THE LAFAYETTE AIRPORT COMMISSION MEETING, held before Connie Marks, Certified Court Reporter, at the Lafayette Regional Airport, 200 Terminal Drive, 2nd Floor Main Conference Room, Lafayette, Louisiana, on the 14th day of January, 2015, beginning at 5:43 P.M.

APPEARANCES:

MATT CRUSE
PAUL SEGURA
PAUL GUILBEAU, SR.
JOHN HEBERT
TODD SWARTZENDRUBER
MIKE BURROWS
DEBBIE AMY
TIMOTHY SKINNER
CARROLL ROBICHAUX
VALERIE GARRETT

GENERAL AUDIENCE MEMBERS
MR. CRUSE:

We'll call the regularly scheduled January meeting to order. If you could, rise and join in the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance)

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. We'll start with a roll call from my left.

MR. SKINNER:

Tim Skinner.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Carroll Robichaux.

MR. SEGURA:

Paul Segura.

MR. CRUSE:

Matt Cruse.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Paul Guilbeau.

MR. HEBERT:

John Hebert.

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

Todd Swartzendruber.

MR. BURROWS:

Mike Burrows.

MS. AMY:
Debbie Amy.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. I'll accept a motion to approve the minutes from the regular and the special meeting of December 10th and December 16th of 2014.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

I move we accept it as written.

MR. CRUSE:

A motion by Mr. Robichaux.

MR. HEBERT:

I second.

MR. CRUSE:

Second by Mr. Hebert.

Any other comments or questions from the Commission?

(No response.)

From the public?

(No response.)

All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS:

Aye.

MR. CRUSE:

All opposed?

(No response.)
Motion carries.

At this time, I don't really have any comments about anything that's not going to be covered on the agenda tonight, so I will open the floor to any comments from the public on anything that has to do with an item that may not be on tonight's agenda.

(No response.)

All right. Hearing none. Any comments from the commissioners?

(No response.)

Well, that's a first.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

I'll just say I'm --

MR. CRUSE:

Now, I know we --

MR. ROBICHAUX:

-- on the agenda toward the end. I'll do my thing then.

MR. CRUSE:

All right. Director's report.

MR. BURROWS:

Thank you, sir.

So for Item 1, Canteen M&M Sales, we have two -- actually 2/7/15 to 2/6/16, the drink
vending machine agreement will automatically renew for one year on February 7, 2015. This is the second and final automatic renewal.

Item 2, Central Auction House. It's basically going 4/15 to 2/16. The agreement with Central Auction House provides assistance with electronic bidding services by providing access to proprietary software for compliance with Act 590. The agreement will automatically renew on February 4th. There is no charge to the Lafayette Airport Commission.

Fly Lafayette Passenger Statistics. I'll turn it over to Mr. Sides for his report.

MR. LARRY SIDES:

Mr. Chairman and commissioners, I thought I may have to arm-wrestle Mike Burrows for the opportunity to be able to give this report to you tonight, but he very kindly allowed me to do it.

Enplanements for the month of December were twenty thousand seven hundred and fifty-five (20,755); deplanements were twenty thousand five hundred and fifty-eight (20,558) for an increase of nine point nine three percent (9.93%), or one thousand eight hundred
and seventy-five (1,875) passengers on enplanements, and eleven point nine eight percent (11.98%) for a total of two thousand one hundred and ninety-nine passengers (2,199). Total passengers, forty-one thousand three hundred and thirteen (41,313), which makes for the best December ever in terms of Lafayette Airport history.

The load factors remain impressive. United had seventy-nine percent (79%). Delta had seventy-eight percent (78%). American Eagle had seventy-seven point five percent (77.5%).

On the 2014 totals, enplanements were two hundred and fifty-two thousand oh fifty-two (252,052); deplanements were two hundred and forty-nine thousand oh forty-nine (249,049). The total passengers for the year was five hundred and one thousand -- five hundred and one -- five hundred and one thousand one hundred and one (501,101) passengers.

If you will remember, during the campaign to educate the public with regard to the new terminal, we said again in the beginning, four hundred and seventy-one thousand three hundred
and thirty-three (471,333) passengers in 2013, those were the numbers that we had. But this year, for the first time, the Lafayette Regional Airport has surpassed a half a million passengers in one year. And the increase in enplanements over the past year was six point six eight percent (6.68%) for a total of fifteen thousand seven hundred and eighty-eight (15,788) passengers.

