2	necessarily mean that that is a benchmark to
3	continue from. Although, I can't say that I would
4	want to really cut it from here, because he's done
5	a good job.
6	CHAIRMAN COX: Well, we've held off two years
7	on any discussion, actually, for his salary
8	review. How long did it take us to get to that?
9	MR. GEORGE: A long time.
10	CHAIRMAN COX: Well, my point is
11	MR. GEORGE: I remember from the last I
12	remember from the last time, that there are a
13	couple of airports that go through and do a
14	statewide analysis of what the executive director
15	does, but they don't go the next step of, well,
16	what are they responsible for? Are they
17	responsible for accounting? Are they not
18	responsible for accounting, whatnot?
19	And back to your comment about the property,
20	Jack, if we are going to require that he stay, you
21	know, on the property, if we pay if we if we

22 take what we think the property is worth, put it 23 in his salary and make him pay it back right now? 24 MR. GORMAN: Even though that seems silly, then it -- then if the market value is -- is paid 25 AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006 100 for the house, and we do have other rental houses, 1 2 it just becomes, oh, to put it in kind of silly 3 vernacular, a cleaner deal. MR. GEORGE: Yeah. About a year ago, I -- I 4 discussed this with some people in the county, and 5 they said the cleanest deal is to put it in his 6 7 contract, that we require him on-site and part of his compensation is to provide that house. 8 9 MR. GORMAN: And they thought that -- that 10 the provision of the house without any -- because 11 we talk about then --12

file:///A|/MTG071706.txt (132 of 203)8/22/2006 10:12:44 AM

13

14

MR. GEORGE: Well, every --

MR. GORMAN: Does that include the

maintenance? See, I keep constantly get people

15	that ask me, does that include his maintenance?
16	Is he doing his maintenance? Is he doing this?
17	Is he doing that?
18	And that leaves all of those discussions
19	open. If it's just simply rented to him at fair
20	market value, even if we recompensate him for
21	that, in terms of pure market, like I said, it's a
22	cleaner deal.
23	CHAIRMAN COX: Well and you can have those
24	kinds of questions regardless. I mean, does the
25	President pay his maintenance on the White House?
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
	101
1	You know, I don't know. Is anybody going to
2	require him to answer that? No. But, I mean,
3	it's part of his deal.
4	It just it gets you're going to run
5	into all kinds of questions. You're always going
6	to have questions on that. And I I agree with

Buzz; I think we need to specify that he lives on

A/MTG	J/1/00.txt
8	the property and that's and it's the airport's
9	situation, we have that house available for the
10	person who we have as the director of the airport.
11	MR. BRUNSON: Mr. Chairman?
12	CHAIRMAN COX: Yes, sir.
13	MR. BRUNSON: I would like to comment on
14	Buzz's thoughts of of bonuses and this.
15	My personal opinion is that as a taxing
16	authority, I had rather we look at his
17	performance, pay him accordingly, but not pay
18	somebody a bonus of the percentages under this,
19	over that. And I think we're just opening up more
20	things to discuss. So, I'd like to keep it clean
21	and simple.
22	CHAIRMAN COX: Your suggestion is a quarterly
23	performance review or what?
24	MR. BRUNSON: No. Doesn't at the end of

the year, we -- we look at his performance.

1	CHAIRMAN COX: Okay.
2	MR. BRUNSON: But but I think the figure
3	for the increase on the state level is about seven
4	percent. And I think Ed has kind of looked at
5	five percent, which I think he's really holding
6	the
7	CHAIRMAN COX: Oh, I misunderstood what your
8	point was last. I thought you were trying to get
9	individual managers and look at their salary level
10	as opposed okay. I see what you're saying, is
11	that you're averaging statewide what all employees
12	were getting. Okay. That's a very good point.
13	MR. BRUNSON: Yes. All employees from the
14	Governor to the whatever. And and I don't know
15	what the county level Mr. Bryant, have you
16	do you know the percentage yet of the what
17	increases in cost of living and that
18	COMMISSIONER BRYANT: It's either two and a
19	half or five. It's not over five, I know.
20	MR. BRUNSON: Okay. So, I think the director
21	is in line of budgeting the five, and we certainly
22	need to do something along those lines.

- MR. GEORGE: I will make a motion.
- 24 CHAIRMAN COX: I will accept one.
- MR. GEORGE: I make a motion that we increase

- 1 Mr. Wuellner's salary by 12 percent, making six
- 2 percent of it retroactive to the time that we were
- 3 supposed to have done it last time, and then six
- 4 at this year, also.
- 5 We incorporate into his contract that part of
- 6 his compensation is the property, you know, on
- 7 board. And if the board would like for me
- 8 personally to take the responsibility of comparing
- 9 to other ones, since I've done it for the last two
- or three times, and I know the avenues to get into
- it, I'll be glad to take that and go back and look
- at it and bring it back to the board for their
- review.
- But I don't think we ought to hold
- 15 Mr. Wuellner off. We're already held him, you

25

8

- 16 know --17 CHAIRMAN COX: I agree. 18 MR. GEORGE: -- pretty close to 12 months, 19 you know, on compensation. 20 CHAIRMAN COX: Let me just clarify something, 21 because you said increase by 12 percent. So, from 22 2004, we back -- 2004 to 2005, six percent, and 23 then 2005-'06, so another six percent --24 MR. GEORGE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN COX: -- so that now he's at 12

104

AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006

percent -MR. GEORGE: Right.
CHAIRMAN COX: -- from what he was at 2004.
MR. GEORGE: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. I gotcha.
MR. BURNETT: Mr. Chair?
CHAIRMAN COX: Sir.

MR. BURNETT: I'm not sure if it's

9	appropriate time or or not, but public comment?
10	CHAIRMAN COX: We're going to get to it, yes.
11	MR. BURNETT: It's one of these
12	CHAIRMAN COX: Oh, you're right. He's had a
13	motion on it. Very good point. My apologies.
14	MR. GEORGE: I withdraw the motion.
15	CHAIRMAN COX: And we do have public
16	comments, and I had these right here in front of
17	me. So, we have Mr. Ciriello, I believe, wanted
18	to make public comment to that agenda item.
19	MR. CIRIELLO: I've said before different
20	times about the executive director and his salary,
21	and it had nothing to do with him as an
22	individual. It's the job. I don't think it's
23	worth the money that's being paid. But I'm not
24	going to argue anything about that.
25	All I want is one figure from you guys when
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006

105

1 you're done. I want to know the total

2	compensation figure. I want the house, the car,
3	the insurance, his actual salary, all of that
4	added up so that you can come out and say, we are
5	paying out of our pocket the executive director
6	\$150,000, or a hundred thousand or \$90,000.
7	That's what I want, the total compensation for the
8	job he's being paid for.
9	I don't want it broke down into what what
10	he's getting, not getting. I want to know how
11	much we are actually really putting out for his
12	services.
13	CHAIRMAN COX: So, your suggestion is we pay
14	him \$150,000?
15	MR. CIRIELLO: No. I'm suggesting I want to
16	know what you're giving him.
17	CHAIRMAN COX: Yes, sir.
18	MR. HICKOX: I'll check my thing for you in a
19	moment, or if you'd do it for me, I'd appreciate
20	it.

