1	S1. AUGUSTINE - S1. JOHNS COUNTY AIRPORT AUTHORIT
2	Final Public Hearing on
3	FY 2005-06 Annual Budget
4	held at 4796 U.S. 1 North
5	St. Augustine, Florida
6	on Monday, September 19, 2005
7	from 5:01 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.
8	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
9	BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:
10	WAYNE GEORGE, Chairman
	BOB COX, Secretary-Treasurer
11	RANDY BRUNSON
	JOHN "JACK" GORMAN
12	SUZANNE GREEN
13	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
14	ALSO PRESENT:
15	DOUG BURNETT, Esquire, Rogers, Towers, Bailey,
16	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.
10	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

20	
21	JANET M. BEASON, RPR, RMR, CRR St. Augustine Court Reporters
22	1510 N. Ponce de Leon Boulevard St. Augustine, FL 32084
23	(904) 825-0570
24	
25	

1		INDEX		
2		PAGE		
3	1.	CALL TO ORDER 3		
4	2.	OPENING REMARKS BY CHAIRMAN	3	
5	3.	ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROPOSED MILLAGE RAT	ГЕ	4
6	4.	DISCUSSION OF MILLAGE RATE BY AUTHORIT	Y	6
7	5.	PUBLIC COMMENT ON MILLAGE RATE	28	
8	6.	ADOPTION OF MILLAGE RATE - RESOLUTION 2	005-06	50
9	7.	PRESENTATION OF PROPOSED BUDGET	61	
10	8.	DISCUSSION OF BUDGET BY AUTHORITY	62	
11	9.	PUBLIC COMMENT ON BUDGET	78	
12	10	o. ADOPTION OF FY 05/06 BUDGET - RESOLUTION	N 2005-07	7 79

13	11. FINAL COMMENTS	86
14	12. ADJOURNMENT	87
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDG	ET MEETING - SEPTEMBER 19, 2005
		3
1	PROCEEDINGS	S
2	MR. GEORGE: Let's take	our seats, please.
3	We're going to call our final be	udget hearing
4	meeting to order.	
5	I have elected to turn the ch	nairmanship over

6	to Mr. Cox, because I was not at the last meeting,
7	and for continuity sake, he heard the comments and
8	everything of the last meeting, and I think that
9	he could probably handle it better than I would.
10	So, I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Cox.
11	CALL TO ORDER AND REMARKS BY CHAIRMAN
12	CHAIRMAN COX: Thank you, sir. Call to order
13	this final public hearing of the '05-'06 annual
14	budget. I'm going to limit remarks to the public
15	to five minutes per individual. And the board,
16	if if we decide that we want to allow further
17	comments on a particular issue, if somebody's
18	speaking to the point, that's fine; we'll extend
19	that time frame.
20	But generally speaking, please try to your
21	comments to five minutes or less, because
22	otherwise, we could end up here for hours and not
23	get the subject matter covered.
24	Please keep your comments focused to the
25	budget portion of the meeting, because we will

1	continue the general meeting after the annual
2	budget meeting is concluded.
3	3 ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROPOSED MILLAGE RATE
4	CHAIRMAN COX: Announcement of proposed
5	millage rate?
6	MR. BURNETT: And and if I could just
7	interject real quick
8	CHAIRMAN COX: Yes, sir.
9	MR. BURNETT: real briefly for the public.
10	I know that the Authority members know this, but
11	for the public, at the last meeting, the tentative
12	millage and tentative budget were approved.
13	For the purpose of this meeting, we have to
14	sort of follow we have to follow a strict
15	statutory requirement that we discuss the millage
16	and approve the millage prior to discussing the
17	budget and approval of the budget. And so, that's
18	why the agenda is formulated the way it is.
19	CHAIRMAN COX: Very good.
20	MR. BRUNSON: Well may I ask a question,

- 21 Doug?
- MR. BURNETT: Yes, sir.
- MR. BRUNSON: When you approve the millage,
- 24 how can you not talk about the budget to -- why
- you are going to propose a certain millage rate?

- I mean, why would -- it seems like the two go hand
- 2 in hand.
- 3 MR. BURNETT: They really do. The focus, at
- 4 least until you've approved the millage, needs to
- 5 be the millage, although obviously it has -- the
- 6 budget impacts the millage rate. The -- the
- 7 simple fact of the matter is, though, the statute
- 8 requires you to approve the millage before you
- 9 approve the budget.
- Now, understand even in your discussion of
- the millage, you're going to have -- presumably,
- you'll have discussions related to what the budget
- is to support the millage that you're

14 contemplating passing. CHAIRMAN COX: I think the statute 15 16 contemplates the -- the symbiotic relationship 17 between the two, but as long as you're discussing 18 the millage rate in a movement towards approving 19 that particular --20 MR. WUELLNER: The argument is that you don't 21 use the budget to justify the millage. 22 CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. Do you want -- did you 23 have an opening statement or --MR. WUELLNER: I don't have an opening 24 25 statement per se, but to just remind the board AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING - SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

- 1 that the tentatively adopted millage rate was set
- 2 last week, last Monday in fact, at .2055 mills,
- 3 which is consistent with the rolled-back rate
- as -- as proffered by the Property Appraiser. 4
- 5 4. - DISCUSSION OF MILLAGE RATE BY AUTHORITY
- 6 CHAIRMAN COX: Well, I -- I have a question,

- because this -- the editorial in Sunday's paper
 gave me -- piqued my curiosity on a couple of
- 9 different things.
- 10 If we went to a millage rate of .5, how long
- would it take for the airport to come off the tax
- rolls and how much would that involve?
- MR. WUELLNER: If you went to the full
- statutory half mill?
- 15 CHAIRMAN COX: Right.
- MR. WUELLNER: You could -- I would suggest
- it is probably two years.
- 18 CHAIRMAN COX: Two years or less or two
- 19 years --
- MR. WUELLNER: I think it would take a full
- 21 two years, yes, based on what it would generate.
- 22 CHAIRMAN COX: And then just follow me
- 23 through here, because the issues brought up -- and
- 24 it's actually a very good point that Mr. Sutton
- 25 make -- made in his editorial, that if --

- 1 regardless of what we do here, in three years or
- 2 two years, whenever other board members are on the
- 3 board, they're not obligated at all to -- to
- 4 follow through with what we've started.
- 5 If we in fact were able to get the airport
- 6 off -- completely off the tax rolls and in the
- 7 green, there would have -- there would be almost
- 8 no way for another board to come in here and --
- 9 and go back to the tax roll. There would be no
- way to justify it because there -- unless you had
- a huge urban project to justify going back to
- levying a tax.
- MR. WUELLNER: My -- my suspicion is the only
- way it would begin to be palatable again would be
- 15 following some sort of a -- a debt service request
- 16 you've made to the public wherein they dedicate
- some ad valorem millage to a debt service proposal
- that might, you know, some day materialize that's
- 19 not forecast now.
- 20 CHAIRMAN COX: Comments from the board

- 21 members on that idea?
- MR. BRUNSON: With the -- with this proposal,
- 23 2005-2006, what would the estimated ad valorem tax
- 24 be?
- MR. WUELLNER: The tax or the generated

- 1 revenues?
- 2 CHAIRMAN COX: Generated revenue?
- 3 MR. GEORGE: It's more than double what the
- 4 original forecast --
- 5 MR. WUELLNER: It's --
- 6 CHAIRMAN COX: On a \$125,000 homesteaded
- 7 home, you would end up paying \$46, right?
- 8 Something like -- fifty bucks?
- 9 MR. GEORGE: At fifty -- at fifty. At .5,
- 10 yeah.
- 11 CHAIRMAN COX: Right. Exactly.
- 12 MR. WUELLNER: You --
- 13 CHAIRMAN COX: As opposed to -- go ahead.

- MR. WUELLNER: As good as the idea is, you've
- got a -- you've got a minor problem. Actually,
- it's major at this point. You have a problem in
- that this current year would not allow you to
- exceed the approved -- the millage you've
- 19 advertised in the TRIM.
- 20 CHAIRMAN COX: Okay.
- MR. WUELLNER: It would work fine for next
- 22 year, but --
- MR. GEORGE: See, I --
- MR. WUELLNER: -- you're really statutory
- limited right now to the -- to your last year's

- 1 rate.
- 2 CHAIRMAN COX: Okay.
- 3 MR. BRUNSON: I agree. I think it's a good
- 4 idea, but I think we have a plan and I think we
- 5 need to educate everybody to the plan and stick to
- 6 the plan and take the heat, and -- and it will

7 work. 8 The only argument I think that Mr. Sutton has 9 is that we're -- have a plan, but best case, that 10 you and I will only be here three and a half 11 years, so possibly we won't be here to follow out 12 this plan. But, you know, that's true with the 13 County Commissioners, with the President of the 14 United States. You -- you can just do what you 15 can. 16 And if -- I think if we do the right business 17 decisions, that any board member that comes to 18 follow us will continue that decision. 19 CHAIRMAN COX: Go ahead. 20 MR. GEORGE: I have a few comments, but I was 21 not at the last meeting. And I'll try not to make 22 them as long as the number of comments that I 23 would have made had I been here for two hours. 24 But a couple of things from the -- from the 25 press and the things that are going around, I

AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING - SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

think that most of us here that -- I'm sorry. 1 Most of us that -- that ran for election, 2 part of our election campaign was to get off the 3 tax roll. But if you really look and go back, it 4 wasn't just get off the tax roll; it was run this 5 place like a business and consequently get off the 6 tax roll. 7 Well, I defy anybody who has never been in 8 9 the airport business to come in for a half a day 10 and say, "I know how to do it." 11 You've got to understand the operation. And I think this board has spent a lot of time behind 12 13 the scenes driving Ed and the staff nuts trying to 14 understand the operation. And I think we do. 15 And we put together -- for the first time, to 16 my knowledge in the history of the airport, we put 17 together a business plan. Now, is it the best 18 one? I don't know, but it's one we all came up with and we said this is doable. 19

If we take a 5 -- .5 millage rate to get off

in one year, I have a concern. Any business plan

20

- is made up of assumptions. For instance, I'm
- 23 going to take a vacation with my family and go to
- California, provided my husband or -- or my wife
- can get the time off of work and provided this is

- 1 here and provided -- those are assumptions. We
- 2 have a lot of assumptions in here. I think
- 3 they're good and sound and they're based on what
- 4 we've done in the past.
- 5 But we just had a catastrophe in New Orleans.
- 6 The President says we're going to make \$200
- 7 billion available to -- to rebuild New Orleans?
- 8 How much is that going to impact the amount of
- 9 state and federal money that is going to be
- available in the year 2007-2008 for us to build
- our facilities so that we can get the rent?
- To give you another example, the Master Plan,
- which we'll discuss at the next meeting, the
- 14 forecast, the forecast that we put in, an

- 15 aggressive plan and we're heading that way, calls 16 for an additional 173 airplanes to be based here 17 in St. Augustine in the year 2023. St. Augustine 18 already has 27 percent of the airplanes of Northeast Florida based here. 19 One hundred and seventy-three T-hangars, if 20 we can fill them up, at today's rates, generates 21 \$435,000 a year in income to pay the bills around 22 23 here. 24 So, our plan has got, you know, some of these things, you know, going into it that's going to 25 AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING - SEPTEMBER 19, 2005 12
 - 1 bring in the revenue that's going to put us in a
 - break-even situation. 2
 - 3 We've looked at so many options. You know,
 - 4 that one. We looked at -- at Mr. Gorman's can't
 - we do it in 14 percent per year over 7 years? You 5
 - 6 know, and we looked at a lot of other ones.
 - One of the things that I keep looking at is 7