The increase in deplanement was five point nine five percent (5.95%) of thirteen thousand nine hundred and eighty-one (13,981) passengers, for a total additional over the previous year of twenty-nine thousand seven hundred and sixty-nine (29,769) more passengers, which is almost like adding another month.

Thank you.

MR. CRUSE:

Thanks, Larry.

MR. BURROWS:

Okay. Moving on to financials.

Operations receipts were up about eleven percent (11%). Operations disbursements, we're down about three percent (3%). Other income
expenditures, we're to the plus forty-one percent (41%). Total available from operations is about four hundred and nineteen percent (419%) of One Million Thirty Thousand One Hundred and Ninety-four Dollars ($1,030,194.00).

Net increase/decrease in cash, we're about to the positive of One Million Forty-three Thousand Eight Eighty-two (1,043,882.00). This concludes financials.

And then the last item that I have is the Louisiana Board of International Commerce nominations. I know I received an email from Ms. Garrett stating that she wanted to serve, but I wanted to make sure if we had any other person who wanted to. We're to submit two names to the board, basically. And then from that list of pool, the government will pick a name based -- one person based on a list of other airports as well. So I just want to make sure that we have one other nomination to submit.

MR. CRUSE:

I didn't know if you're --

MR. SKINNER:
I have enough --

MR. BURROWS:

  Okay.

MR. SKINNER:

  My plate is full.

MR. CRUSE:

  Yeah, Paul -- Paul will volunteer for that.

MR. SEGURA:

  What's that?

MR. GUILBEAU:

  I second that. You said Segura; right?

MR. CRUSE:

  Yeah, Segura.

MR. GUILBEAU:

  Make sure it's not Guilbeau.

MR. CRUSE:

  Don't worry. You'll be okay with it.

MR. SEGURA:

  Okay.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

  One question. Mike, on the Canteen M&M, is that everything except the secure area, or do they have the --

MR. BURROWS:
What's that? Cafe? It's -- I think it's primarily over here because --

MR. GUILBEAU:
Yeah. I mean the secure area is -- isn't it -- there's a cafe?

MR. CRUSE:
The odds of getting it in the --

MR. BURROWS:
A lot of it in the cafe. Yes, sir.

MR. CRUSE: -- is very small.
Okay. Scheduled business. Or are you still answering the question?

MR. BURROWS:
No. I just -- I just want to make sure that the two nominations are Mr. Segura and Ms. Garrett.

MR. CRUSE:
You okay with that, Paul?

MR. SEGURA:
Is there travel involved?

MR. BURROWS:
I'm not sure. This is a newly created --

MR. SEGURA:
International.
MR. BURROWS:
-- and I'm not sure who the government will
pick at that time.

MR. CRUSE:

And their meeting will be twice a month.

MR. BURROWS:

There will be other airports submitting
nominations. So it will be one candidate from
the list.

MR. SEGURA:

Okay.

MR. GUILBEAU:

I don't want to diffuse Paul, but you
might want to check. I know you serve on
another -- there might be a restriction. But
if not, I highly encourage you to do it.

MR. SEGURA:

Okay.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Don't get the Pauls mixed up now.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. Scheduled business.

MR. BURROWS:

Okay. We request at this time that Items
A and B be moved to another meeting. So we
would like to pull Items A and B.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. Because we didn't get the --

MR. BURROWS:

We didn't get the information on time.

MR. CRUSE:

-- information? Okay.

MR. BURROWS:

So we would like to pull those items.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Do we need to make a motion to defer or

can we --

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

No. You don't have to do anything.

MR. BURROWS:

Okay. That brings us up to Item C. This is "Request for Proposals, Runway 11-29,
Rehabilitation, Discussion, Action."

According to preliminary engineering, in
view of Runway 11-29 pavement by LPA Baker Group, the previously thought sealcoat
application is no longer a cost-effective nor a viable pavement integrity remediation solution.
Rather, with the state program's allowable budget of Two Point Three Million ($2,300,000.00) in asphalt overlay is the recommended course for reasons of cost efficiency and product longevity. However, the consultant selection committee's engineering service's recommendation was based on request for proposal specifically for designing the management of a sealcoat application, not an overlay.

Additionally, legal counsel has opined that based on the language associated with the initial RFP, the Commission would be rightful in again soliciting RFPs with new language related to the rehab, not a specific remediation measure. And it should be noted that the state program manager assigned to the project is comfortable allowing the selected engineer to proceed with the design management of either an overlay or a seal coating.

I have -- Mr. Hixson is here tonight to also discuss this project as they're with -- he's with LPA Baker.