We go through this every time; Joe and I

disagree on this subject totally. But I've got to

21

- tell you, actually what you're giving Mr. Wuellner
- is not a pay raise. In true terms -- and I think
- everybody would agree with me on this -- you're

- 1 just about meeting the cost-of-living increase.
- 2 He deserves that, at least. I think he deserves
- 3 more.
- 4 I do not agree, however, with the bonus
- 5 proposal. I think it's a bad -- bad idea to set
- 6 for a public agency. On the other hand, if you
- 7 want to give him the money, I wouldn't argue with
- 8 it. I think he's earned it. Thank you.
- 9 CHAIRMAN COX: Thank you very much. Any
- further public comments on that? Mr. Holiday?
- MR. HOLIDAY: I don't think I've ever agreed
- with you, but I'm going to today. I would really
- like to know exactly what Mr. Wuellner makes,
- right out in the open, if his utilities are paid,
- does he have gas in the car, all of these things.

This has to do with just simple responsibility of 16 17 knowing how much the man is making. 18 Quite frankly, I'm flabbergasted. But that's 19 okay. I'm just me. Thank you. CHAIRMAN COX: Further public comment on it? 20 21 MR. GEORGE: Did you have a comment you want 22 to make? 23 MR. BURNETT: I'm -- I'm going to wait and 24 see how things go. 25 MR. GEORGE: Okay. AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006 107 1 MR. BURNETT: I may have some legal issues 2 that come up, but I'll wait and see how things go. 3 CHAIRMAN COX: I don't see any other further public comment on the agenda item. We'll open it 4 5 back up to the board. And you had -- I think you 6 wanted to make a motion? 7 MR. GORMAN: I have a comment. Can I do

that?

9	CHAIRMAN COX: Oh, I didn't see it. Yeah,
10	you can make a comment.
11	MR. GORMAN: I would think that we would try
12	to do that comparative analysis before we awarded
13	the raise. That would be my only comment.
14	Because you don't have a benchmark at this time.
15	You're rowing from where you already are.
16	CHAIRMAN COX: The benchmark is his current
17	salary.
18	MR. GORMAN: Yes, but is that benchmark at
19	all in line with? You have not done any research
20	along those lines.
21	CHAIRMAN COX: Your insinuation would be that
22	if that's not the benchmark, then we would reduce
23	his salary if it didn't come up to that standard.
24	But we've had it for four years.
25	MR. GORMAN: Wouldn't you like to know?
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 200

1 CHAIRMAN COX: I -- I think I do know.

2	MR. GORMAN: You know about comparatively how
3	much he's making compared to other airports with
4	other amounts of business with other amounts of
5	operations?
6	CHAIRMAN COX: No. I know the responsibility
7	that he has. I know how he directs this airport.
8	And
9	MR. GORMAN: This isn't a value of how well
10	he does, because he does a good job.
11	CHAIRMAN COX: Oh, I disagree with you. I
12	think it totally is the value of what he does.
13	MR. GORMAN: But you do not know, without
14	doing the comparison before you award a raise,
15	what that benchmark is. That's the only comment I
16	can make.
17	CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. Any other discussion?
18	(No further discussion.)
19	MR. GEORGE: I'd like to make a motion, then,
20	that we I'm sorry, Ed table this. You don't
21	get a raise at this one, okay? But we've got to
22	have a concrete plan, you know?
23	I will be glad to honcho the analysis from

- with the state, if Mr. Gorman will be good enough
- 25 to honcho the value of the rental property that he

1	presently has.
2	MR. GORMAN: Certainly.
3	MR. GEORGE: Because the the compensation
4	plan we did two years ago, it clearly specified,
5	here's what we're paying for the car, here's what
6	we're here's the equivalent of what we're
7	paying for a three-bedroom house, and here's what
8	we're paying here, and here's what we're paying
9	here. So
10	CHAIRMAN COX: We will
11	MR. GEORGE: So, that so, I'm saying that
12	we come back with some sort of a plan just like
13	that. And that way, it answers everybody's
14	questions
15	CHAIRMAN COX: We'll table the issue
16	MR. GEORGE: you know, whether they like

17 it or not. 18 CHAIRMAN COX: We will table the issue until 19 the September meeting. Sir? 20 MR. BRUNSON: Let me ask a question. If we 21 approved the previous motion -- or approved any 22 motion of a pay increase, when would that be 23 effective? 24 CHAIRMAN COX: We could make it effective immediately. 25 AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006 110 1 MR. BRUNSON: Okay. Well, I would agree with 2 the tabling if we set a date that, if we decide to 3 give him a raise -- and -- and I'm talking about 4 salary only -- that it's effective today. 5 CHAIRMAN COX: Well, the motion that was 6 withdrawn was -- would have been retroactive back

MR. BRUNSON: Right. I'm saying that I -- I

just want -- I don't want to -- you come back with

to 2004.

7

8

10 all of these analysis and then, in September, we 11 say okay, effective today, that your salary's increased, that he deserves --12 13 CHAIRMAN COX: Right. I understand. 14 MR. BRUNSON: -- and make a decision. 15 MR. GEORGE: That would be the call of the 16 board members at the September meeting, how they 17 wanted to do that. 18 MR. BRUNSON: Yeah. Well, that's my 19 thoughts. CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. Very good. So, we're 20 21 tabling the motion until the next meeting. And --22 MR. BURNETT: I believe your next meeting is August the 21st, not --23 24 CHAIRMAN COX: Oh. MR. BURNETT: -- in September. And that was 25

#### AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006

- 1 one thing --
- 2 CHAIRMAN COX: I said September. Okay.

- August 21. The next agenda item is the MR. GEORGE: I made a motion. Is everybody
- 5 agreeing to it?
- 6 CHAIRMAN COX: We tabled. You didn't have
- 7 to --
- 8 MR. GEORGE: Oh, I didn't have to do that.
- 9 Okay. Fine. You're right.
- 10 CHAIRMAN COX: And -- and you withdrew your
- earlier one, so...
- MR. GEORGE: Right.
- 13 CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. The next agenda item is
- the one we moved to the last, is the T-hangar
- design presentation.
- MR. WUELLNER: Wait --
- 17 CHAIRMAN COX: Say again?
- MR. WUELLNER: She probably needs a minute or
- two break.
- 20 CHAIRMAN COX: Oh, okay. You want to just
- 21 hold on for a minute? Okay. We'll just recess
- for about five minutes. How's that?
- 23 (Whereupon, a recess was had.)