- 8 find a millage between what we had last year and
- 9 the roll-back. There are 44,000 pieces of
- property, that's 47, percent that are homesteaded
- 11 that are on the tax rolls.
- 12 CHAIRMAN COX: In St. Johns County.
- MR. GEORGE: If I took the homesteaded
- capital and kept the tax dollars the same, that
- would be a \$164,000 piece of property, \$38.71.
- So, if I kept -- with a 3 percent increase
- this year, if I kept the same \$38.71, I come up
- with a millage in between the two. That millage
- 19 generates half a million dollars. Who pays it?
- The registered homesteaded property owners? No.
- 21 The businesses coming in. You know, the -- the
- people that are not St. Johns County -- not
- 23 necessarily St. Johns County residents that are
- here.
- 25 If you look at what's happening in the county

- and the -- and in the cities, we're short on
 schools, we're short on roads. Is that because of
- 3 hindsight, you know, that we were -- didn't have
- 4 the right foresight? I think it is.
- I would hate for us to come up at the end of
- 6 the sixth year and say, Oh, (indicating), we now
- 7 have to have something because Grumman has their
- leases up in the year 2007. I don't want to see
- 9 Grumman leave here. I don't think they're going
- to leave here, but we're going to have to work
- with them to add some more facilities, add a
- length of the runway to make sure that we keep
- them here and keep them as our largest employer.
- Now, we've got some of that information in the
- plan. But these are all assumptions.
- 16 I personally -- I personally like the use the
- higher rate and get off the tax rolls one year
- earlier. I have a selfish reason for wanting
- that. I intend to rerun for this board next year.
- And if I am elected, my last budget that I approve
- will be after the fifth year to cut it to zero. I

- will feel like that's mission accomplished, you
- know, if we can do that. So, that's one of the
- reasons I'm there.
- 25 But with Katrina coming up, you know, New

- 1 Orleans, you know, with all the money that
- 2 we're -- has not been funded for this, those
- 3 impact when it's going to come on line, when we're
- 4 going to rent it.
- 5 Maybe we leave it at six years. That gives
- 6 us a little bit more time to cope with what might
- 7 happen down the road. Sorry. Thank you.
- 8 CHAIRMAN COX: Further discussion?
- 9 MR. GORMAN: This is just as far as
- editorializing and budget comments, a quick one.
- 11 As -- as far as voting this budget in, I feel the
- operation should have had a comparative analysis
- of costs, just an open discussion of budgets of
- similar airports. This would assure the board

- that expenditures are consistent with a
- 16 competitive business situation. And, of course,
- 17 I've asked for this several times. And this just
- needs a broad-base comparison.
- 19 CHAIRMAN COX: Is this going to the millage
- 20 right, then?
- 21 MR. GORMAN: Yes, it does.
- 22 CHAIRMAN COX: All right.
- MR. GORMAN: Because to approve a millage
- rate you have to understand whether or not you're
- running as competitively as possible, whether or

- 1 not you're actually -- your expenditures are maybe
- 2 too broad in some areas and could be cut down,
- 3 therefore, allowing for a lesser millage rate.
- 4 So, yes, it does have a direct rate bearing.
- 5 MR. BRUNSON: Can I make --
- 6 MR. GEORGE: What are our total expenses for
- 7 the year, total operating expenses, roughly? It's

- 8 \$900,000?
- 9 MR. WUELLNER: Current year?
- 10 MR. GEORGE: Yeah.
- MR. WUELLNER: Is that what you're asking?
- MR. GEORGE: I think it's in the nine --
- through eleven months, I think it's been \$900,000.
- So, if we do this operational, you know, audit,
- what's the best we think we can come up with?
- 16 Five percent?
- MR. GORMAN: You don't have any idea right
- 18 now.
- MR. GEORGE: I know. But I have enough
- 20 exposure to what's going on out here on a daily
- basis, I know it's not in the neighborhood -- it
- 22 ain't higher than 15 percent. So, if you came up
- with 10 percent, that's \$98,000. And we're
- talking about three and four million. That's a
- drop in the bucket.

1 I'm not saying we shouldn't look at it, but 2 don't hang your hat on that's the salvation, you 3 know, to do an operational audit of the place, and we're going to come up with all of this excess 4 windfall of money that's going to get us off the 5 tax rolls. 6 MR. GORMAN: But if you ask the general 7 8 public, the consensus will be to lower the taxes. 9 With that analysis, it doesn't have to be in-depth 10 and it doesn't have to be expensive, you could 11 then get your scientific guess much closer and 12 possibly lower the millage by that much; in other words, running this thing as lean on taxes as 13 14 possible. And that would be the reason for the 15 comparative analysis. 16 MR. GEORGE: Okay. 17 CHAIRMAN COX: Mr. Brunson? 18 MR. BRUNSON: I had a thought, but maybe it 19 will come back to me. But we're talking about millage rate. And the last public meeting, we 20 21 agreed to use the rollback rate, which made the

taxpayers not pay the \$600-and-something thousand.

- But we still came up \$150,000 that they won't be
- taxed additionally. And we've all worked on this
- 25 hard.

- 1 And so, I've gone back to Mr. Wuellner again.
- 2 And I'm in favor of being off of here in six years
- and keeping the plan, but I'm in favor of reducing
- 4 the taxes immediately.
- 5 There's two items on the capital -- you know,
- 6 without looking at the expenses, and we've got the
- 7 revenues probably as high as we can get them, and
- 8 without looking at the expenses right now, and
- 9 I've done some work on that this week, and I think
- 10 you're right, that we need to do something.
- 11 I worry about spending megabucks to --
- 12 \$30,000 to save \$9-. And that might be what we --
- what we get into. But we need -- in my opinion,
- to cut the taxes and have the millage rate at
- 15 .1959 instead of .2055, we would have to look at

16 capital expenditures. And the only place I see 17 capital expenditures that -- that the -- and I'm a 18 pilot. I have an airplane. I -- I'm one of the 19 people that can -- can afford it. 20 But -- and I'll probably make some pilots upset with me, but I would like to defer the 21 22 seaplane ramp, and -- and I think that needs to be 23 a study that there might be a higher and better use for that in conjunction with the seaplane 24

ramp. I'm -- I'd like for us to keep an open mind

AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING - SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

18

1 with that.

- This ARFF, if we don't go ahead and use that,
- 3 we're going to lose that. So, we can't touch
- 4 that. You -- you go through all these things, and
- 5 the only thing I see that is not -- probably won't
- 6 happen this year, but we keep it on here some way,
- 7 is the Taxiway B of two and a half million dollars
- 8 and where we've got to come up with \$125-.

9	I think this airport, in my short time here,
10	and my travels over different airports, has the
11	best infrastructure and the best managed airport
12	that I know of.
13	Sure, I might not agree with some things that
14	happened in the past with homeowners' rights and
15	so forth, but it's done and we've got to go
16	forward. But I think this airport is run very
17	efficiently. We have some good people running
18	their facilities, Grumman, Aero Sport, Aviation
19	Training. Everybody I think is doing a great job.
20	But I would like to see us defer the \$125-
21	and the \$50 I would like to make a statement
22	that that and I'd like for Ed's comments on
23	there, that if it still is a doable deal, that I
24	would like to immediately cut the taxes and and
25	stay with the six-year plan.

19

1 CHAIRMAN COX: Your -- your position would be

- 2 to go to the .2055?
- 3 MR. BRUNSON: Go to -- I'd lower it.
- 4 CHAIRMAN COX: Okay.
- 5 MR. BRUNSON: Nineteen -- I did the figures
- on it. It would -- it would come out to .1959,
- 7 would be the millage rate of what you would be
- 8 paying taxes. That would bring you in --
- 9 MR. GEORGE: That's with the elimination of
- those two capital projects.
- MR. BRUNSON: Right. That would bring you in
- 12 still -- what was it, Ed, \$3,300,000 less the 2
- percent that Dennis Hollingsworth, the tax
- collector gets.
- 15 CHAIRMAN COX: Okay.
- MR. BRUNSON: And you know what? Who knows
- what we can do if we really start looking at
- things hard? And we're all business people here.
- 19 And we just really need to -- to tighten our belts
- and -- and do our job.
- MR. GEORGE: At what time during -- in the
- future do you see the need for the Taxiway B

- 23 extension?
- MR. BRUNSON: Well, I know that some of the
- 25 money has been appropriated already, maybe, but in

- 1 2007 -- and Ed, help me -- we're going to get some
- 2 money from Grumman. Sure, we need -- and we're --
- 3 every time I see John Mica, I talk about the
- 4 extension of the runway to get more contracts for
- 5 Grumman, our largest employer in the -- in the
- 6 county, and that's big on my mind.
- 7 But I promise you, I think that we -- we
- 8 can -- can defer Taxiway B and let's get in the
- 9 budget for the year after that.
- MR. GEORGE: Okay. So, we're really not
- saving anything. All we're doing is deferring.
- MR. BRUNSON: Right. But we're getting off
- the tax rolls --
- MR. GEORGE: And when we defer, we might not
- have 90 percent money there. We might have 50

16 percent money. 17 MR. BRUNSON: We're not -- we could still be 18 on the -- that would be case --19 MR. GEORGE: And that -- that be the case 20 that it cost us another \$300,000. 21 MS. GREEN: And then we have to go back and 22 not be able to take the rolled-back rate. We 23 might have to increase that. 24 MR. BRUNSON: I don't think that's right. 25

MS. GREEN: Well, but --

AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING - SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

21

1 MR. GORMAN: How would you know that without 2 a broad-based discussion of the entire budget 3 comparative to other airports? How would you know 4 that? 5 MR. GEORGE: I've been doing a broad-based 6 discussion of the budget for two months. 7 MR. GORMAN: And you -- have you looked at

other budgets during this broad base?

9 MR. GEORGE: No. 10 MR. BRUNSON: Let's -- let's ask our 11 director, would that two and a half million go 12 away? MR. WUELLNER: Well, it's technically not 13 there yet. It's for -- it's in the capital 14 15 development program, and we do not have a grant. The federal side, it's not a -- the way they go 16 about issuing grants is different than the state. 17 And if we get the grant with the state, then we 18 19 can go about developing the project. 20 The federal side, in the sense, you develop 21 the project, then wait for the grant. 22 CHAIRMAN COX: But there are -- there are 23 other issues behind extending Taxiway B, other 24 than just putting, you know, large airplanes

AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING - SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

22

1 MR. WUELLNER: Absolutely.

for -- I mean --

2 CHAIRMAN COX: If we're wrong, it's for -- I 3 mean, it's a boon for Grumman, for one thing, but it's an operational issue that's -- that's outside 4 the scope that Randy mentioned. I mean, there are 5 a tremendous number of other issues involved with 6 extending B. 7 MR. BRUNSON: Sure, there is. 8 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. The issue is really not 9 a Grumman issue or even size of aircraft issue. 10 11 The issue itself is the fact that the taxiway is 12 nonstandard in its -- in its separation from the 13 runway, and creates an operational issue with --14 with the tower. It's just simply too close. 15 MR. GEORGE: Does that have an impact on 16 other projects that we might want to do? 17 MR. WUELLNER: Sure. Long term, absolutely. 18 MR. BRUNSON: Long term, it does. 19 MR. WUELLNER: It's -- it's a project I 20 wouldn't -- you know, I couldn't support, just from a Staff level, of deferring indefinitely. 21 22 It's -- it's not a project that should be put off any longer than we can find the money for it. I 23

- say "find the money," but get the grant funds for
- 25 it.