MR. MICHAEL HIXSON:

Thank you, Michael. My name is Michael
Hixson. I represent the Michael Baker, Jr. Corporation, Aviation Services Division for this region. And as Mike said, the -- we've taken a closer look at the product benefit from using a sealcoat versus an overlay. And just to backtrack a little bit, due to historically low oil prices, that's really has a lot to do with why we even have the opportunity to possibly even look at an overlay versus a sealcoat. But regardless, a sealcoat, typically on a commercial service airport, would yield approximately three to seven years of life, seven are the absolute best-case scenario. Whereas your typical mill and replace with asphalt, you're looking at eight to twelve years of expected life. And as difficult it is to get out there and close a runway for this type of project, we would certainly typically lean towards that product which has the longer duration, which would be, in this case, the asphalt. And again, taking advantage of the historically low oil prices which, theoretically, should reduce the overall cost of asphalt, we believe that for the budget the state has set fourth for this project, we
could, in fact, mill an inch and a half and replace, as well as regroup and re-stripe the runway, for that anticipated budget.

MR. GUILBEAU:

I have a question for staff. Mike, the funding is totally from state aviation?

MR. BURROWS:

Yes, sir.

MR. GUILBEAU:

What is the time limit on the funding?

MR. BURROWS:

Right now I believe it's outwards of three years, is it, Daniel? It's three years.

MR. DANIEL ELSEA:

Right. It was started -- it was first on priority program 2013, 2014, so July 1st of last year.

Daniel Elsea with staff. It was first put on the priority program in 2013/2014. Title 70 of the state states that we have up to three years to spend -- actually get the product to bid. So we have until, I guess, 2016/2017, so we have time.

MR. GUILBEAU:

And I understand we have to take action on
it to set the process for it?

MR. CRUSE:

Yes, because we have to cancel the
original RFP and issue a new --

MR. GUILBEAU:

I move that we cancel the --

MR. CRUSE:

Before you make your motion, --

MR. GUILBEAU:

Oh, sorry.

MR. BURROWS:

-- I just want to make sure in the motion,
correct me, but we need to go ahead and set
forth, so that LPA Baker gets reimbursed for
any of their cost associated with --

MR. BURROWS:

I would think so.

MR. CRUSE:

-- to this point.

MR. BURROWS:

Because they have worked on it up to this
point, so --

MR. CRUSE:

Absolutely. Yeah. And they did the
absolute right thing by making this
recommendation. So just include that in your motion.

MR. SKINNER:

I got a new question. So we would have to go through the RFP process again?

MR. GUILBEAU:

I'm coming up with my motion here, and then you can vote against it.

I'll move that whatever expense was incurred by LPA --

MR. MICHAEL HIXSON:

Well, Baker, Michael Baker.

MR. CRUSE:

Michael Baker.

MR. MICHAEL HIXSON:

We merged with LPA.

MR. GUILBEAU:

-- they be reimbursed for the work they have done up to this point, and that we cancel the RFP, and we defer looking at another RFP until a new director is on board. I know the sealcoat is usually done to extend the life of asphalt. In this case, we should have some life left. We're probably not looking at more than thirty, sixty days, at the most, coming
back to us. But I think we should let the new
director chime in on it. And that's my motion.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. We have a motion by Mr. Guilbeau.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Second.

MR. CRUSE:

Second by Mr. Robichaux. Any other
comments or questions from the Commission?

MR. SKINNER:

I got a question. Who is-- are we
reimbursing out of our budget, or are we going
to reimburse from the state?

MR. CRUSE:

It will be out of airport funds.

MR. SKINNER:

And, otherwise, this would have been paid
for by the state?

MR. CRUSE:

Correct.

MR. SKINNER:

So do we know -- like, I mean, is it a
small amount?

MR. MICHAEL HIXSON:

I don't -- I don't anticipate invoicing
for the work that we've done so far. I really
don't.

MR. SKINNER:

Okay. And then there's no guarantee that
you're going to get the RFP next time.

MR. CRUSE:

That's correct.

MR. MICHAEL HIXSON:

We understand that, but we're -- again,
even though or not we felt like if -- if
there's any way to overlay that runway versus
the sealcoat, that's the right choice, whether
we do it or another firm does; so.

MR. SKINNER:

Okay. Very good.

MR. GUILBEAU:

We appreciate you being professional with
us.

MR. MICHAEL HIXSON:

Yes, sir. Thank you.