- 24 CHAIRMAN COX: We will readjourn the meeting
- and come back from recess and go right into the

1	agenda item of the T-hangar design. And we have a
2	presentation here from Passero and some
3	discussion.
4	9.C T-HANGAR DESIGN - PASSERO
5	MR. HOLESKO: Good evening. Andrew Holesko
6	program manager with Passero Associates. Going to
7	talk about comparison of the T-hangar layout area
8	here along Estrella Avenue, comparing your layout
9	inside the Master Plan. We have an updated
10	proposal to you.
11	But before we do that, I would like to
12	introduce two new members of our staff that you're
13	going to see here quite a bit. To my right,
14	actually on the end, is Tom Cottrell. Tom is a
15	new project manager with Passero Associates. He
16	will be responsible for civil engineering design

25

/A /MTG071706.txt	
17	for all of our projects in the State of Florida on
18	airfields. So, you'll definitely be seeing Tom,
19	and he'll be working on your projects.
20	To his right is Matt Lesser. Matt is one of
21	our project managers who actually will be one of
22	our main physical physically located on the
23	airport in our office. He will be managing the
24	hangar 8, 9, and 10 project, the Taxiway F and

apron project, and managing a lot of the

#### AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006

- coordination between the Airport Authority and St. 1
- Johns County, so... 2
- 3 CHAIRMAN COX: Welcome aboard, gentlemen.
- MR. COTTRELL: Thank you. 4
- MR. LESSER: Thank you. 5
- MR. HOLESKO: Thank you very much. Okay. 6
- 7 The first graphic we have here is a layout. You
- 8 see a red rectangle here (indicating). This is
- 9 the area we're actually talking about this

10	afternoon, but the red rectangle is a T-hangar
11	layout area between existing Pine Ridge Road and
12	Casa Cola Way.
13	We've identified this area because that is
14	really our focus this afternoon, to talk about the
15	next phase of hangar development in that
16	rectangle.
17	The area to the right of it, which is to the
18	east, this is the same area that Ed mentioned
19	earlier where you are expecting to receive a grant
20	from the FAA to build a taxiway all the way from
21	Taxiway Delta back into this area, and hopefully
22	an aircraft parking apron.
23	Notice that the this rectangle also abuts
24	the same area. There could be taxiway access, as
25	shown here from the Master Plan. But this is the
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
	114

1 layout from your Master Plan.

2 Our next sheet, this is a layout that we have

3	proposed. And the same red rectangular area, if
4	we were to put on this sheet, it would be right
5	here (indicating). Again, it's the same area from
6	Pine Ridge Road over to Casa Cola Way.
7	Here is the taxiway leading to Taxiway Delta
8	coming in here (indicating). We tie in this area
9	(indicating). We tie in this area (indicating).
10	What we have shown in this area, we have four
11	different groupings of T-hangars. There's two
12	here. There's two here (indicating).
13	This is a taxi lane system. We also have
14	bulk hangars, an individual hangar here to Hangar
15	T (indicating). We have three here as Hangar S,
16	we have four down here as Hangar N, and we have
17	two larger bulk hangars at the bottom
18	(indicating).
19	We have an office complex here labeled as
20	"Building U" at the corner of Estrella and Casa
21	Cola (indicating). This area still has
22	flexibility to change. This area still has
23	flexibility to change (indicating).
24	What we're trying to bring back to you today

and have some -- some detailed discussion is that

# AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006

1	we agree on how these taxi lanes are going to
2	access Taxiway Foxtrot here and here (indicating),
3	so we can really get going on the concrete design
4	of what's going to happen right in this area.
5	Some of the other variables we've looked at,
6	first is that, very different from the Master Plan
7	layout, we have quite a bit more green space. And
8	these are just some very general green areas
9	identified. These are areas that have either had
10	trees preserved from the first phase of the
11	project, there have been some relocations in these
12	areas, and they're also areas that we think should
13	be protected in the future.
14	Areas to the west of Casa Cola, the light
15	blue area there could become future office and can
16	become future hangars. The area south of that
17	also has the ability for future offices and future

18 hangars. 19 And what we had previously shown as bulk hangar N had a recent question about whether or 20 21 not we could take a similar amount of T-hangars, 22 which we have here shown as T-hangar Q -- this is 12 units of T-hangars. Could we take another 23 grouping of T-hangars and put them here in place 24 25 of these four bulks? And the answer is yes.

#### AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006

1	So, if there's an immediate interest in
2	switching out these four bulks for perhaps 12
3	T-hangars, we could take T-hangar Q and put a copy
4	of it right there, and end up with 12 more units
5	right there (indicating).
6	We did a listing of basic statistics of
7	Master Plan layout to our updated proposal. First
8	variable we looked at was T-hangar units. There
9	are 80 shown on the Master Plan. We are proposing
10	38. If we add that 12, that would obviously take

11	that up to 50.
12	There were two bulk hangars shown in the
13	immediate area of the Master Plan. We took that
14	up to 10, the actual square footage of bulk
15	hangars, because the Master Plan did show some
16	large ones. They had 40,000 square feet shown.
17	We took it up to a little over 77,000. Total
18	hangar square foot on the Master Plan, 172,000,
19	and 119,000 on the proposed development.
20	Quite a big difference, actually in the
21	updated proposal, for office space. There wasn't
22	any office space shown inside the Master Plan. We
23	have a little over 32,000 square feet proposed in
24	our layout.
25	The open space, you have a very aggressive
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
	117
1	layout inside your Master Plan. And again, that
2	was your concept created to show how many

T-hangars, taxi lanes, bulk hangars you can

- 4 absolutely fit in that area. That does show
- 5 minimal -- minimal green space. And we have quite
- 6 a bit of more open space and green space
- 7 throughout our proposed layout.
- 8 With that, I will open up to questions. And
- 9 once again, I just want to remind you that the
- area along Estrella, the areas to the west, you
- know, those are still open for future input on
- that. We're really looking at some approval on
- that center core of taxi lanes and that center 36
- to 38 T-hangars.
- 15 CHAIRMAN COX: So, we're removing all trees,
- right? Just kidding. Didn't find that humorous?
- MR. HOLESKO: In some areas, we are, in some
- areas -- in some areas, we're definitely not.
- 19 CHAIRMAN COX: No, I'm teasing you. You had
- some -- go ahead.
- MR. GORMAN: Well, I've got -- one begs the
- question, is --
- 23 CHAIRMAN COX: I mean, he --
- MR. GORMAN: Why -- why does this layout

look -- doesn't look at all and bears no

## AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006

1	resemblance to the designs I have been looking at
2	for the last eight months?
3	The constituents I've talked to, the public
4	I've talked to, have always been consistently very
5	interested in pursuing this, and the object of the
6	game being a parklike a parklike presence, in
7	other words, a parklike development. But a
8	parklike presence of the development with good
9	revenues presented. And not and my own
10	comment's not driven by convention or compromised
11	by contractors that don't want to bother with
12	issues of environment.
13	To be honest with you, members of the board,
14	this looks like a cookie cutter layout right out
15	of an aviation magazine. There is absolutely
16	no there's no intelligent design involved in
17	this. This is this is designed by convention.