- 1 MS. GREEN: And that's my concern. I --
- 2 being the only nonpilot here, I'm looking from a
- 3 business perspective that, as a board, we're
- 4 making a decision that if -- let's say we keep it
- 5 at the rolled-back rate and we do defer, end up
- 6 not doing it; we may get off a year earlier then.
- 7 MR. GEORGE: And that money goes into the --
- 8 MS. GREEN: Right.
- 9 MR. GEORGE: -- kitty.
- MS. GREEN: And that's my concern, is to keep
- progressing as we can. We get a comparative
- analysis for next year, whatever, cut more in the
- budget. We'll stay at that rolled-back rate.
- Maybe it's two years earlier that we'd get off.
- But I'm real concerned with all of the work
- we've done on this budget, with the figures we

17 have and what we've proposed, accepting the 18 rolled-back rate. We have now six years. 19 I think if we cut more budget, we -- we can 20 only cut more coming off earlier on the tax rolls. 21 So, from a business standpoint, from a board of directors, I would support the rolled-back rate. 22 And, listen, there are board of directors of 23 24 Ford and other big companies that change all the 25 time. And if the board of directors is smart, AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING - SEPTEMBER 19, 2005 24 1 they're going to follow what's been implemented in 2 place to keep that business afloat. 3 And I think -- this was not just started by this board. This has been coming for several 4 5 years from the old board, and I think we have

stepped in the shoes and followed them.

6

7

8

9

able to come in and cut this off, possibly. You

know, I never say never to certain things. But,

So, Mr. Sutton's comments about a board being

- 10 consistently over the past six years, seven years,
- we have been coming to this point. So --
- 12 CHAIRMAN COX: So, Ms. Green, your position
- would be to go to the .2055?
- MS. GREEN: Yes.
- 15 CHAIRMAN COX: Okay.
- MR. BRUNSON: But let me make a comment on
- that. And I agree with you a hundred percent.
- But I also know, in my business experiences of
- having businesses and being with banks and so
- forth, that we've got this two and a half million
- 21 that possibly we might can get some money for.
- But we would have to fund \$125,000.
- MS. GREEN: Uh-huh.
- MR. BRUNSON: This is not income-producing
- stuff, but it -- it relates to other projects.

- 1 But if -- I guarantee you, good business sense
- 2 would say if we could get two and a half million,

- 3 we have lines of credit that we -- besides the
- 4 county taxpayers, that we could get \$125,000.
- We need to be concentrating on what we've
- 6 been concentrating on here, getting this approval
- 7 from FAA and getting more hangars and -- and --
- 8 and getting the revenues up and -- and -- but if
- 9 we can -- if we can get two and a half million
- grant, I guarantee you we can get the \$125-
- 11 without hurting ourselves.
- But I think it's time that -- we've been
- going forward with this six-year plan. This -- I
- don't think that by having the rolled-back rate
- and the -- and the .1959 millage rate, we -- with
- the numbers I look at, we still can get off in six
- 17 years without any problem.
- 18 CHAIRMAN COX: Anything further then?
- MR. GORMAN: (Shakes head.)
- 20 CHAIRMAN COX: All right. Well, we've got
- several iterations here of what rates we should
- 22 use. So .19 -- .1959, .2055, which is a
- 23 rolled-back rate. And did you --

- 24 MR. GEORGE: .2287 --
- 25 CHAIRMAN COX: .2287?

1	MR. GEORGE: which is the homesteaded
2	property owners keeps their actual tax dollars
3	CHAIRMAN COX: And this is the this is the
4	rate that's in between .2356 and .20 and what
5	does that do for us again in in generating
6	revenue?
7	MR. GEORGE: What it does is it keeps it
8	keeps 47 percent of the property owner, the
9	parcels of property, it keeps their tax dollar the
10	same as it was last year, even though their
11	their value of their property went up 3 percent
12	from the Tax Assessor's Office.
13	MR. BRUNSON: And my comment on that was
14	just just like impact rates, that the
15	nonresidential is paying this big rate and the
16	residential's paying this and the square footage

- is paying that. I think ad valorem tax and impact
- rates should be equal and -- in my opinion.
- MR. GEORGE: Say that again? Ad --
- MR. BRUNSON: Ad valorem and the homesteaders
- and the -- you know, I don't think -- are you
- saying that just the homeowners --
- MR. GEORGE: No, no, no. What I'm saying is
- 24 that the -- the people, our charter says do the
- aviation needs for the St. Johns County resident.

- 1 A St. Johns County resident that pays -- that
- 2 pays taxes is a homesteaded -- in other words, if
- 3 you're renting property, you're not going to pay
- 4 the taxes anyway; somebody else. So, I'm saying
- 5 that let's go -- let's target them to keep their
- 6 tax dollar the same.
- 7 In other words, they haven't moved at all.
- 8 But because we did that, the other 53 percent of
- 9 the property owners, they in essence are going up

- 10 to -- from our rollback to that .22- --11 MR. BRUNSON: So, the commercial -- you know, 12 that's what I'm saying. MR. GEORGE: Exactly. 13 14 MR. BRUNSON: The commercial people and --MR. GEORGE: Roughly, yeah. 15 16 MR. BRUNSON: -- and the commercial 17 buildings I own are -- and the rental property would be paying a higher rate than --18 19 MR. GEORGE: No, you pay the same rate. 20 MR. BRUNSON: Well -- but I'm saying I want 21 that rollback. I want it more than rollback. I want it to start getting off the tax roll. 22 23 CHAIRMAN COX: Anything further before I open 24 it up to public comment? Okay. I think we've
 - AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

28

1 Authority.

25

2 5. - PUBLIC COMMENT ON MILLAGE RATE

concluded discussion on the millage rate by

- 3 CHAIRMAN COX: Any public comment, please, on
- 4 millage rate? And keep -- keep your comments,
- 5 please, focused on millage rate discussion right
- 6 now because we'll be moving into -- Mr. Ciriello.
- 7 MR. CIRIELLO: Joe Ciriello again. What --
- 8 what millage rate did you guys set at the last
- 9 meeting?
- 10 CHAIRMAN COX: Well, we approved --
- 11 MR. WUELLNER: Tentatively.
- 12 CHAIRMAN COX: -- a rollback rate of .2055 to
- be discussed at this meeting.
- MR. CIRIELLO: Oh. So, that doesn't mean you
- can't go up or --
- 16 CHAIRMAN COX: Right.
- 17 MS. GREEN: Right.
- MR. CIRIELLO: Because Mr. George mentioned
- 19 .288 (sic), so he --
- 20 MR. GEORGE: .22 --
- 21 CHAIRMAN COX: No, .22 --
- 22 MR. GEORGE: .2287.
- 23 CHAIRMAN COX: See, right now --
- MR. CIRIELLO: Well, that's higher than .205,

so you can't do that.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING - SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

1	MR. GEORGE: Well, no, but we published in
2	the paper that we were not going the rollback; we
3	were going to go with .2356, and that would have
4	generated that would have given us off the tax
5	roll one year sooner, and that was the whole
6	purpose for doing so.
7	MR. CIRIELLO: Okay. You guys keep talking
8	about wanting to get off the tax rolls and stuff,
9	and you keep talking about running this place like
10	a business. And I'm talking private business now.
11	Any private business that doesn't make more
12	money than it spends is in trouble. And when a
13	business gets in trouble, what are some of the
14	first things they cut? One of them is the
15	payroll, because I worked in a steel mill for 38
16	years, and whenever they had problems, they cut
17	production, for one thing, so they didn't make as

10

many products, and they cut the payroll to keep
their heads above water. And I keep insisting if
you guys don't start cutting some of your capital
projects and live with what you have, you're never
going to get off the tax rolls.

So, if you're talking about cutting the
budget and getting off the tax rolls, why aren't

you cut -- talking about getting rid of some of

AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING - SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

30

1 these capital projects instead of keeping it on 2 the road that, We're going to still build this and 3 we're going to make that and get off the tax 4 rolls? I just can't see how you can do it. 5 CHAIRMAN COX: Thank you. Sir? 6 MR. SUNDEMAN: My name is John Sundeman, 4665 7 Fifth Avenue, Jackson Park. I have just a couple of comments and a couple of questions. I think 8 9 you've got some serious math problems in this

budget and in your future budget here.

- 11 The question that I have, which all ties into 12 the millage rate and your leases, when you're 13 figuring your lease revenue, just for an example, 14 let's say that you build a \$900,000 hangar, and it 15 took another \$5 million for land acquisition, 16 attorney fees and costs, architects, engineers; you have a total investment of \$5.9 million. 17 18 When you charge rent to the public, what is 19 the rent based on? Is it based on \$5.9 million? Is it based on \$5 million? Or, is it based on 20 21 \$900,000 or somewhere in between? 22 MR. GEORGE: Market value. 23 MR. SUNDEMAN: Market value? 24 MR. GEORGE: Uh-huh. MR. SUNDEMAN: Okay. Then I think you have 25
 - AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

- 1 some real serious problems here with the math.
- 2 MR. GEORGE: Then every airport in the State
- 3 of Florida has the same problem.

4 MR. SUNDEMAN: No, sir. That's not what my question was. 5 6 MR. GEORGE: I'm sorry. 7 MR. SUNDEMAN: Back on your discussion, you 8 discuss about making this like a business. If you 9 take a look at the numbers -- I like to deal with 10 the mathematics, not with the rhetoric. 11 MR. GEORGE: Okay. All right. MR. SUNDEMAN: Let's take a look at some of 12 13 the numbers here. CHAIRMAN COX: May I ask you a question? 14 15 Where -- where did the \$5 million come from to begin? 16 MR. SUNDEMAN: It was just a hypothetical 17 18 example to try to find out where you're coming, 19 and the answer was market value. So, the answer 20 would have to be \$5.9. I mean, is that correct? 21 CHAIRMAN COX: But you proposed a number of 22 \$5 million to -- to acquire the \$900,000 --23 MR. SUNDEMAN: It's -- it was a hypothetical

to try to determine how you're calculating the

25 rental revenue which affects the millage rate.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING - SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

1	CHAIRMAN COX: All right.
2	MR. SUNDEMAN: And the only answer I got was
3	market.
4	MR. GEORGE: And you misinterpreted that,
5	Mr. Sundeman.
6	MR. SUNDEMAN: Well, then, what is the
7	answer?
8	MR. GEORGE: Market value of what we can rent
9	a hangar for or that space on any other airport
10	facility in Northeast Florida. You interpreted
11	that to say the market rate of the cash dollars
12	that you put out. I would that was not my
13	answer.
14	MR. SUNDEMAN: Well, then, how would you
15	calculate the rental revenue on the budget that
16	you've got here for the year 2006?
17	CHAIRMAN COX: I'll I'll defer to the

- director, if he could comment.
- MR. WUELLNER: The original calculation is
- based on our initial investment in the facility.
- 21 After that, it's done -- it's reevaluated --
- MR. GEORGE: Excluding land.
- MR. WUELLNER: Excluding land, by appraisal,
- 24 after that point. The annual adjustments are made
- by CPA -- CPA -- CPI, which is the -- one of the

- only methodologies approved by the Federal
- 2 Aviation Administration for staying current with
- 3 the original market value of the property.
- 4 So -- so, we do it by appraisal and we do it
- 5 also -- we validate it by appraisal every fifth
- 6 year of the lease.
- 7 MR. SUNDEMAN: If that is the case, if I
- 8 understand the answer, the answer means that
- 9 instead of basing the rental income on \$5.9, which
- would be your total investment, it's based on

11 \$900,000 adjusted for some value on the \$900,000. 12 MR. GEORGE: Not quite true. If the federal government gave us \$450- and we're \$450- out of 13 14 pocket, it's based on the \$450-. MR. SUNDEMAN: So, it's based on the out of 15 pocket; is that correct? 16 MR. GEORGE: The out of pocket to the St. 17 18 Johns County taxpayer, right. MR. SUNDEMAN: Well, you've got some very, 19 20 very serious math calculations here in this 21 budget, in your future budget. 22 For example, if you take your lease revenue that you've got calculated each year, you're going 23 24 to come up with a total capital investment in the 25 next ten years of \$93 million.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING - SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

- 1 Well, at the end of the year 2016, you're
- 2 going to be collecting around \$4 million in
- 3 revenue based on a capital outlay of \$93 million.