MR. GUILBEAU:

And I'm not trying to take the project
away. I just --

MR. MICHAEL HIXSON:

I don't --
MR. GUILBEAU:

-- got a new director coming on. I'm a great backer of trying to let him get his hands on it and see where we go.

MR. MICHAEL HIXSON:

Certainly. And I appreciate that. We understand the process. And, again, it's what's in the best interest of the airport.

MR. CRUSE:

Yeah, I appreciate it.

MR. CRUSE:

All right. Any other comments or questions from the Commission?

(No response.)

From the public?

(No response.)

All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS:

Aye.

MR. CRUSE:

All opposed?

(No response.)

Motion carries. Next item.

MR. BURROWS:

Tab D: Taxiway Mike, Change Order No. 2.
After discussion with LAC, counsel, and staff, Domingue Szabo & Associates recommends Change Order No. 2 to allow a change in concrete expansion joint frequency due to modernized design not integrated into the bid specifications. And in effort to reduce future maintenance issues related to unnecessary number of joints, Change Order No. 2 decreases the cost of construction as follows: An increase due to increased size joint material required, Seven Thousand Six Hundred Ninety Dollars and Fifty Cents ($7,690.50); decrease due to deletion majority of expansion joint materials, Fifty-five Thousand Four Hundred and Eight Dollars and Forty Cents ($55,408.40). Total contract cost deduction is Forty-seven Thousand Seven Hundred and Seventeen Dollars and Ninety Cents ($47,717.90).

MR. SKINNER:

Are y'all good with the process? Are we -- I mean, it's new technology or new design. Have we -- I mean, are y'all comfortable with it?

MR. ADAM THIBODEAUX:

Adam Thibodeaux with Domingue Szabo &
Associates. We, historically, have placed expansion joints in concrete. Our firm likes to see it at every sixty feet. Primarily, that reason is to handle the expansion, thermal expansion, over the life of the pavement.

The current pavement designs being published are more -- the sixty foot is extremely conservative. Primarily, all of the pavement guidance now recommends elimination of expansion joints, except at changes of direction and where you have geometry changes and such.

So this change is in accordance with the FAA recommendations. It's just that what we had before was an overly conservative design. And so we just recommend approval of that.

The reason that we continue to do it that way is we had great experience with it on those airports. We had two pavements that were done that way. The terminal apron and the cargo -- the west cargo apron were done about fifteen -- well, one was done about twenty-five years ago, and the other one was done about fifteen years ago. And we had good success with it.

When we went to do the north GA, we used
the same joint spacing, and it was more conservative than the current FAA. At the time the guidelines were released, they put the sixty-foot joint spacing. And our contractor has issues putting the joints down at the sixty-foot spacing, especially with the expansion joint.

When we went to do the north GA, our contractors again requested to eliminate the -- suggested to go to a different joint spacing. We again said, well, we had good success before. We just had issues with one contractor, and the issues we have with the joints are at the expansion joints again.

So when we sat down with this contractor, they proposed to eliminate the expansion joints again. And due to our past records, we kind of think that we'll get a better design and a better useful constructed project if we eliminate the joints, expansion joints. There will still be a joint there. It just that it won't be an expansion joint. It will be a contraction joint. So we recommend approval.

MR. SEGURA:

And when you say "conservative," you mean
reducing or you mean more -- more expansion joints?

MR. ADAM THIBODEAUX:

Correct. We were putting expansion joints every sixty feet. And so they'll be much further apart. There will still be a joint. The joints are closer than that --

MR. SEGURA:

Correct, but not an expansion joint.

MR. ADAM THIBODEAUX:

-- it was a -- correct. So the change is just to change -- there's still a joint in the same orientation. It's just to change it from an expansion joint to a contraction joint.

MR. SEGURA:

Right.

MR. ADAM THIBODEAUX:

And, historically, the reason that we recommend that to all our -- typically, we've been recommending that to all our clients. We're starting to change now within our firm. But, historically, our clients, including y'all, have poor pavement maintenance. In other words, y'all don't reseal the joints in a timely fashion. Typically, we would like to
joints resealed every five to ten years, ideally. None of our clients do that.

The thing that y'all have going for y'all is is that even though the joint sealing isn't reinstalled every ten years or every fifteen years, especially on this type of pavement, which is y'all's taxiways, y'all do clean it very often. Y'all run the vacuum cleaners, the vacuum trucks down it.