18	This is strictly, really is cookie cutter.
19	And I I must ask, are we building around
20	any mature growth? Are we doing anything
21	environmentally sensitive? And and we can
22	build around mature growth. We can do an
23	environmentally sensitive layout. I've seen them.
24	I have seen them.
25	I have envelopes full of them that Passero
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006 119
1	and Associates has given me. And yet I don't
2	understand why, at the eleventh hour, this
3	bait-and-switch. I tried very hard to get a copy
4	of this plan before this meeting. I was not
5	provided with it. And I can see why, because
6	there's no resemblance.
7	I don't understand why I looked at they
8	were good designs, too. And they're in envelopes.
9	And they exist. But why they are not being

implemented in this design, this -- that's --

11	that's one. You can build environmentally
12	sensitive. You and you can have good revenues
13	without compromising lots of space.
14	This is this is right off of the front of
15	a magazine that exists already. This is
16	in-the-box thinking.
17	CHAIRMAN COX: Ask a question. Is there some
18	reason he couldn't get this layout?
19	MR. WUELLNER: We just got it.
20	MR. HOLESKO: I provided the most updated
21	copy of the layout to the Authority on Friday
22	morning. I would be the one to take the
23	responsibility for not getting it to Mr. Gorman
24	over the weekend. I left a copy here, but I I
25	did not mail him a copy personally and I should
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
	120
1	have.
2	MR. GORMAN: I've been wanting to walk that
3	layout and know firsthand so that I can repeat to

- 4 the board, you know, in -- in-kind, you know,
- 5 in-depth, you know, problems and compromises that
- 6 would be necessary for a layout for eight months.
- 7 And for eight months, I've been looking at
- 8 designs. And this design here isn't even remotely
- 9 close to those designs I've looked at. And my
- question to you, to be honest with you, is why the
- bait-and-switch? What happened?
- 12 CHAIRMAN COX: Mr. George?
- MR. GEORGE: I met with Andrew and -- and Ed
- this morning, and this is my first time to look at
- it, Mr. Gorman. I'm trying to answer your
- 16 question.
- 17 MR. GORMAN: Okay.
- MR. GEORGE: I don't know of a
- bait-and-switch. But I looked at it with the
- intention of how do we optimize the utilization of
- 21 that space so that we don't have to do eminent
- domain to take anymore space because we ran out of
- space 15 years from now. After look -- I'm not
- 24 through.
- MR. GORMAN: That's fine.

1	MR. GEORGE: After looking at this design
2	with them and coming up with the idea of the
3	possibility of taking row N and extending that to
4	12 T-hangars as opposed to bulk hangars, and
5	taking U, which is the office building, and moving
6	that to the west of Casa Cola, and then taking the
7	area of where U, T, and S are, and maximize the
8	number of bulk hangars in that. If you go back to
9	the square footage and the spaces that the next
10	chart back, I think what it shows is that we are
11	satisfying the demand more closely.
12	You're taking 38 to 50, if you add in another
13	12 there, and we have 165 people on the waiting
14	list. On the bulk hangar list, I think there's 22
15	on the bulk hangar list now. And I'm trying to
16	look at how do you how do you give a park
17	setting and everything.
18	Now. I am told that your post of trees are

25

are they?

still here, that this is the big oak specimen that
were there. So, your implication that all of
that's been eradicated and gone out the door is
not, you know, really true. I think there's
another one here (indicating), there's a couple of
big ones here (indicating). Andrew, where else

#### AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006

1	MR. HOLESKO: The two main areas of
2	older-growth trees that we made sure to remain are
3	these two oaks here (indicating). And there's
4	actually a small third one next to it right here.
5	On all the recent plans, those are shown obviously
6	remaining. The second is is actually a grove
7	of maple right here between these two hangars
8	(indicating).
9	And I I just want to wait for Mr. Wuellner
10	to return before I if it's all right, I would
11	respond to a few a few other comments.

12	Certainly Mr. Gorman and I and Ed and Bryan
13	have have looked at many layouts over the past
14	few months. I think one of the differences of
15	what you see here is is simply what you look at
16	from the actual T-hangar area. And you and
17	Mr. Gorman has seen many layouts that actually
18	show the entire site all the way to the marsh and
19	all the way to the to the retention pond.
20	This is a very different layout only that
21	it's it's smaller in stature and it looks at
22	the layout of this area. What you don't see is
23	all of the green space, parks, and walkway.
24	One of them here is at the end of Pine Ridge
25	(indicating). One of them is here to the east.
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17

## 7, 2006

- 1 You know, this is a snapshot of the -- of the
- 2 central core. So, it does look a little bit
- different than some of the other photographs we've 3
- looked at that -- wee looked at some planning all 4

5	the way from U.S. 1 all the way out to the runway.
6	I think that's just a little bit different in
7	terms of how you look at it, that some of that
8	green space, obviously that is that is taken up
9	now in hangars.
10	Mr. Wuellner has just handed me a copy of
11	hangar layouts going back to October of 2005. And
12	I'll just come up to the front there and
13	actually, I'll just hold it up where I'm at.
14	Even though they are a little bit different,
15	here, you see this is the this
16	MR. GEORGE: Jack (indicating).
17	MR. HOLESKO: This is the area of Taxiway Fox
18	and the apron (indicating). These are the same
19	same two bulk hangars that you see there on the
20	bottom. And these are the the hangers and
21	bulks and the taxi lane system.
22	As I mentioned, I think it's this area here
23	that you don't see on our graphic, that this is
24	there's a lot of green space and open space on the
25	site here and also up here that's not necessarily

1	on our screen. We have always tried to put in a
2	comparable amount of T-hangar space and open
3	space. Here, the black areas are are T-hangars
4	and there's some some light gray taxi lanes and
5	some green space throughout, but
6	MR. GEORGE: So, what changed?
7	MR. GORMAN: Almost everything. I mean, it's
8	just it's they aren't the same layouts. If
9	you want to believe me, go ahead. If you don't
10	want to believe me, go ahead.
11	CHAIRMAN COX: Well, we can go back and look
12	at the layouts.
13	MR. GORMAN: We need to I mean, my
14	attitude towards this whole thing is that we've
15	not really done an in-depth study of the layouts.
16	And I and the layouts that this firm was
17	proposing before were out of the box. They were
18	clever. And they did, I felt, maximize space.

//A /MT	G071706.txt
19	They were really done well.
20	And this is that particular T-hangar
21	configuration has none of those ingredients on it.
22	It does not it's not building around old
23	growth. I mean, there is some old growth saved,
24	yes, and green areas, but it's not building around
25	old growth when it can. We're not designing out
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
1	of the box. That's cookie cutter. And it doesn't
2	really provide a parklike setting.
3	It's certainly a linear it is a linear
4	layout. It is not what I would call a nonlinear
5	layout. It is not like more systematically
6	designed like an air park. It is designed like an
7	airport. That is cookie cutter. And that is
8	probably my my point.

Why did we spend eight months designing?

I've got envelopes full of it when it comes out

looking like this. Simple as that.

9

10

11/1111	50/1/00.ER
12	I mean, I think that we can do more. I don't
13	think that designwise I think we were ahead
14	designwise. We've retrogressed. We've
15	whatever. I'm using the wrong word.
16	MR. GEORGE: Well, what Andrew is saying is
17	he's showing us the
18	MR. GORMAN: Regressed.
19	MR. GEORGE: designs that he's given in
20	the past. So, these must have been ones that
21	MR. GORMAN: Yes. One of those designs is
22	I recognize. All I know is, is that that this
23	is the proposed layout. It does not incorporate
24	intelligent design and parklike setting design.
25	This is something I have not seen before, no
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
1	element that I have seen before.

cul de sacs around and building plenty of hangars.

We're talking about just simply wrapping little

And I recognize some of the old-growth trees.