- 4 That's a return of 4.3 percent.
- 5 But here's the problem: When you take a look
- 6 at your operating expenses and you factor them in,
- 7 it's going to bring your return on the investment
- 8 of \$93 million to 1.5 percent.
- 9 Now, the next problem you have, in addition
- to the \$93 million capital outlay as called for in
- 11 your 10-year plan, if you add the other 60-some
- million dollars worth of assets to the \$93
- million, that means that the overall rate of
- return, no matter how you look at it, how you want
- to argue it, what kind of rhetoric you want to put
- on it or what kind spin you're going to put on it,
- you're going to have less than one-tenth of
- 18 1 percent return on the taxpayers' money.
- 19 So, the next question would lead to be, if
- you were -- you keep saying you want to run this
- 21 like a business. Okay. Mr. Brunson, maybe you'll
- help me here with this.
- MR. BRUNSON: Sure.
- MR. SUNDEMAN: Let's say, as a group, we're
- all going to go out here and we're going to invest

35

in a shopping center. It's going to cost \$5.9 1 2 million between the land and the buildings. The land is \$5 million, the building is \$900,000, 3 total \$5.9. 4 MR. GEORGE: That -- that's a private 5 project. 6 7 MR. SUNDEMAN: Now, excuse me, sir --8 MR. GEORGE: Do I-95 --MR. SUNDEMAN: Let me finish the question 9 10 here. Call for order, Mr. Chairman. You know where I'm going. And you're --11 12 MR. MARTINELLI: You're past your five 13 minutes. 14 MR. SUNDEMAN: Excuse me. Under Florida 15 Statute ---MS. BADGER: He can have my five minutes. 16

Statute, you can't limit the time. That's clearly

MR. SUNDEMAN: Excuse me. Under Florida

17

19 the law. 20 Now, I'm just about through, but you know where I'm coming at and you know you're in 21 22 trouble. No, sir. Let me finish. 23 There's no way that a person in this room would go out and get involved in that shopping 24 25 center if they knew that tenants were going to be AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING - SEPTEMBER 19, 2005 36 1 charged rent based on the \$900,000, not the \$5.9 million. 2 3 Number two, there's nobody going to get into 4 an investment with a return of less than one-tenth 5 of 1 percent on the assets. That's the problem 6 you've got here. You're trying to dig your way 7 out of a hole by making the hole bigger and bigger 8 and bigger. 9 Now, don't take my word for it. Take the

you argue here, when you take the total assets

math. Because here's the problem: No matter how

10

- 12 here, which will be in excess of \$150 million to 13 collect \$4 million worth of revenue, there ain't 14 no way, no way you're going to justify something 15 like that to the taxpayers; I don't care what kind 16 of rhetoric or spin you put on it. This is not my spin. This is mathematical 17 facts from your financial statements and from your 18 budget. You're digging yourself into a deeper and 19 deeper hole here --20 21 CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. MR. SUNDEMAN: -- very clearly. Now, the 22 23 next question: How many people at this table are 24 utilizing services of this Airport Authority?
 - AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

MR. SUNDEMAN: How many people sitting at the
 table - CHAIRMAN COX: You can't question the

CHAIRMAN COX: Say that again?

4 individuals on the Authority, sir.

5 MR. SUNDEMAN: Yes, you can. 6 CHAIRMAN COX: Well --7 MR. SUNDEMAN: I have the right to ask you 8 any question. You can -- you can decline. CHAIRMAN COX: You can't --9 10 MR. SUNDEMAN: I have a right. Do you have 11 an airplane at this facility? 12 CHAIRMAN COX: I decline. MR. SUNDEMAN: You decline to answer the 13 question. 14 CHAIRMAN COX: Right. 15 16 MR. SUNDEMAN: Mr. George, do you have an airplane here? 17 18 MR. GEORGE: Yes. 19 MR. SUNDEMAN: How can you assure the 20 taxpayers that you're charging fair market value 21 rent in lease when in fact you're a benefit of 22 this district, and the facts that the numbers show 23 you're getting less than one-tenth of 1 percent return on their investment? 24 MR. BURNETT: Let me weigh in --25

1	MR. GEORGE: Do you want me to answer that?
2	MR. BURNETT: real quick, because that
3	implicates a legal issue. So let me weigh in very
4	quickly.
5	There are plenty of times when governing
6	bodies and their individual members can vote on
7	things that implicate themselves. For example,
8	you're all here today to vote on the issue of
9	taxes, which clearly implicates your wallet at the
10	end of the day, your individual wallets. So, you
11	clearly have an interest in the outcome.
12	It's only when that issue of when you have
13	a special pecuniary gain that would go to you as
14	the individual, as in you're voting on your
15	individual rent for your individual hangar, not
16	one that's voting on setting rents airport-wide,
17	could the potential for a conflict arise.
18	But other than that, the Attorney General

file:///C|/Documents%20and%20Settings/Bill/Desktop/BUDGET091905.txt 19 Opinions related to this issue clearly are very 20 clear that this is not one of the issues in 21 generally voting on what -- what rentals would be across the board for large numbers of people is 22 23 not something that it causes a conflict. 24 MR. SUNDEMAN: That was not my question. The question is: What mechanism do you have in the 25 AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING - SEPTEMBER 19, 2005 39 1 budget process to ensure that you as commissioners 2 are paying a fair rent compared to everyone else? MR. GEORGE: A survey of all of the airports 3 around the Jacksonville, the Northeast Florida 4 5 area, and ours is set -- Ed, correct me if I'm

11 MR. BRUNSON: I'm certainly not. I don't --

wrong -- right in the middle.

benefits over other people?

6

7

8

9

10

MR. SUNDEMAN: Is there anyone renting space

from the Airport Authority that's getting special

MR. GEORGE: Not to my knowledge.

12 I don't rent from the Airport Authority. I'm hangared at Aero Sport. 13 MR. SUNDEMAN: Okay. Thank you very much. 14 15 MR. GEORGE: You -- you also asked another 16 question that, you know, how would I do, you know, 17 something. And, Mr. Sundeman, you -- you're very 18 good at bringing up some good points, and you've 19 brought the point before -- and correct me if I'm 20 wrong -- that you were the CPA for the Airport 21 Authority at one point in time. So, at that time, 22 you understood how a government agency works. 23 Let me take the -- the parking garage for St. Augustine. Do you think that they justified 24

AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING - SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

that parking garage and the revenue coming in from

40

- 1 it by adding the cost of the land?
- 2 MR. SUNDEMAN: Yes.

- 3 MR. GEORGE: No. They didn't do that.
- 4 MR. SUNDEMAN: Yes. I'm sorry.

- 5 MR. GEORGE: Does I-95 -- if you set up a
- 6 toll booth, do you charge that first customer what
- 7 it cost you to acquire the land and pave I-95, you
- 8 know, for 200 miles? No, you don't do that.
- 9 MR. SUNDEMAN: Well, let me answer the
- question. You asked me a question. Let me answer
- 11 the question.
- MR. GEORGE: Okay.
- MR. SUNDEMAN: That's a very good question,
- and it's a very easy one for me to answer.
- Whether you're in government or private business,
- only a fool would go into a project that would
- bankrupt the taxpayers or cause serious financial
- harm.
- 19 So, back on -- on the parking garage issue,
- yes, I would. I would determine what is the
- 21 economic impact on the taxpayers related to that
- total investment? Yeah, I would never go into
- investment where I have to go out and increase
- everybody's -- double their taxes. Yes, it is
- something that you'd have to do.

41

MR. GEORGE: So, you would look at the 1 economic impact of that garage. 2 MR. SUNDEMAN: Here's another easy thing that 3 would help you. 4 5 MR. GEORGE: Is that correct? 6 MR. SUNDEMAN: Yeah. Yes, I would. 7 MR. GEORGE: Okay. So, you answered my 8 question --9 MR. SUNDEMAN: Here's --10 MR. GEORGE: -- so let me continue --11 MR. SUNDEMAN: Okay. 12 MR. GEORGE: -- okay? Mr. Cox, in a session 13 a while ago, showed that we had a hundred million 14 dollars, and that was from the year 2001, of 15 economic impact -- and those are your term, 16 economic impact -- from having the airport here on the county. I have heard things that it's \$125 17 million now. 18 So, how do we take into consideration that \$5 19

- 20 million we spent for the land to put the hangar
- out there for the jobs that the people that have
- their airplane here do and the fuel they burn and
- \$268 a day from their overtime? How -- you didn't
- leave that in the formula.
- MR. SUNDEMAN: Well, let me answer that.

- 1 It's very simple. This economic impact that
- 2 you're talking about is an estimate. Secondly,
- 3 the economic impact doesn't come from this Airport
- 4 Authority. It comes from Grumman. That's where
- 5 the biggest economic impact comes from here.
- 6 Plain and simple.
- Yes, I had many years here at the Airport
- 8 Authority. It's been in -- it had problems for
- 9 years because they kept making the hole bigger and
- bigger and bigger, and that's what the problem is
- 11 here. The math doesn't lie.
- Now, the real answer here, the real question

- 13 is, does -- to sort of sum up this economic impact 14 issue. Why don't you tell the taxpayers that 15 you've got \$150 million worth of assets, giving a 16 return to them of less than one-tenth of 17 1 percent, and let them decide at the voting booth 18 whether or not they want to go this route? 19 Then you can argue whether, okay, look, 20 taxpayers, we've got \$150 million in assets; we're 21 getting less than one-tenth of 1 percent. No fool 22 in this room would invest in a project that would give them less than one-tenth of 1 percent. 23 24 However --
 - AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

MR. GEORGE: Can we conclude the statement?

43

- 1 MR. SUNDEMAN: Excuse me. Let me finish.
- 2 MR. GEORGE: Okay.

- 3 MR. SUNDEMAN: Then you can go on and tell
- 4 them, however, it's creating all of this economic
- 5 impact, and see how long you stay in office.

6	The problem here with this Airport Authority,
7	the public clearly does not understand what's
8	going on. And I don't think the public will side
9	very fairly or kindly if they find out in the
10	next next ten years alone, you're going to
11	spend \$93 million, and the revenue on that that
12	alone, on that \$93-, is going to bring in \$4
13	million. Nobody's going to spend \$93 million to
14	collect \$4 million and get a 1 1.5 percent
15	return. Nobody does that. It doesn't make any
16	economic sense for anything.
17	Another serious mistake you're making here,
18	heard over and over again, is you're
19	talking about let's make it like a business. Let
20	me help you a lot here. Go to Google and type in
21	"How to run government like a business," and you
22	will get hundreds and hundreds of articles of how
23	previous fools have tried that same route and what
24	it has cost the taxpayers of this country.
25	This is not a business. A government is not

1	a business. It's not supposed to be a business.
2	It's not supposed to be run like a business.
3	Government provides services to the taxpayer.
4	What is the service that you're providing to
5	the taxpayer? That's and if I'm wrong, every
6	textbook, every governmental textbook will argue
7	that same point: Governments are not run for
8	businesses. They are run to provide services to
9	the taxpayers, which means you're supposed to
10	collect ad valorem taxes or other taxes to provide
11	a service. It's in all of the textbooks. It's in
12	all of the universities. It's all over the
13	internet except right here.
14	And if you think I'm wrong, just go type
15	"How to run a government like a business," and
16	it's it's everywhere. It's all over the place.
17	And you'll be surprised.
18	CHAIRMAN COX: We need to get back on the

discussion of millage rate.

- MR. SUNDEMAN: Yes, sir. Just like
- 21 Mr. George got off millage rates, I'm just in the
- same line he is.
- 23 CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. Thank you for your
- 24 comments.
- MR. SUNDEMAN: Thank you.