And the real problem with the expansion joints is when incompressible sand, gravel, and such gets in the joints, and then it can't work. So what -- and it gets in your contraction joints, and that's why we had the expansion joints, because when the contraction joints got full, they compressed into the expansion joint. But if you keep your pavement clean, then, you won't have that problem. So this is what we recommend. We think it's the best solution overall, and you can save a little money.

MR. CRUSE:

Yeah. I'll accept a motion.

MR. SEGURA:

You work for the highway department. You
not gonna -- I move to accept.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Whenever it's saving money, I stay quiet.

MR. CRUSE:

We have a motion by Mr. Segura.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Second.

MR. CRUSE:

Second by Mr. Robichaux. Any further comments or questions from the Commission?

(No response.)

From the public?

(No response.)

All in favor?

MR. GUILBEAU:

One question. Adam, one question. Would this affect our warranty of any --

MR. ADAM THIBODEAUX:

No.

MR. GUILBEAU:

-- under any circumstances?

MR. ADAM THIBODEAUX:

No, sir.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. All in favor?
COMMISSIONERS:

    Aye.

MR. CRUSE:

    All opposed?
    (No response.)

    Motion carries.

MR. GUILBEAU:

    Mr. Chairman, just one comment from what
    Adam said. I would like to -- I think you had
    mentioned we might not have anything in the
    process for looking at the maintenance of our
    joints. Did I understand you right?

MR. CRUSE:

    I think so.

MR. GUILBEAU:

    I would like to make sure that we have a
    process to do that, because that's important.

MR. ADAM THIBODEAUX:

    The only time y'all have done a joint
    maintenance project is when you constructed the
    west cargo apron, which was about twelve years
    ago. We actually cleaned and resealed the
    terminal joints, which, at the time, were about
    fifteen to twenty years old. So since that
time, we haven't. The thing that y'all had
before was y'all didn't have much concrete.
Now, with the west cargo, the north GA, and
then also your west cargo, y'all don't have --
y'all have a lot more concrete.

The thing that y'all have going for y'all
is both on the joint sealant that y'all been
using on most of y'all's jobs, including the
cargo apron, the big cargo apron, is either
silicone based or compressive. And so that the
life expectancy of those is much greater than
what's typically used on the real big jobs.

So just, in my opinion, in looking at the
pavements, they're in pretty good shape, but
it's just something that needs to happen every
once in a while. And every once in a while,
y'all do a pavement evaluation; you're required
by the FAA to do it. I think the last time I
did one was about five years ago. I assume I
was the last one to do one. I don't know if
y'all have done one since. But that's what we
do need, to do an evaluation of the joints.

MR. GUILBEAU:

I'm actually for it. Let's get it on a
to-do list.

MR. BURROWS:
We actually had it on our to-do list. And actually one of it was on our CIP to actually look at the joint expansions --

MR. GUILBEAU:

Because that's --

MR. BURROWS:

-- concrete in the future.

MR. GUILBEAU:

That's important, and you're welcome.

MR. ADAM THIBODEAUX:

Yeah.

MR. GUILBEAU:

The joint maintenance.

MR. ADAM THIBODEAUX:

And just to clarify, though, the real importance is -- well, that's what y'all have going for y'all is y'all keep y'all pavements really clean. On the highway department, the failures almost always is when any compressants getting in the joints. The water really isn't a big issue. Well, it's not as much of an issue as the sand and gravel in the joints, because then the pavement can't move, and that's when we get all those problems.

MR. CRUSE:
Okay. Next item.

MR. BURROWS:

Tab E (Echo) Executive Director Search Committee Report. And I'll turn it over to Mr. Guilbeau.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Yes. Thank you, Mike.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to first thank you for appointing me as chair of the search committee. It was truly an experience. I went through that before with another organization, but this was very unique and informative, and I would say challenging at the time.

I would like to thank Ms. Garrett and Commissioner Skinner to serve -- who serve on the committee with me. And also Dave Welsh, the CEO and Chairman of Stone Energy. And Chairman Kenneth Boudreaux of the city parish council. We will express our thanks by letter, the Chairman and I, to Kenneth. And Dave Stone was very, very helpful. They have an enormous HR department and provided us some valuable information and still is.

With that said, we started with some thirty-somewhat applicants; we're down to
three. And, like I said, when we're down to four, I think any one of them could do justice to this airport. It could bring it forward. But we got to pluck the feathers a little thinner, and we got to come up with one.