2

3

5	Yes, you're going to have cut trees; we understand
6	this. But none of this clever cul de sac design
7	is being implemented in this layout. I don't see
8	it. It's gone away.
9	I mean, I to be honest with you, I've seen
10	this happen in the Renaissance Center in Detroit
11	where they had a tremendous arbor of trees, and
12	they had a tremendous sell job to the public of
13	how good it was going to be. And it really did
14	it really was well designed.
15	And at the eleventh hour, contractors came in
16	that didn't like that idea, that didn't want to
17	think out of the box, that were afraid of the
18	whole issue. They were afraid of the issue. They
19	didn't want to become environmentally stung. So,
20	they what ended up being is that there, they
21	ended up bulldozing everything down because there
22	was a bait-and-switch that happened there, too.
23	Same thing.
24	And I it's and it became a real story

to be told. And I don't think we need to redo

1

## AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006

127

2	been I've seen some awfully clever designs.
3	You had part of one right up just then.
4	CHAIRMAN COX: Okay.
5	MR. GORMAN: That's my opinion.
6	CHAIRMAN COX: There's a there's a
7	question that begs to be asked here and or at
8	least a point made, and and that is and it's
9	on neither side. But we we are looking out for
10	the citizens of the county, 178,000. And and
11	we have to ask ourselves, how do we better serve
12	them? And is that and I don't disagree with
13	the park setting at all.
14	Are we better serving the citizens of the
15	county by not having as many available hangars as
16	we possibly can and keeping and keeping within
17	the park setting, or, going to the original plans
18	that you looked at and not having as many hangars?
19	And Buzz made a very good point, which is how

that. I think we need to stay clever. They've

- 20 many people we had on the waiting list and stuff.
- And so, are we -- somehow or other, we've got to
- compromise and come up and -- and serve the county
- as best we can and still try to stay within that.
- So, I think we have to -- we're going to have
- 25 to --

- 1 MR. GEORGE: When I saw this this morning at
- 2 8:30, I thought this was your design.
- 3 MR. GORMAN: This is a contractor's design.
- 4 This isn't the design done. This is not an
- 5 out-of-the-box design. This is a cookie cutter.
- 6 And, really, it is. I've seen designs that would
- 7 sacrifice less than five percent of the hangars.
- 8 And we've talked about this.
- 9 And as a matter of fact, my -- one of my last
- 10 conversations with Mr. Wuellner and Passero and
- 11 Associates' Andrew was the fact that we would
- have -- the design implemented would be, you know,

13 a build around the old growth, and it would 14 encompass a less than five percent sacrifice from 15 a straight linear box, you know, cutting things up 16 in straight 90-degree angles. 17 And that's my last conversation with them. 18 And then -- then I -- we see this. 19 CHAIRMAN COX: No. I just want to ask you, 20 the -- your most -- your most -- your most favorite proposal, or the plan that you like the 21 22 most, how many hangars are in it? Because I don't know. 23 24 MR. GORMAN: I believe the last rendition was -- this is just general aviation -- was 36, 25

### AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006

- but they could build more. And there was some
   sacrifice of some tree area that we needed to do
   to make that more. And that's the last. I had CHAIRMAN COX: In this iteration --
- 5 MR. GORMAN: -- expected during this

6 meeting --7 CHAIRMAN COX: In this iteration, how many is 8 there? 9 MR. GORMAN: -- to be talking about this. 10 MR. GEORGE: Thirty-eight. CHAIRMAN COX: Thirty-eight? 11 12 MR. GORMAN: Thirty-eight, right. You know, 13 whatever. 14 MR. GEORGE: Well --15 MR. GORMAN: And so, that's -- we're -- we're certainly close. 16 MR. GEORGE: Did your -- did your iteration 17 that there was 36, and you could build more, was 18 19 the "could build more" to the west of Casa Cola? 20 MR. GORMAN: That's what -- that's what I 21 thought, we'd be looking at more than one design 22 now so that we would be actively discussing 23 that -- that kind of in particular issue; in other words, where you'd be sitting with three or four

#### AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006

of these layouts going, well, this, but no, no.

24

1	And, well, this, but look what you've got to
2	sacrifice.
3	In other words, that to me would be
4	discussing intelligent design, we'd be looking at
5	one proposed layout and being asked to to
6	actually give our blessing on that. And I've seen
7	much more clever layouts already. And that
8	build 36 hangars.
9	MR. GEORGE: Do you agree that going west of
10	Casa Cola is not in the question?
11	MR. GORMAN: I can't you know, Buzz, I
12	haven't got that in my mind's eye exactly how to
13	do that, but
14	MR. GEORGE: We don't own that property over
15	there.
16	MR. GORMAN: Yeah. We're not going to go
17	west of Casa Cola, no. And there was during
18	these different layouts I had previously
19	discussed, there was no talk of doing that, only

- because that's just another whole boundoggle that
- 21 certainly this board does not want to address.
- 22 Certainly, I don't.
- MR. GEORGE: So, with the demand we've got of
- 24 165 or 170 on the waiting list, with a 40 percent
- fallout, that's 80. If we go through our capital,

- 1 you know, budgets, and approve this, that's
- 2 generating 38 T-hangars to satisfy --
- 3 MR. GORMAN: Right.
- 4 MR. GEORGE: -- 160. Maybe a net of 80.
- 5 MR. GORMAN: I think that could be
- 6 accomplished with a -- with a different, more
- 7 environmentally friendly design than that. I was
- 8 told that -- that you had been -- had some
- 9 problems with, you know, I mean -- that we had --
- that there might be some problems with this small
- business development area, that it would eat too
- much space. And I said, well, maybe he's right;

13	it's possible. But I still would like to develop
14	small business.
15	MR. GEORGE: Well
16	MR. GORMAN: So, I mean, this was the kind of
17	compromise. And then if you're trying to save a
18	stand of trees here but you're going to eliminate
19	one whole bulk hangar, well, you can't do it. But
20	that's the type of discussion I thought we were
21	ready for right here. But we can't possibly have
22	that discussion looking at one layout.
23	CHAIRMAN COX: Mr. Brunson, you had some
24	comments?
25	MR. BRUNSON: Yeah. Jack, I think that your
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
1	points are well taken. And I think this is
2	you're right; this is for discussion. Now, you've
3	opened it up. So, I think the Andrew, based on
4	hearing what Jack has said, the difference between
5	38 and 36 hangars, can you come up with a design

6	that would be more park friendly and
7	MR. HOLESKO: Well, one of the other items
8	that I've noticed, just looking back from October
9	of 2005 to now, is that the you had a lot of
10	T-hangar access taxi lanes in 2005 that were shown
11	as, for lack of better term, dead ends. There was
12	not
13	MR. GEORGE: Cul de sacs.
14	MR. HOLESKO: There was not taxiing through.
15	And that is definitely a change from what you see
16	in 2 from this layout to this current one.
17	The current one, on all sides of the
18	T-hangars, gives them the ability to go either
19	way. So that there's no question, that is
20	something that that definitely shows
21	differently from what you have here in 2005.
22	And obviously, the the result of that is
23	that in areas where a taxi lane was able to stop
24	prior and now it flows through, those are those
25	are some of the areas where trees are now gone.