- 1 CHAIRMAN COX: Public comment? Any further?
- 2 MR. MARTINELLI: Yeah. Over here.
- 3 CHAIRMAN COX: Vic, please?
- 4 MR. MARTINELLI: How about looking over to
- 5 this side?
- 6 CHAIRMAN COX: Sorry. I'll get right back to
- 7 you.
- 8 MR. MARTINELLI: After listening to
- 9 Mr. Sundeman's numbers, all of which, or a great
- majority of which I don't understand simply
- because I'm not that close to them these days, but
- in all due respect, Mr. Sundeman, I agree with

- 13 you; government can't run like a business, because 14 the government is not a business. And that's not 15 the philosophy that these folks are talking about, 16 I'm sure. 17 The philosophy is, think like you're running a business, but you know you're running a 18 governmental institution. Okay. With that as the 19 caveat to start with, I submit that you're really 20 21 talking about three different things here; one, 22 the millage rate; two, the budget; and operational 23 audits, et cetera, et cetera, those two are 24 separate and distinct. They are, because if you're doing your job thinking like a businessman, 25
 - AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

- 1 you're doing operational audits every day. You're
- 2 watching your budget expenditures every day.
- 3 You're controlling your expenses every day. Okay?
- 4 So, that's an ongoing thing.
- 5 Setting the millage rate is a once-a-year

- file:///C|/Documents%20and%20Settings/Bill/Desktop/BUDGET091905.txt 6 thing. What's the objective of your millage rate? 7 The objective is ultimately to support the 8 airport, and if possible, with the businesses at the airport, ultimately reducing that millage 9 requirement to zero. Okay? 10 11 Now, I believe it was Mrs. Green who said, if 12 you are watching your budget, if you're watching 13 your spending and you're doing it frugally, you're going to shorten the time at which you will get 14 15 off the tax rolls. But that's the way to do it. 16 I believe that the way not to do it is to cut 17 your millage rate in anticipation of that, so that if you kept the same millage rate as you had last 18 19 year, as I believe Mr. --20 CHAIRMAN COX: George. 21 MR. GEORGE: Buzz. 22 MR. MARTINELLI: If Mr. Buzz -- no. If -- if
 - 24 the homesteaders don't have any increase; they're

paying the same amount. Okay? If your assessment 25

Wayne had -- if Mr. George had said, as he said,

AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING - SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

goes up because your property value goes up, yeah, 1 you pay a couple of dollars more. 2 But fundamentally, keeping the same millage 3 rate as you had last year, not the rollback rate, 4 is in my opinion the way to go, because you go 5 that route, and at the same time, and on a 6 continuing basis, you look into every expenditure 7 8 you make. And you don't need to pay an expensive 9 consultant to do that. You can do that on your own. You can go out to other airports. You can 10 take segments. You can do that. 11 12 MR. GORMAN: May I say something? 13 MR. MARTINELLI: Okay. Excuse me. Let me 14 just finish and then -- then I'll listen to you, 15 Jack. CHAIRMAN COX: Address -- address me, Jack. 16 17 MR. MARTINELLI: The -- the third area that I 18 want to talk about is the investment. These -- these projects, which right now are 19

the sole, as I understand it correctly, the sole

- reason for having to have the millage, being on
- 22 the tax rolls at all, that's the investment in the
- future of this airport. And without the
- investment, you cannot have any revenue
- whatsoever.

11

12

13

AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING - SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

48

1 And, Mr. Sundeman, whether it's one-tenth of 2 1 percent, whether it's 10 percent, 5 percent, 2 3 percent, whatever that return is, the airport is a requirement. It's a requirement. And this is a 4 5 governmental entity. It is not a public business. 6 It is not -- can't be run like a business. We all 7 know that. But keep the business philosophy. Reduce 8 9 your expenses, make your investments, because your

in, increase their workforce, and all of the other

road to get off the tax rolls. It's going to

investments today are going to enable you down the

enable you to have Grumman bring more contracts

- 14 side effects, extending taxiway -- taxi lane B, 15 all of those issues. 16 So, those are the three points. Keep your 17 investments; keep your -- your millage as it was 18 or is presently, not the rollback rate; and continue with your operational audits, your 19 tightening of your belt, and do that on an ongoing 20 basis, separate and distinct from your millage 21 22 rate. 23 CHAIRMAN COX: Thank you. This is public 24 comments. Yes, ma'am. 25 MS. McELROY: Carolyn McElroy again. I have AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING - SEPTEMBER 19, 2005 49
 - 1 to say that I would vote for the rollback rate. I
 - 2 think that you people need to be getting in
 - 3 training. If you can't show that you can't live
 - 4 on a rollback rate, how can you show that you're
 - 5 going to be able to live with no money coming in
 - 6 at all?

- 7 You need to be tightening your belt now and
- 8 coming up even with extra money on the rollback
- 9 rate. You -- you -- for the public, I think you
- need to show the public that you can do this. Why
- should we believe you're going to go off the --
- off the tax rolls if you can't even roll back that
- amount of money?
- 14 CHAIRMAN COX: Thank you. Any other? Yes,
- ma'am.
- MS. HART: I have a question, but I'm sorry,
- 17 I came in late.
- 18 CHAIRMAN COX: That's fine.
- MS. HART: My name's Patty Hart. And I don't
- 20 understand why public money goes to a private
- entity.
- MR. MARTINELLI: It's not a private entity.
- 23 CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. Well, we're discussing
- the millage rate. Do you have a specific comment
- on the proposed millage rate at this point?

1 MR. BRUNSON: Patty, we -- we're going to 2 open up --3 MS. HART: Okay. 4 MR. BRUNSON: -- the general board meeting 5 after this. 6 MS. HART: I'm sorry. 7 MR. WUELLNER: That's all right. 8 CHAIRMAN COX: Any further public comment on 9 the millage rate input? (No further public discussion.) 10 6. - ADOPTION OF MILLAGE RATE - RESOLUTION 2005-06 11 CHAIRMAN COX: We'll move to the adoption by 12 the board of the millage rate. 13 MR. GEORGE: I make a motion that we take --14 accept the .2287 rate. That rate will keep the 15 tax dollars the same for homesteaded property 16 17 owners that they paid last year, and that takes 18 into consideration that the county Tax Appraiser 19 raise their tax -- their taxable value of their

property 3 percent. So, for the average property

- of \$164,305, that would keep the taxes at \$38.71.
- 22 CHAIRMAN COX: Have a motion on the table.
- No second? No discussion? The motion failed.
- MR. GEORGE: Absolutely. That's the way you
- 25 do it.

- 1 MR. BRUNSON: I'd like to make a motion that
- 2 the millage rate is .1959, still bringing in
- 3 \$3,211,000, instead of the \$3,300,000.
- 4 MR. BURNETT: That would be 0.195 --
- 5 MR. BRUNSON: .-9.
- 6 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. It's .1959 mills.
- 7 MR. BRUNSON: And I'm just ready to see how
- 8 tight we can run this airport.
- 9 MR. GORMAN: I would second that. I would
- 10 like to see it smaller, but without the analysis,
- I don't know how much smaller we could go. I
- would second that because it shows the taxpayers
- that we are actually trying to cut.

6

14 CHAIRMAN COX: Motion on the table. It's been seconded. Any further discussion on it? 15 MR. GEORGE: We've picked up two projects 16 that we're talking about deferring capital expense 17 on it, when the federal government is giving us 90 18 19 cents on the dollar. MR. BRUNSON: Not yet. 20 21 MR. GEORGE: We --22 MR. BRUNSON: Go ahead. 23 MR. GEORGE: It won't -- our money will not 24 be spent unless the federal government gives us

that money, so we wouldn't spend it anyway.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING - SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

52

1 But we've also agreed that sooner or later, 2 we're going to have to do that project. So, are 3 we risking getting into a 50-cents-on-the-dollar 4 project three years down the road? 5 I think it would be wise to leave it in the

budget, and if the federal funds are there, we

- 7 take it. And my logic there is, I don't know
- 8 what's going to happen with the New Orleans
- 9 impact. I don't know what's going to happen with
- the ability to have funds out there.
- But if you take it off, you don't have
- that -- that impact there. Therefore, I would not
- like to see that happen.
- MS. GREEN: And I -- I kind of agree with
- 15 you. I would rather cut it down the road on the
- 16 fifth or sixth year if we're not going to take it,
- if the funds aren't there.
- MR. GEORGE: Well, if we don't take it, the
- 19 \$125,000 rolls into our reserve fund, which is
- what we're trying to build up.
- MS. GREEN: Correct.
- MR. GEORGE: So, I'm in line with you --
- MR. BRUNSON: Also, I'd like for the director
- 24 to -- to -- the comment has been said that we --
- we're going to lose it. If the money becomes

- 1 available, we're going to do it.
- 2 MR. WUELLNER: You -- you would have to be in
- a position to do it when the federal government
- 4 offers the monies to you.
- 5 MR. BRUNSON: Right. And the position would
- 6 be available to do it is simple. We would borrow
- 7 the \$125,000 if we don't have it. I don't
- 8 think -- I'm telling you, we've got \$11 million
- 9 spent here in federal funds, state funds, and --
- and county funds. We're talking about rolling it
- 11 back to .1959 to bring in \$3,211,000. That's a
- lot of money. Let's -- let's just do it.
- MR. GEORGE: One other question. That
- \$\\$\ \\$\\$\ million -- \\$\\$3.2 million and change, that
- 15 considered something over and above what we had
- actually calculated. You said there was
- another -- somehow or another, that money -- if I
- took .1959 for the property value, it wouldn't
- 19 come out \$3.2.
- MR. BRUNSON: Well, the -- the figures,
- you're going to get \$3,360,000 with the -- with

- the rollback rate. But you -- that's the number
- 23 that you've got to pay the 2 percent to the tax
- 24 collector.
- MR. WUELLNER: Right. Yeah. That ends up

- 1 actually \$3,342,800.
- 2 MR. GEORGE: What does, the .1959?
- 3 MR. WUELLNER: Correct. At -- at 98 percent.
- 4 MR. GEORGE: Okay. What does the rollback
- 5 rate bring in at the 98 percent?
- 6 MR. WUELLNER: That's what's in your
- 7 budget -- rolled-back rate, it's in your --
- 8 MR. GEORGE: .2055.
- 9 MR. WUELLNER: That's in your -- you can read
- that directly off your budget.
- 11 MR. BRUNSON: \$3,360,000.
- MR. WUELLNER: You can read that directly off
- 13 your budget.
- MR. BRUNSON: Yeah. So, we -- you know, what

- 15 I'm trying to do is -- is start a trend of
- getting -- cutting the taxes, and we're talking
- about \$150,000, is what we're talking about. And
- we've made a statement. And we're trying. And...
- 19 CHAIRMAN COX: There's a motion on the table.
- 20 It's been seconded. And as I understand it, your
- 21 motion is that we move to a rate of .1959 --
- MR. BRUNSON: Yes.
- 23 CHAIRMAN COX: -- as the millage rate? Any
- 24 further discussion?
- 25 (No further board discussion.)

- 1 CHAIRMAN COX: All of those in favor?
- 2 MR. BRUNSON: Aye.
- 3 MR. GORMAN: Aye.
- 4 CHAIRMAN COX: All those against?
- 5 MS. GREEN: No.
- 6 CHAIRMAN COX: No.
- 7 MR. GEORGE: No.

8	CHAIRMAN COX: It's three against and two	
9	ayes. The motion failed.	
10	MR. GEORGE: Okay.	
11	CHAIRMAN COX: I'd like to chip in some	
12	comments here. I I like what the comments	
13	that Mr. Martinelli had to proffer to to the	
14	audience, and that was the concern of taking the	
15	rolled-back rate or a lesser rate than what we	
16	have now and then ending up on the tax rolls even	
17	longer.	
18	My opinion would be to stay with the .2356 at	
19	this point and try to move this along and get us,	
20	you know, in the five-and-a-half to six-year	
21	range. Any discussion?	
22	MS. GREEN: My only comment about that is,	
23	with our figures as we've looked at, we're there	
24	at the rolled-back rate.	
25	CHAIRMAN COX: That's true.	

1 MS. GREEN: Rather than keeping the rate we 2 have now. So, I'm with you in the philosophy, 3 because I want to stay on the agenda and -- and 4 work our projects and what have you. And if we 5 decide not to do, like you're saying, the seaplane 6 project, fine. Then that expenditure won't be 7 there. But let's budget for it now so that we can 8 come up to the fifth or sixth year and say, we're 9 not going to do that. All right. We don't need 10 anymore. CHAIRMAN COX: Right. 11 MS. GREEN: We're off now in five years. 12 So, my comment is just to -- the rolled-back 13 rate, at least, so we stay on the budget, and then 14 15 four or five years from now, we find some expenditures we're not going to do, cut them off. 16 CHAIRMAN COX: That's a very good point. 17 18 MR. BRUNSON: And as hard as it would be 19 to -- to support the rollback rate, how strongly I 20 feel about cutting taxes more, I certainly would 21 support your comments to at least take away the

- \$600-and-something thousand that -- that would put
- \$600,000 more in the kitty, like we did last --
- you did last year. Was bragged about, well, we've
- got \$400-more-thousand. You know, it's -- it's

- 1 time to roll it back.
- 2 MS. GREEN: Well, like we do each year, we
- 3 look at our budget, and like Mr. Gorman said,
- 4 we'll cut back some more.
- 5 Let's -- you know, if we want to get a
- 6 comparison, we say, okay, we don't really need to
- 7 budget X amount for whatever expense. And I don't
- 8 want to pick on any. But, you know, we can trim
- 9 it and trim it and trim it each month -- I mean,
- each year so that we can take rollback or less
- than that, and keep cutting it maybe quicker. I
- don't know.
- 13 MR. GEORGE: So, the motion is what?
- 14 CHAIRMAN COX: I didn't --

- MR. BRUNSON: You made that a motion.
- 16 CHAIRMAN COX: That's why I didn't form it --
- 17 I didn't form it as a motion. I was looking for
- input. So -- but, yeah, I -- I dis -- I agree
- with what you said, Suzanne.
- MS. GREEN: But if the court -- or if the
- 21 board would entertain a motion --
- 22 CHAIRMAN COX: I would entertain a motion.
- MR. WUELLNER: Old habit.
- MS. GREEN: I know. That we accept the
- 25 rolled-back rate as we presented earlier.

- 1 CHAIRMAN COX: Of .2055.
- MS. GREEN: Yes.
- 3 CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. Is there a second?
- 4 MR. BRUNSON: I -- I'll have -- I will have
- 5 to second that. I made that a motion --
- 6 CHAIRMAN COX: Yes, sir.
- 7 MR. BRUNSON: -- at the last meeting, but I

- 8 thought we could do better and I'm --
- 9 CHAIRMAN COX: That's fine. There's a motion
- on the table. It's been seconded. Any
- 11 discussion?
- 12 (No further board discussion.)
- 13 CHAIRMAN COX: All in favor?
- MS. GREEN: Aye.
- MR. BRUNSON: Aye.
- 16 CHAIRMAN COX: Aye.
- 17 MR. GEORGE: Aye.
- 18 CHAIRMAN COX: All opposed?
- 19 MR. GORMAN: Nay.
- 20 CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. The motion passes. The
- 21 millage rate is .2055.
- MR. WUELLNER: Then -- then to follow up that
- action, you'll need to adopt a resolution per
- 24 Florida Statutes relating to that adoption of the
- 25 millage rate. And your proposed resolution number

- 1 is 2005-06. And since he's -- hasn't earned his
- 2 keep today, I will ask our illustrious attorney to
- 3 read the resolution into the record. And
- 4 following that, you'll need an affirmative vote of
- 5 that resolution adopting it.
- 6 MR. BURNETT: This is a resolution of the St.
- 7 Augustine-St. Johns County Airport Authority,
- 8 Resolution Number 2005-06. "A Resolution Of The
- 9 St. Johns County -- St. Augustine-St. Johns County
- 10 Airport Authority Of St. Johns County, Florida,
- 11 Adopting The Final Levying Of Ad Valorem Taxes For
- Fiscal Year 2005-06; And Providing For An
- 13 Effective Date.
- 14 "Whereas, the St. Augustine-St. Johns County
- 15 Airport Authority of St. Johns County, Florida, on
- 16 September 19th, 2005, adopted for Fiscal Year
- 17 2005-06 a Final Millage Rate following a public
- hearing as required by Florida Statute 200.065;
- 19 and
- 20 "Whereas, the St. Augustine-St. Johns County
- 21 Airport Authority of St. Johns County, Florida
- held a public hearing as required by Florida

- 23 Statute 200.065; and
- "Whereas, the St. Augustine-St. Johns County
- 25 Airport Authority proposed a millage rate of

- 1 0.2055 mills which is the rolled-back rate
- 2 certified by the St. Johns County Property
- 3 Appraiser.
- 4 "Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved by the
- 5 St. Augustine-St. Johns County Airport Authority
- 6 of St. Johns County, Florida, that the Fiscal Year
- 7 2005-06 operating millage rate is 0.2055 mills
- 8 which is the rolled-back rate.
- 9 "This Resolution shall take effect
- immediately upon its adoption.
- 11 "Duly Adopted at a public hearing this 19th
- day of September, 2005. St. Augustine-St. Johns
- County Airport Authority," by Mr. Wayne George,
- 14 Chairman, with Mr. Cox attesting as
- secretary/treasurer.

- 16 CHAIRMAN COX: What was the resolution number
- 17 again?
- 18 MR. BURNETT: 2005-06.
- 19 CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. And we need to adopt
- 20 that resolution.
- MR. WUELLNER: Yes, you will. To effect the
- 22 millage rate.
- 23 CHAIRMAN COX: Entertain a motion.
- MS. GREEN: I make a motion to adopt the
- 25 Resolution 2005-06.

- 1 MR. GEORGE: Second.
- 2 CHAIRMAN COX: Second? Motion on the table
- 3 to adopt. All in favor?
- 4 MS. GREEN: Aye.
- 5 MR. BRUNSON: Aye.
- 6 CHAIRMAN COX: Aye.
- 7 MR. GEORGE: Aye.
- 8 CHAIRMAN COX: All opposed?

9	MR. GORMAN: Nay.
10	CHAIRMAN COX: Nay? Four for, and one
11	against, the motion passes. Resolution's adopted.
12	7 PRESENTATION OF PROPOSED BUDGET
13	MR. WUELLNER: Okay. Next substantive order
14	is the discussion of the budget or presentation
15	of the budget.
16	CHAIRMAN COX: Presentation of the proposed
17	budget by the staff.
18	MR. WUELLNER: As provided in handouts up
19	front, as well as individually to members here,
20	and is also up on the screen, you have the summary
21	page of the budget as proposed by Staff and as
22	modified by this Authority moving forward. It is
23	also the budget as tentatively adopted at last
24	week's first or preliminary budget hearing.
25	The budget as proposed, or as being

62

1 considered here, results in operating revenues or

- 2 forecast operating revenues at \$1,375,268.
- 3 Nonoperating revenues, to include cash forward,
- 4 interest loans, grant funds from state and federal
- 5 agencies, and ad valorem proceeds, based on a
- 6 millage adopted at .2055 mills, generates
- 7 nonoperating revenues in the amount of
- 8 \$12,673,097, for a total revenue estimate of
- 9 \$14,048,366.
- On the expenditure side of the budget -- I'm
- sorry. I can't get that any higher on the screen.
- Personnel expenditures estimated for next year at
- 13 \$680,066. Operating expenditures forecast at
- \$1,002,500. Nonoperating expenditures, including
- debt service and reserves, which I will note to be
- zero, and capital expenditures to the tune of
- \$12,365,800, providing a total expenditure budget
- estimate of -- next year of \$14,048,366, which
- balances against the revenues previously
- 20 presented.
- Be happy to go over any other details,
- specific questions you may or may not have on

- 23 this, comments or -- or the like.
- 24 8. DISCUSSION OF BUDGET BY AUTHORITY
- 25 CHAIRMAN COX: Discussion by board members?

- 1 Mr. -- Mr. Gorman.
- 2 MR. GORMAN: Again, just a quick one on
- 3 the -- on this very tentative situation with
- 4 insurance. And there is no way you can properly
- 5 budget insurance, I know, at this time. And so, I
- 6 just wondered about any type of contingency plan,
- 7 should the insurance just go right through the
- 8 roof, which I really don't think is at all
- 9 impossible.
- 10 MR. GEORGE: I think you've already taken
- care of that, haven't you?
- MR. GORMAN: Well, I'm just curious.
- MR. WUELLNER: We have --
- MR. GORMAN: Just a question.
- MR. WUELLNER: -- somewhat forced the issue

25

8

16 with our carriers this week and -- as promised. And currently, their estimate -- and they believe 17 they're going to be able to get the property 18 aspect of this insurance down a little bit. 19 Currently, when you add property -- airport 20 21 liability, auto, computers, and mobile homes into 22 the mix, which is what's left of our property 23 interests, the estimated insurance premium this coming year will be \$282,423, which is already 24

\$22,000 more than what is in this budget.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING - SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

64

I -- I would ask that we just -- we not react
to it in terms of the budget at this point. We
can deal with it as an amendment as the numbers
solidify over the next couple of weeks, because at
that point, we'll need to bind the policy for the
upcoming year.
They're telling us they may be able to get

the property number down a little bit. Whether

- 9 that results in \$22,000 of reduction, I -- I --
- 10 I'm not overly optimistic. That's a pretty high
- percentage. But we -- we'll certainly report back
- what that is.
- MR. GEORGE: How much was it this year?
- MR. WUELLNER: 2004 ended up at \$230,000,
- with all of those insurance pieces together.
- MR. GEORGE: And you increased it in this
- 17 budget to \$262-?
- 18 MR. WUELLNER: Correct.
- MR. GEORGE: And they're telling you it could
- 20 be \$282-.
- MR. WUELLNER: Correct. Went up 20 -- the
- property aspect, I don't remember the number.
- Donna, was it 23 percent or --
- MS. GLASSER: 23.8 percent.
- MR. WUELLNER: It was 23.8 percent, is the

65

1 property aspect. The rest of it stayed pretty

2 stagnate. 3 The liability aspects, the automobile, that type of thing, it's pretty -- pretty much the 4 5 same. But the property is -- with all of the --6 we've added a lot. In fairness, too, we have added a fair amount of property inventory. You 7 8 know, as we build, that number goes up. MR. GORMAN: There's a certain -- no, I'm 9 10 sorry. 11 CHAIRMAN COX: No, go ahead. I just don't 12 want to get lost in the discussion. 13 MR. GORMAN: There's a certain -- there's 14 very few underwriters, of course, that are 15 available for this. And this is, of course, part 16 of the issue. 17 And the other part of the issue, have you 18 asked or can we ask, or might as well make it a 19 matter of public opinion, for a quote minus an 20 amount for property damage? In other words, cutting the property damage out, leaving liability 21 22 in place. And I know underwriters don't like to

do that. But if asked, maybe underwriters could

24 do that.