1	No question about it.
2	And there's actually about five of those that
3	are now are now complete taxi lanes going from
4	north to south.
5	MR. BRUNSON: And, Mr. Chairman, I know you
6	have to start somewhere with discussions. I think
7	we've started. I'm disappointed that I don't know
8	more about how this is laid out, that I certainly
9	would like to look at the physical location and
10	study it now that he's raised this question.
11	CHAIRMAN COX: Not a problem. I want to make
12	one comment, Andrew. And I really despise being
13	blindsided. And the perception that a board
14	member didn't get this or couldn't get this
15	because and after he tried, I hope that will
16	not happen again.
17	MR. HOLESKO: I understand.
18	CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. Thank you very much.
19	MR. HOLESKO: Yes.
20	CHAIRMAN COX: And we need to open this up

- 21 for public comment. There are two specific
- gentlemen that wish to discuss this.
- 23 Mr. Roderick, please?
- MR. RODERICK: Well, obviously, like the rest
- of you -- and I don't have all of the information,

- but I want to stick with the "save the tree"
- 2 concept that I -- that I did during my report.
- 3 Second thing is, I served on the Technical
- 4 Advisory Committee for our club. I was sort of
- 5 the last person standing. Those offices were
- 6 never ever discussed in the plan. If they're in
- 7 the Master Plan, I would like to know what genie
- 8 inserted there. Because that space I envisioned
- 9 for hangars, like everybody else. This is an
- 10 airport, not an office complex. Thank you.
- 11 CHAIRMAN COX: Thank you, sir.
- MR. GEORGE: Ed?
- 13 CHAIRMAN COX: Mr. Holiday?

14	MR. GEORGE: Show the could you show the
15	picture that's got all the green?
16	MR. HOLIDAY: Could I have the picture the
17	picture of that up on the wall, please?
18	MR. GEORGE: What do you want, Dan?
19	CHAIRMAN COX: He wants a picture of this,
20	the layout.
21	MR. HOLIDAY: Like this somehow.
22	CHAIRMAN COX: You want this one?
23	MR. BRUNSON: This one, Dan?
24	MR. HOLIDAY: Yeah. This morning at
25	9 o'clock, I came in and asked for permission
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
1	to to look at one of these. And my favorite
2	gal here told me, and that's no kidding, that I
3	could come in at 11:30 and look at it. And she
4	called me and said no, I couldn't do it.

So, as some of you in -- in here know that I

have sat down a year or so ago and drew a little

5

7	drawing of the place and and probably was
8	ridiculed for it, but at least I was doing
9	something.
10	I look at this, and I see again big jets. I
11	see, of course, they burn 3-, 4-, 500 gallons an
12	hour. I see these great big bulk hangars. It
13	doesn't even vaguely resemble utilizing this space
14	for the little guy. And I guess I'm a little guy.
15	Most people look at me and say I own an aircraft,
16	I'm a big guy. I don't know, betwixt and between.
17	But I look at this stuff and I think to
18	myself, let us try and do what we started out to
19	do, which is very unique, trees and green stuff
20	and aviation, instead of this cookie cutter I
21	love it, Jack cookie cutter hangars. I I'm
22	again flabbergasted. Thank you.
23	MR. GEORGE: Has Dan, it was my
24	understanding that the green area that you see

there is in fact green area.

- 1 MR. HOLIDAY: That's not green (indicating),
- 2 that's not green (indicating), and these --
- 3 MR. GEORGE: My god, the whole thing's not
- 4 green, either.
- 5 MR. HOLIDAY: Let them stay on the north side
- 6 where Galaxy is. You know, there's got to be a
- 7 little bit of space around here for the little
- 8 guy. I'm not a little guy. I'm a big guy.
- 9 CHAIRMAN COX: We have little-guy hangars,
- don't we have? Those -- all the little hangars up
- 11 there.
- MR. HOLIDAY: Hey, bulk hangars for what?
- 13 CHAIRMAN COX: No. I said we've got
- little-guy hangars on there.
- MR. HOLIDAY: A few. Thirty-six out of 180?
- 16 CHAIRMAN COX: You're so senior, you'll get
- two of them. Mr. Brunson?
- MR. HOLIDAY: I won't live long enough to
- 19 have a hangar.
- 20 CHAIRMAN COX: Oh, Mr. Ciriello, yes, sir.

21	MR. CIRIELLO: Will you put a circle on my
22	sheet?
23	CHAIRMAN COX: Yes, I will. Thank you.
24	MR. CIRIELLO: I've got a couple of thoughts
25	on this. And I don't think some of you will like
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
1	what I'm going to say. In my opinion, airplanes
2	don't get along with objects like trees, telephone
3	poles, wires, what all. Airplanes need space.
4	Now, Jack, I'm sorry I've got to attack you,
5	but if you're so interested in being a tree
6	hugger and I am environmentally friendly, okay?
7	But it's now too late. You've opened the door and
8	you've taken all those houses that had trees,
9	plants and everything and tore them down to build
10	hangars.
11	Now, I don't think one of those trees that
12	you want to save is going to pay any income to
13	this airport to get off the tax rolls. I say, now

- that you've done the dastardly deed, use every
- inch and available space you have to make
- revenue-making hangars and buildings and forget
- the trees. You've already destroyed them.
- MR. GORMAN: You must build for Wal-Mart.
- MR. CIRIELLO: No, I'm just speaking from the
- way I feel.
- 21 CHAIRMAN COX: Sir? Very good points,
- 22 Mr. Ciriello. Thank you very much.
- 23 MR. GORMAN: Sorry, Joe.
- MR. JONES: Joe Jones, 4672 5th Avenue.
- 25 Trees are going to make a difference, because

- 1 there is another neighborhood right next to where
- there used to be a neighborhood. Trees will make
- 3 a difference.
- 4 CHAIRMAN COX: Thank you, sir.
- 5 Mr. Martinelli?
- 6 MR. MARTINELLI: I don't need to go over

7	there. Can everybody hear me?
8	Any public development, be it an airport or
9	an industrial park or whatever, has to satisfy not
10	only the utilitarian use of the space for whatever
11	it was built for, but it also has to have a
12	ambiance. It has to have an attraction. It has
13	to satisfy the aesthetic side of the public as
14	well. And I thought it was a great idea to have
15	the green space. I thought it was a great idea to
16	have my airplane among the trees.
17	Joe, I hope I would never tangle with those
18	trees or the wires, and I think properly laid
19	out laid out properly laid out, it would
20	never happen. And I think that that
21	engineering-wise was done.
22	A cul de sac at the end of my hangar row, I
23	have a cul de sac right now at the end of the
24	hangar row, accessible by vehicle only. So what?
25	So I can go out the other way. I don't have to

1	taxi through to get out.
2	And I would just like to see us stay with the
3	kind of plan that would be attractive and that
4	people would come on this airport and say, boy,
5	what a wonderful job those guys on the Airport
6	Authority did when they laid this out and built
7	it.
8	CHAIRMAN COX: Thank you very much, sir. Any
9	other further public comment?
10	(No further public comment.)
11	CHAIRMAN COX: Mr. George?
12	MR. GEORGE: Can I have the the layout,
13	the green one?
14	What we presently have over here (indicating)
15	is barren straight hangars with no trees, no
16	nothing. Andrew and his team have come up with
17	this. There's all green areas. There are big oak
18	trees in there. I would assume that this is also
19	green down here; you just didn't show it.
20	This over in here, see the trees over in here
21	(indicating)? There's another specimen plant