16

MR. WUELLNER: Fortunately, our coverage --

AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING - SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

66

1 MR. GORMAN: Makes a tremendous difference. MR. WUELLNER: I mean, that's -- that's a 2 very good point. But -- and unfortunately, our 3 4 coverage is done component-wise. So, the property 5 carrier is independent from the liability carrier, 6 which is independent of the auto carrier, et 7 cetera. 8 So, certainly, the -- you know, any single 9 stand-alone component of the five I mentioned 10 could be easily decided not to insure it. 11 MR. GORMAN: So, we can bind -- we can bind 12 without binding property. You're saying that this 13 is --MR. WUELLNER: Yeah, absolutely. We could do 14 liability without --15

MR. GORMAN: -- an absolute possibility at

- this time and place.
- 18 MR. WUELLNER: Sure.
- MR. GORMAN: That's -- that answers the
- 20 question.
- MR. WUELLNER: Realizing from the -- from the
- date of its expiration, you have no coverage,
- 23 though.
- MS. GREEN: Well, and also -- getting back to
- 25 Mr. Sundeman said, that when we build these

- 1 hangars, the market rate or comparative may go up
- 2 as well. Every other airport's facing this
- 3 increase. So, we might -- will we not be able to
- 4 recover maybe some of this as a pass-on or
- 5 pass-through cost when our square footage goes up
- 6 because of the cost of insurance?
- 7 MR. WUELLNER: Sure. We can make adjustments
- 8 in rental rates of -- of new leaseholds. But to
- 9 the extent it offsets it directly, you know,

- 10 probably won't. It -- because that's a function 11 of either a lease renewal or lease inceptions. 12 MS. GREEN: Right. I'm talking about our new 13 ones when they come on --14 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. Certainly, it could be 15 considered. 16 MR. GORMAN: My point, and the last point 17 I'll make is there may be a cataclasmic change in 18 property damage in areas that we are in. And it 19 is not at all impossible, in other words, because of these underwriters, because of their losses, 20 21 especially because their reserves no longer exist,
- MR. WUELLNER: And, you know, moving
- 24 forward --

especially --

22

MR. GORMAN: So, that's my point, right.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING - SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

- 1 MR. WUELLNER: -- too, you've -- you've got
- 2 an excellent point, because you have -- you have

- 3 the ability, as you -- as reserves become
- 4 adequately funded with the Authority, you could
- 5 absorb higher percentages of the risk in the
- 6 property side, too.
- 7 MR. GORMAN: Yes.
- 8 MR. WUELLNER: Right now, I don't -- I
- 9 don't -- I wouldn't recommend that, because you're
- sitting there with literally no reserves in the
- sense that --
- MR. GEORGE: How much was paid out in the
- last 12 months by the insurance company or by us
- with our deductibles? In other words, of what
- value has that \$282- -- \$-52,000 been to us? We
- spent \$252-. Did that offset charges against us,
- 17 liability-wise at \$220-, or was it \$5-?
- MR. WUELLNER: Well, what it did more
- importantly than any of that is provided legal
- defense for several, especially on the liability
- side, any number of --
- 22 CHAIRMAN COX: Yeah.
- MR. WUELLNER: -- lawsuits that were

- proffered in the last year, or came to resolution,
- including, the -- the Anna Phillip home lawsuit

69

1 that's still ongoing with the -- with the Pilots 2 Association event that was held out there, the 3 Young Eagles program. You had the automobile accident that you had 4 5 absolutely nothing to do with on U.S. 1, but was -- happened near airport property in which you 6 7 were named and had to defend that. 8 You have an individual who has fallen in a residential unit that the airport had that's 9 being -- you know, is being covered. Just from a 10 11 litigation standpoint, my suspicion is that you 12 have a fair amount of this percentage, you 13 certainly exceed the liability insurance aspect --14 CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. 15 MR. WUELLNER: -- premium in any year. It's

just lawsuits come out of nowhere.

- 17 MR. GEORGE: Okay.
- MS. GREEN: If we were to look at what
- 19 Mr. Gorman said, you know, and pick and choose
- what we want to be insured for or not, taking some
- 21 risk, and maybe building up reserves, which is why
- I think we did the millage rate --
- 23 MR. GEORGE: Some sort of self-insurance,
- 24 right.
- MS. GREEN: -- which we were looking at, does

- 1 that affect any of our grants? Do we have to have
- 2 a certain --
- 3 MR. WUELLNER: No.
- 4 MS. GREEN: Okay.
- 5 MR. WUELLNER: You're not required to carry
- 6 insurance on a grant. Keep in mind, if it comes
- 7 time to replace, you may or may not be successful
- 8 in getting that -- you know, getting the state to
- 9 participate in a revise -- you know, a renewal

10 project of that. 11 CHAIRMAN COX: Any further discussion by the 12 board on the -- stand by. Stand by one second. (Pause in the proceedings.) 13 CHAIRMAN COX: All righty. There you go. 14 MR. BRUNSON: Okay. Just real simply, 15 16 looking at the -- the liability of not having full coverage, I'm one of these people, in my 69 years 17 on this earth, have said nothing will ever happen 18 19 to me. The last hurricane, I lost my 28-foot Sea 20 Ray. And I had it half insured, because nothing 21 will ever happen to me. 22 So, I tell you what; this \$282,000, with 23 this, how much money we -- buildings we have here, 24 compared to \$250- or so forth, it's not even worth 25 discussing.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING - SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

- 1 MR. GEORGE: Plus, we have a dangerous
- 2 business we're in.

3 MR. BRUNSON: So, that's my comments on that. MR. WUELLNER: And you're literally staring 4 at -- I don't know what the value -- maybe you 5 have it off the top of your head. But, I mean, 6 you're talking something in tens of millions of 7 8 dollars in assets that are insured for \$280,000. 9 You still have a component. I mean, you have 10 a -- you know, a deductible, for lack of better terms, but a coinsurance requirement. But, you've 11 12 certainly limited your exposure to something less 13 than 20 percent, I would suspect. 14 CHAIRMAN COX: Mr. George? MR. GEORGE: You mentioned that, you know, if 15 16 it does come out at the \$282-, that we could make 17 an adjustment later. Is that a formal thing that 18 you do because ---19 MR. WUELLNER: Yes. We did last year. It 20 happened in fact in October last year when the --21 when the final bill came in --22 MR. GEORGE: Yeah. 23 MR. WUELLNER: -- so to speak. We went in

and adjusted the budget. Well, we did a budget

amendment to -- to take care of that.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING - SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

- 1 MR. GEORGE: Okay. So, that goes to the --
- 2 whoever it has to go to in the state and
- 3 everything.
- 4 MR. WUELLNER: It doesn't require going back
- 5 through there. It requires you to do it
- 6 internally. It actually doesn't require you to do
- 7 it. You're not -- certain governmental entities
- 8 do.
- 9 MR. GEORGE: Yeah.
- MR. WUELLNER: But we do it just because it's
- a significant number in most cases, and we want
- you to be aware of the impact of the budget.
- 13 MR. GEORGE: Okay.
- 14 CHAIRMAN COX: Going to open the discussion
- up to public comment.
- MR. GEORGE: Well, I've got one more --
- 17 CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. Go ahead.

- MR. GEORGE: -- on the budget. We were just
- 19 talking about the insurance.
- 20 CHAIRMAN COX: All right.
- 21 MR. GEORGE: At the last meeting, I
- 22 understand that, Mr. Gorman, you brought up the
- idea of having, you know, an audit, an operational
- audit. Now, two years ago, we put that in the
- budget and we never -- you know, we never did it.

- 1 Is some money in there for what Mr. Gorman is
- 2 talking about in that budget?
- 3 MR. WUELLNER: We discussed it at the last
- 4 meeting --
- 5 MS. GREEN: Right.
- 6 MR. WUELLNER: -- and felt that it could be
- 7 covered under the professional services, under
- 8 their classification.
- 9 MR. GEORGE: Okay. How much money? I just
- want to know the --

- 11 MR. WUELLNER: It's not a specific amount set 12 aside, but my -- I can tell you here what the --13 MR. GEORGE: The only reason I bring it up, 14 is the last time, we put \$10,000, and by the time 15 we did the exercise of what's the scope of work, 16 we were looking at \$30-, \$40,000. 17 MR. GORMAN: That was done -- that wasn't an 18 actual scope of work that had -- that was based on 19 any common sense notion. That was a scope of work 20 that was a hyperbole based by someone that felt 21 that we didn't need it. 22 MR. GEORGE: Okay. Well, I want to make sure 23 there's enough --MR. WUELLNER: It's currently --24 25 MR. GEORGE: -- in the budget that meets what
 - AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

- 1 your --
- 2 MR. WUELLNER: The line item currently
- 3 contained is -- if passed, would be \$35,000, which

- 4 is the same amount as last year.
- 5 MR. GORMAN: Well, that's certainly far more
- 6 than enough.
- 7 MR. WUELLNER: But that's not the only thing
- 8 necessarily that comes out of there each year.
- 9 MS. GREEN: There's other things that come in
- 10 there.
- 11 MR. GORMAN: Yes.
- MR. GEORGE: Okay. How much did we spend in
- professional services this year?
- MR. WUELLNER: That will take two -- as soon
- as I find the right paper.
- MR. BRUNSON: Here it is. '04-'05 is there.
- MR. GORMAN: Professional services, general.
- MR. GEORGE: That's -- look at the round
- zeros. That's the '04-'05 budget, compared to
- 20 '05-'06 budget.
- 21 CHAIRMAN COX: Well, you wanted this year,
- right?
- MR. GEORGE: Huh?
- 24 CHAIRMAN COX: Didn't you want it for this

1	MR. GEORGE: I want it this year, yean. If
2	we if you guys discussed it at the last time,
3	you think that's worthwhile to do it, then we've
4	got to make sure the money's in there to cover it.
5	CHAIRMAN COX: I thought that's what he was
6	saying, is it's up there on the board.
7	MR. GEORGE: I think number, that '04 to '05,
8	I think that is '04-'05 budget.
9	CHAIRMAN COX: All right. I see what you're
10	saying. Not actually spent.
11	MR. GEORGE: See all of the zeros?
12	CHAIRMAN COX: Right, right, right.
13	MS. GREEN: Allocated, not necessarily spent.
14	MR. GEORGE: Yeah. Okay. Good.
15	MR. WUELLNER: We're grabbing the grabbing
16	the detail for you, but last year's expenditure
17	was or it was estimated to end up at \$33,300

- out of \$35-. She's grabbing the detail so we can
- see exactly what it was that went to that number,
- 20 because --
- MR. GORMAN: The point being you're not --
- you just need an independent firm to do it so that
- 23 the analysis is completely independent as far as
- your conclusions, but it's not an expensive issue.
- 25 MR. GEORGE: My -- my whole point was that if

- 1 we're going to do it, it sounds like, you know, we
- 2 need to do it to put the stake in the ground, need
- 3 to have the money there to do it. Now, we can
- 4 say, yeah, we'll take it out of the \$35-. Well,
- 5 what's the \$35- there for? You know?
- 6 It sounds like if you use last year's
- 7 actuals, there was \$2,000 there to do it. That
- 8 ain't going to hack it.
- 9 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. We're going to look at
- the detail and see if it's something that's a

- one-year anomaly or -- or something else.
- MR. GEORGE: Why not just add a line item and
- 13 put \$15 --
- MR. WUELLNER: Okay.
- MR. GEORGE: -- on operational audit.
- MR. GORMAN: Certainly, if we required more
- scope than that, we shouldn't ever have to. I
- can't imagine spending even actually that on it.
- MR. MARTINELLI: You will. You will. You
- will. If you go to a professional firm.
- MR. WUELLNER: You're not making new money
- here under any circumstance.
- MR. GEORGE: We're taking money out of the
- 24 reserves.
- MR. GORMAN: Just we're doing something

- 1 that's a very --
- 2 MR. WUELLNER: There are no reserves.
- 3 MR. GORMAN: -- basic, basic, basic analysis.

- 4 MR. WUELLNER: My -- my point being is you
- 5 can deal with that as a --
- 6 MS. GREEN: An addendum. I would like to --
- 7 MR. WUELLNER: Okay. Okay. I think you're
- 8 going to be fine.
- 9 MS. GREEN: -- deal with it as it came up,
- and whether we feel it's cost beneficial. We find
- out -- a couple of independent people give us
- their proposals what it costs; should we decide it
- 13 costs \$30,000, it may not be cost beneficial to
- 14 have it.
- MR. GEORGE: Right.
- MS. GREEN: We deal with it when it comes up.
- MR. GEORGE: Right. Or, we -- we vote -- as
- 18 Ed says, we vote on an addendum to it and we add
- 19 it.
- MR. WUELLNER: I think you're going to be
- 21 fine. A couple of things I've seen here that are
- 22 almost two-thirds of that number were one-year --
- 23 MR. GEORGE: Okay.
- MR. WUELLNER: -- one-year items.
- MR. BRUNSON: And this is on the agenda at

1	the board meeting that after this.
2	MR. GEORGE: That's true, it is, right.
3	CHAIRMAN COX: All right. If we're
4	finished
5	MR. WUELLNER: Oh, yeah.
6	CHAIRMAN COX: with the discussion on the
7	budget, I'm going to open it up to public comment
8	on the budget. Any public comment on the budget?
9	Mr. Martinelli?
10	9 PUBLIC COMMENT ON BUDGET
11	MR. MARTINELLI: I just have a question on
12	the insurance on the on the property
13	MR. WUELLNER: Uh-huh.
14	MR. MARTINELLI: side of it. Do you have
15	that premium segregated?
16	MR. WUELLNER: Yes. On property? Yes.
17	MR. MARTINELLI: How much is that?
18	MR. WUELLNER: \$251,782.85.

- MR. MARTINELLI: That's just for the
- 20 property.
- MR. WUELLNER: That's the property.
- MR. MARTINELLI: What's the liability side?
- 23 MR. WUELLNER: Only \$10,200.
- MR. MARTINELLI: Wow. Okay. On the property
- side, what is the coinsurance value?

- 1 MR. WUELLNER: I would say our obligation is
- 2 20 percent. I believe it's an 80/20.
- 3 MR. MARTINELLI: That high, hmm?
- 4 CHAIRMAN COX: Jack?
- 5 MR. WUELLNER: We can -- we'll look at it. I
- 6 don't -- that's my recollection on it.
- 7 MR. MARTINELLI: Okay. Just --
- 8 MR. WUELLNER: To my knowledge, hasn't been a
- 9 claim --
- MR. MARTINELLI: -- if you do a cost benefit
- on that, there's always a risk when you're

12 assessing the risk against the cost, but that's 13 pretty substantial. 14 CHAIRMAN COX: Thank you, sir. Public 15 comments? Any further? 16 (No further public comments). CHAIRMAN COX: Hearing no further requests 17 18 for public comment on the budget, we move to the adoption of the budget, Resolution 2005-07. 19 20 10. - ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION '05-'07 21 MR. GEORGE: Do we have to make a motion to 22 accept the budget as presented? I so do. 23 CHAIRMAN COX: Is that going to be another 24 formal --

AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING - SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

80

1 CHAIRMAN COX: -- resolution to be read -2 MR. BURNETT: It's another resolution -3 CHAIRMAN COX: -- that has to be read into
4 the record?

MS. GREEN: I will second.

5 MR. BURNETT: Yes. 6 CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. 7 MR. GEORGE: But we have to vote that we 8 agree on it, is the first thing we do. 9 CHAIRMAN COX: I know. I just want to make 10 sure that ---11 MR. BURNETT: I can go ahead and read it, if 12 you'd like, before you vote on it. 13 CHAIRMAN COX: That's fine. MR. BURNETT: All right. It's -- it will be 14 15 Resolution Number 2005-07. "A Resolution Of St. Augustine-St. Johns County Airport Authority Of 16 St. Johns County, Florida, Adopting The Final 17 Budget For Fiscal Year 2005-06; Providing For An 18 Effective Date. 19 20 "Whereas, a special meeting of the 21 St. Augustine-St. Johns County Airport Authority 22 was held in St. Augustine, St. Johns County, 23 Florida on the 19th day of September, 2005, at

of the St. Augustine-St. Johns County Airport

5:01 p.m. at which time a majority of the members

24

I	Authority were present, and
2	"Whereas, the St. Augustine-St. Johns County
3	Airport Authority has prepared a budget for the
4	Fiscal Year 2005-06; and
5	"Whereas, the St. Augustine-St. Johns County
6	Airport Authority held a public hearing on the
7	proposed annual budget as required by Florida
8	Statute 200.065; and
9	"Whereas, the St. Augustine-St. Johns County
10	Airport Authority adopted the final millage rate
11	prior to adopting this Resolution.
12	"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved by the
13	St. Augustine-St. Johns County Airport Authority
14	of St. Johns County, Florida, that:
15	"1. The annual budget estimates of revenues
16	and expenses and expenditures of the
17	St. Augustine-St. Johns County Airport Authority
18	for the fiscal year 2005-06, as considered and

acted upon by the St. Augustine-St. Johns County
Airport Authority, under and by the authority of
the Laws of Florida, are hereby ratified, approved
and adopted by the St. Augustine-St. Johns County
Airport Authority, and the amounts of money set
forth therein are hereby appropriated.

"2. The annual budget of revenues and

AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING - SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

82

- expenditures adopted by (sic) the ensuing fiscal
 year 2005-06, shall be attached to the minutes of
 this meeting.

 "This Resolution shall take effect
 immediately upon its adoption.

 "Duly Adopted at a public hearing this 19th
- 8 "St. Augustine-St. Johns County Airport

day of September, 2005.

- 9 Authority by: M. Wayne George, Chairman."
- 10 CHAIRMAN COX: Thank you very much. I'll
- 11 entertain a motion.

- 12 MS. GREEN: I think there was a motion on the 13 floor that Mr. --14 MR. GEORGE: I made -- I so moved. CHAIRMAN COX: Oh, did you? Okay. Did you 15 second it already? Or somebody seconded it? 16 17 MS. GREEN: Are you going to amend your motion to -- since he's read the resolution in, 18 19 that we adopt the budget and the resolution? 20 MR. GEORGE: At the same time? Yes. 21 MR. BRUNSON: Aren't we going to have a 22 discussion? 23 MS. GREEN: Yeah. And I'll second that 24 motion that we adopt the budget as presented and 25 the resolution as read.
 - AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

- 1 CHAIRMAN COX: Motion on the table that's 2 been seconded. Discussion?
- 3 MR. BRUNSON: Okay. Keeping in mind of
- the -- of what I've talked about on the capital 4

- 5 expenditures, is there a possibility that we could
- 6 amend the motion that the \$125,000 for the Taxiway
- 7 B, and the \$50,000, that that be earmarked to go
- 8 into the reserves if we do not fund the project?
- 9 MR. WUELLNER: Actually, no, because
- 10 you're -- you're currently showing loan value of
- \$409,000. So, until it -- until your cuts in the
- capital program exceed \$409-, it would go to
- reduce the amount of --
- 14 MR. BRUNSON: Okay.
- MR. WUELLNER: -- money to borrow,
- 16 potentially borrow.
- 17 MR. BRUNSON: Okay.
- MS. GREEN: In other words, I think it would
- 19 go to cut what you want. I mean, it's going to
- 20 cut some debt service.
- 21 MR. WUELLNER: Yeah.
- MS. GREEN: Yeah.
- 23 MR. BRUNSON: Okay.
- MR. WUELLNER: It's not going to reserve. It
- wouldn't make much sense to borrow money to put in

1	reserve.
2	MR. GEORGE: Discussion point: Mr. Wuellner,
3	I am correct in saying that before that \$125,000
4	and the seaport money is spent, you have to come
5	to this board to say, I got the grant, you know;
6	I'm going ahead, and you have to
7	MR. WUELLNER: Yeah. In the case of the
8	seaplane project, you have a grant already.
9	There's no capital project.
10	MR. GEORGE: Okay, fine. Let's go to the
11	other one.
12	MR. WUELLNER: Any capital project would have
13	to come back to you.
14	MR. GEORGE: Yeah. Okay. So, it's going to
15	have to come back to us, anyway. All of them are
16	going to have to come back to us.
17	MR. WUELLNER: And since
18	MR. BRUNSON: Keep trying.
19	MR. WUELLNER: there's some trepidation in

- 20 that particular project, we will ask before we
- 21 develop the project.
- 22 CHAIRMAN COX: All right. Any further
- 23 discussion?
- 24 (No further board discussion.)
- 25 CHAIRMAN COX: Motion on the table that's

- 1 been seconded. All in favor?
- 2 MR. WUELLNER: I just wanted to, one more
- 3 time, read into the record the total amount of the
- 4 budget.
- 5 CHAIRMAN COX: Okay.
- 6 MR. WUELLNER: Just so everybody's clear and
- 7 it's no -- it's \$14,048,366. Thank you.
- 8 CHAIRMAN COX: It's in the record. All of
- 9 those in favor?
- 10 MS. GREEN: Aye.
- 11 MR. BRUNSON: Aye.
- MR. GEORGE: Aye.

- 13 MR. COX: Aye. 14 CHAIRMAN COX: All those opposed? 15 MR. GORMAN: Nay. 16 CHAIRMAN COX: It's four to one, the motion 17 passes. The '05-'06 annual budget is adopted. 18 And thank everybody for their time and patience. 19 MR. GEORGE: Final comments. 20 CHAIRMAN COX: That's what I'm doing. 21 MR. GEORGE: Oh, sorry. You're right. 22 MS. GREEN: He's making them. CHAIRMAN COX: Did you want to add a final 23 24 comment?
 - AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

86

1 CHAIRMAN COX: Go ahead.

MR. GEORGE: Yes, sir.

- 2 11. FINAL COMMENTS
- 3 MR. GEORGE: I think that -- that what we've
- 4 done here is we have identified that all of us
- 5 need to spend some more time on each individual

- 6 line item, like Mr. Brunson has on coming up with
- 7 two projects.
- 8 I would like to propose an after-the-budget
- 9 approval workshop so that we go back to our
- six-year plan now and understand each line item
- thoroughly by everybody here so that we then can,
- you know, make up our own mind and speak more
- informed about what we're going to do.
- MS. GREEN: Can we do that if we approve of
- the comparative analysis that Mr. Gorman's doing,
- or suggested? And if we approve yes, we can find
- someone to do it for X amount of reasonable
- dollars, have it after that? Because if we're
- 19 going to go line -- I'd like to see if --
- MR. GEORGE: Got to have that there. Good
- 21 idea.
- MS. GREEN: -- a hundred thousand for this
- 23 project is good or not.
- MR. GORMAN: Thank you.
- 25 MR. GEORGE: Yeah.

1	MR. GORMAN: Perfect point.
2	MR. GEORGE: Right.
3	CHAIRMAN COX: Any further comments before we
4	close this portion of the meeting?
5	(No further comments.)
6	12 ADJOURNMENT
7	CHAIRMAN COX: This will close this portion
8	of the annual budget meeting. And reopen the
9	portion of the open public meeting.
10	MR. GEORGE: Does everybody want to take a
11	five-minute recess?
12	MR. BRUNSON: Please.
13	CHAIRMAN COX: Five minutes.
14	MR. GEORGE: Then we'll get back.
15	(Thereupon, the budget meeting concluded.)
16	
17	
18	
19	

JANET M. BEASON, RPR-CP, RMR, CRR Notary Public - State of Florida My Commission No.: DD102224 Expires: April 30, 2006

AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET MEETING - SEPTEMBER 19, 2005