22	there. You do have your greenery.
23	Now, is it enough? I don't know. But I look
24	at it that if I change this to a row of 12
25	T-hangars, I'm up to 50. If I take the office
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
1	building, and possibly if we want to have an
2	office building, we already own this corner of
3	this property right here, so look at that for
4	future reference down there.
5	But that gives us the ability to have eight
6	of the bulk hangars, where your design called for
7	10. So, we're looking at 12 more T-hangars and
8	only two less bulk hangars.
9	Now, my question to the people that want to
10	put more greenery, how many hangars are you going
11	to sacrifice for one more tree? I think he's done
12	a real good job of giving you trees throughout the
13	whole place. But if you want more, how many

hangars are you going to give away? Are you going

- to give away -- if you go back to this design,
- you're going to give away 12.
- MR. MARTINELLI: I don't know what the
- original cul de sac design looked like. Does
- somebody have a --
- MR. GEORGE: Well, let's look at it from we
- 21 don't care what it looked like.
- MR. HOLIDAY: I do.
- 23 MR. GEORGE: Okay.
- MR. HOLIDAY: Yeah, I really do.
- MR. GORMAN: And so do I. Thank you.

- 1 CHAIRMAN COX: Andrew, you had a comment?
- 2 MR. HOLESKO: Yeah. Just want to go back and
- 3 note, I just put one of the old designs up there.
- 4 I guess just to back up for a moment, I would tell
- 5 you that there's been at least 15 to 20 different
- 6 layouts of how to make it work, everything from
- 7 simple sketches like this, to CAD drawings.

8	You can notice, you know, what we see here
9	right now is that this taxi lane does not connect
10	through here (indicating). It doesn't connect
11	through here (indicating). And I just want to
12	note that there's no question that that is one of
13	the differences that we've seen.
14	This is the same area of old-growth maple
15	that we have protected on the mall (indicating).
16	These are the old oaks. This is a mature maple.
17	Those are those are some of the very important
18	features back there.
19	And I just want to throw out there that,
20	right now and I'm going to take you all the way
21	from this T-hangar area out to Taxiway Delta. And
22	when you come off of Taxiway Delta all the way
23	down in what will be on the floor right now,
24	you're going to come out on a on a taxiway
25	that's going to have, you know, head-to-head

- taxiing, because only one plane's going to come
  through, and then it's going to come to a fork of
- 3 right now where you have Araquay and Indian Bend.
- 4 And you're going to be able to choose one of two
- 5 ways to go so you can actually come in and out.
- 6 The same concept has carried forward all the
- 7 way down from this -- from this taxiway, what is
- 8 old Indian Bend (indicating), here to Araquay, so
- 9 you can actually have movements in here, and
- you're actually going to have a choice of which
- 11 way you can come out.
- 12 If -- if you want to have a layout and show
- where these are dead-ends, then you're not going
- to have that option coming out of a T-hangar. In
- some cases, you're going to come out and you're
- going to have a choice of one way to go. And that
- is definitely a big difference of what we're
- showing versus this old -- this old sketch.
- MR. GORMAN: This layout here is -- is far
- closer to the layout I looked at. And I think
- 21 here, we -- he's nailed it on the head -- part of

it is the cul de sac concept is I think in
--

- the head-to-head taxiing problem, is not as much
- of an issue with the small aircraft. I really
- don't believe it.

143

1	As good as it is now, and that's how we have
2	it, it is not as much of an issue with small
3	aircraft as, of course, it would be with jet
4	aircraft, which is a tremendous issue, because of
5	the turning radius.
6	This layout here I wish you could label
7	this layout is far closer to the layout I
8	thought (indicating). Look look at look at
9	the look at the mature growth it saves. And
10	yet it doesn't compromise hangar space. It
11	compromises almost none of it.
12	And so, I think that the connectivity of
13	this of the of the taxiways is probably

issue one, because it's eating lots of space up.

15 Does it need to? Well, it's discussible. I 16 don't think it's an issue -- as much of an issue 17 with small aircraft, because it isn't on this 18 aircraft -- this airport now, as it is with 19 larger --MR. GEORGE: Andrew, is this the same --20 21 MR. GORMAN: -- design-wise. 22 MR. GEORGE: -- in the rectangular area that you presented before? 23 24 MR. HOLESKO: That's -- that's a similar 25 number of T-hangars there, but it certainly AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006 144 1 doesn't show the small --MR. GEORGE: But isn't it the same -- you 2 3 started off with the same --4 MR. HOLESKO: Oh, yes. It's the same site 5 area, yes. It's just oriented right now --6 MR. GEORGE: I just counted, and there are 50

7

T-hangars in there, okay? Under the other

8	concept, you know, and extending the ones on the
9	end and what I said, there are 50 T-hangars and
10	eight bulk hangars. So, what you're saying is it
11	is worth eight bulk hangars to you to have this
12	type of design.
13	MR. GORMAN: No, you said that. I didn't say
14	that. You might want to compromise that design
15	and try to fit in more hangars. But I'm saying
16	that particular design without the
17	interconnectivity of the taxiways is certainly
18	saving far more green space.
19	Now, you way want to compromise that. You
20	may want to just try to get some more area in
21	there. And I agree. I don't have a problem with
22	that. But that interconnectivity I see as being
23	the first issue to discuss.
24	CHAIRMAN COX: All righty. Thank you, sir.
25	Mr. Director, I haven't heard many comments from

1	you on the issue. Do you have anything to say?
2	MR. WUELLNER: Other than providing other
3	than making provisions in the design to be able to
4	taxi through the areas, I don't think anybody
5	being totally objective is going to tell you
6	that's different than what you just looked at with
7	the lines cleaned up, because it's now an engineer
8	drawing versus a sketch being made by someone.
9	Now, you do indeed have, what is it, a
10	12-unit T-hangar up there that was replaced by the
11	addition of some bulk hangars, or some 50 x 60's
12	or whatever they ultimately end up.
13	But other than that, the layout intended, and
14	has always intended, there's been no departure by
15	Staff, no departure in direction by the engineer
16	to overtly depart from the original intent of this
17	design, which was to preserve a significant amount
18	of vegetation back there.
19	And I really don't appreciate innuendo to the
20	opposite of that effect. We worked very hard to
21	make a layout that works functionally, as well as
22	preserving from an environmental

23	MR. GORMAN: Why does it look so much
24	different than it did before?
25	MR. WUELLNER: It doesn't. There
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
1	MR. GORMAN: Ed, it is. Let's just stop
2	MR. WUELLNER: There's two pieces of small
3	taxiway that changed the whole thing.
4	MR. COOPER: Can I? Okay. One thing that
5	you need to understand about this drawing is you
6	can't build it this way when it was designed.
7	It's designed to save these trees right in here
8	(indicating). But in doing that, the taxiway came
9	across Casa Cola, which you can't do. We can't
10	this is an active street.
11	Same thing here (indicating). There was some
12	designs in here, based on saving some things, but
13	this can't be done, either (indicating).
14	So, there would have to be some modifications

if you decided to go for that. But that can't be

16 done. 17 MR. WUELLNER: We don't have any problem 18 recreating the cul de sac. We were trying to 19 create an atmosphere where you could get to it 20 from either direction on the airport, from either 21 taxiway direction. If that's something that you 22 just don't want to do, that's fine. I mean, 23 it's -- it's not that big a deal. That's why 24 we're here at 10 percent drawings. CHAIRMAN COX: Well, I think it's generated 25 AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006 147 1 some very active discussion, and probably worth 2 some more. But you're not looking for any action 3 on this particular item, are you? Just --4 MR. WUELLNER: It's really up to you. 5 CHAIRMAN COX: Just a discussionary item? 6 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah.

7

8

CHAIRMAN COX: Okay.

MR. GEORGE: Well, we have to give him some

9	direction on what we are going to discuss next.
10	CHAIRMAN COX: Yeah.
11	MR. GORMAN: Can I make a motion that we go
12	back and have at least three different layouts
13	that are close, that are usable, presented to us,
14	discuss it again, and then try to hammer it a
15	little harder and get this thing done and
16	eliminate some of the
17	CHAIRMAN COX: I think we're under some
18	we're under some time constrictions here with
19	doing this. What what kind of
20	MR. GEORGE: Wasn't there a time constriction
21	of, you know, losing a grant if we didn't go ahead
22	and get started with something?
23	MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. But you're all right
24	with that. You did distribute design. You're all
25	right with that.
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - IULY 17-200

148

MR. GEORGE: Okay. 1

2	CHAIRMAN COX: Andrew, can you come up with
3	three, two other designs that are down to this
4	level of detail by August the 21st?
5	MR. HOLESKO: Yes. Absolutely.
6	MR. GEORGE: That sounds like a good way to
7	postpone it.
8	CHAIRMAN COX: There's a motion on the table.
9	MR. GEORGE: I second that motion.
10	CHAIRMAN COX: Motion and a second. Any
11	discussion?
12	(No discussion.)
13	CHAIRMAN COX: All in favor, say aye.
14	MR. BRUNSON: Aye.
15	MR. GEORGE: Aye.
16	MR. GORMAN: Aye.
17	CHAIRMAN COX: I'm opposed. The ayes have
18	it. Move forward. Okay.
19	10 HOUSEKEEPING ITEMS
20	CHAIRMAN COX: Move into housekeeping items.
21	MR. WUELLNER: I have nothing for you.
22	CHAIRMAN COX: You want to discuss electronic

23 minutes so that just -- we know where that's at? 24 MR. WUELLNER: Make sure everybody was 25 getting them and able to open them. AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006 149 1 CHAIRMAN COX: All right. 2 11. - PUBLIC COMMENTS 3 CHAIRMAN COX: Public comments. General public comments. Any comments from the public? 4 (No public comments.) 5 CHAIRMAN COX: Seeing no comments, we'll move 6 it to Authority members' comments. Mr. Brunson? 7 8 12.A. - MR. RANDY BRUNSON 9 MR. BRUNSON: I had -- have no comments, 10 except that I -- I -- I'm a little disappointed 11 that I didn't know more about this to know what 12 the layout was and not study it with Staff, too, 13 so I could have comments. But I agree with you,

Mr. Chairman; we need to have this.

CHAIRMAN COX: I think it's been addressed.

14

16	Ms. Green's not here. Mr. Gorman?
17	12.C MR. JACK GORMAN
18	MR. GORMAN: I think to actually do this, we
19	need to have this discussion, if you need to hurry
20	it up, but this is important. This is important
21	to the community, this design. We need to have
22	this discussion, look at these layouts, and then
23	come to some decisions.
24	I would like this board to actually walk out
25	there, which is a plan I was supposed to have done
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
1	before this meeting, somehow. Walk out there and
2	take a look. See what you're going to save. See
3	what see what you would save on paper that
4	you know, and you may say, well, that's not really
5	worth saving. Take a look. Take a physical look
6	like an old farmer. Figure out what we want to do
7	from a few proposals.
8	Get it done, and then we'll move on. But

9	without just looking on paper, without actually
10	doing a little more work, I'm afraid we'll do the
11	wrong thing.
12	CHAIRMAN COX: Well taken. Mr. George?
13	12.D MR. WAYNE GEORGE
14	MR. GEORGE: I think that having three
15	different plans for us to take a you know, a
16	look at, I think it would be a great idea to get
17	that, you know, accomplished. But understand that
18	there's a price to pay for this stuff.
19	And I'm not against greenery, okay? As a
20	matter of fact, when I sat down this morning, I
21	thought this was Jack's design that I was looking
22	at, and didn't have that many objections to it,
23	but I wanted to squeeze some more hangars out of
24	it.
25	But if we come up with three more, we'll have
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
	151

it quantified what each one of those does as far 1

2	as hangars, and therefore, we'll be able to
3	quantify, okay, what are five more trees? What
4	are we willing to pay for five more trees?
5	MR. GORMAN: We need to make that discussion.
6	MR. GEORGE: That's what I'm saying.
7	MR. GORMAN: Sure. And we we need to go
8	out and look at them and say, well, no, let's not
9	do that.
10	MR. GEORGE: No. I agree with you a hundred
11	percent.
12	CHAIRMAN COX: All right.
13	MR. GEORGE: That's all.
14	12.E CHAIRMAN BOB COX
15	CHAIRMAN COX: My comments are that and
16	once again, I'd like to reiterate that that our
17	responsibility is to the county overall, and
18	it's it's not to how we want to see the
19	airport. It's not how any of the individuals here
20	on the airport want to see the airport.
21	Our responsibility and duty is to the county.
22	And and we can compromise a bit and still come
23	out making the hangars, as many hangars as we can

- get, and having some greenery involved. I don't
- disagree with that at all. But, I mean, if we

- 1 have to sacrifice some greenery to have the
- 2 benefit, a bigger benefit for the citizens of the
- 3 county, then we need to do that. You know, it's
- 4 unfortunate that we might have to do that, but we
- 5 may have to do that.
- 6 MR. GORMAN: After further discussion, we may
- 7 have to, to some extent, certainly.
- 8 CHAIRMAN COX: Those -- those are my
- 9 comments.
- 10 Public comment was closed, sir. I'm sorry.
- MR. HOLIDAY: I'm not going to say anything.
- 12 CHAIRMAN COX: Okay.
- 13 MR. HOLIDAY: Sick of sitting.
- 14 MR. GEORGE: Next meeting.
- 15 13. NEXT MEETING DATE & ADJOURNMENT
- 16 CHAIRMAN COX: Next meeting date is August

17	21st, if everybody would check their dates.
18	And we have a lease policy and ops workshop
19	on that same day at 2 o'clock. So, everybody
20	copacetic with that? Okay. 2 o'clock and then 4
21	o'clock. No other comments? Meeting is
22	adjourned.
23	(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 6:43 p.m.)
24	
25	
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING - JULY 17, 2006
1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	
3	STATE OF FLORIDA )
4	COUNTY OF ST. JOHNS )
5	
6	I, JANET M. BEASON, RPR-CP, RMR, CRR, certify
7	that I was authorized to and did stenographically
8	report the foregoing proceedings and that the
9	transcript is a true record of my stenographic

10	notes.
11	
12	Dated this 3rd day of August, 2006.
13	
14	JANET M. BEASON, RPR-CP, RMR, CRR
15	Notary Public - State of Florida My Commission No.: DD531390
16	Expires: April 30, 2010
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	