The committee has provided the Commissioners with the online application, which is a binder like this, that we gave them; copies of the resumes, which is in the binder; background checks on the three candidates; tapes of the videos of the interviews. We did video face-to-face meeting. I was the person -- I attended all three of them. And I was accompanied by Mr. Larry Sides, with SIDES and Associates, that did the videoing. And that was provided to all of the Commissioners.

Ms. Garrett accompanied Larry and I to Atlanta to visit Mr. Robert Kennedy. Tim was lucky enough to do two. He did Baton Rouge and Amarillo. And that's the three people we have in front of us tonight by the name of Robert Kennedy, Ralph Hennessy out of Baton Rouge, Kennedy out of Atlanta, and Steven Picou, the deputy director at Amarillo International.

With that said, the names are being submitted
to the full Commission. I think that, at least tonight, the Commission has to come up with a decision: Do we bring the three people in to interview as a full commission, or are we satisfied with the material that the committee has submitted to them?

So, with that said, I'll turn it over to Chairman Cruse. And just for the news media, Mr. Cruse, now it's in his domain, so he will answer all the questions to the media concerning the director search.

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CRUSE:

Yeah. Before we open it up for any motions, first of all, I just want to thank the search committee. You know, you did -- obviously, you did a wonderful job, but the -- I never thought, before this process started, that by -- that by watching the in-depth interviews that you guys did, it was almost like being there, you know. I just thought it was a -- you guys did a wonderful, thorough job. I think one of them was almost two hours to get through, you know, but -- so I just want to thank you for, you know, giving us a product
that, literally, I felt like I was sitting, you
know, right there in the interview when you
guys were talking to those people; so...

MR. GUILBEAU:

And I have to express my appreciation to
Larry. He was the leader on this. Larry has
been invaluable to me, as the Chairman, and
provided some guidance. And I failed to
mention his name. And I'm sorry, Larry, but I
know I've expressed my appreciation on numerous
occasions.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. At this point, you know, we'll
accept any comments, questions, or motions from
the Commission as far as the will of the
Commission.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a
motion that we -- the executive committee
offer -- start the process of the offer to Mr.
Picou out of Amarillo, as soon as tomorrow,
with the attorneys start the negotiation
process, offer him the job.

I went through all the interviews also,
and resumes, and I think we need to get someone
here as quickly as we can, with the project we have going on that we waiting for a director. My motion is to offer the job to Mr. Picou, have the executive committee and the lawyers start negotiating as soon as tomorrow, get him down, if he accepts, as soon as possible.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. We have a motion by Mr. Robichaux.

MR. SEGURA:

I would like to make a comment. I know who I prefer, but I would like to just ask the rest of the Commissioners. Some of you met the candidates directly. And then some of you, as myself, either went to some of the meetings or saw video interviews. And so I'm just wondering: Does anybody need to meet any of the candidates at all, or not?

MR. ROBICHAUX:

And let me interject here.

MR. SEGURA:

Because there might be a couple of different options, just thinking.

MR. GUILBEAU:

And I know Todd is checking his book here. Do we need a second, huh, Todd, for a
discussion?

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

Yeah.

MR. GUILBEAU:

I'll second it for discussion purposes.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. We have a motion and a second. I mean, we can go one by one. I'll start it off.

MR. SKINNER:

I'll start off. I'm -- I mean, I was there for most of the interviews. I don't think I need them to come before me. I was not prepared to vote tonight, but if it comes up for a vote, I will vote. But I was part of the process; so I personally don't believe I need to see them in front of the Commission.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

As I said, I saw the videos and read the resumes, and I spoke to a few of the Commissioners, and that's all I need.

MR. SEGURA:

You know, I mean, I kind of feel the same way too. I read the resumes and their answers in their -- in this booklet, the videos, and talked to some members of the committee; but
I'm willing to do whatever everyone wants to do. But I don't need --

MS. GARRETT:

I was a part of the --

MR. SEGURA:

-- need them to come in for me, is all I'm saying.

MS. GARRETT

I was part of the search committee. I didn't attend all the individual meetings as Mr. Guilbeau said; however, I attended one. And the one I did attend, I guess it's -- in all fairness to all, it's one thing to see a video and another thing to talk to somebody in person. My feelings would be that I would rather see them in person. Now, -- and part of that reason is because my experience with the one I did see, he was not going to even be a consideration until I met him.

MR. SEGURA:

Right.

MS. GARRETT:

Just looking at him on paper and just looking at his interview, his video interview, and being part of that process, he was not a
consideration until I had an actual one-on-one conversation with him.

So although I would prefer to see all three of them, I think it's fair to all three of them for us to see them. That's my personal feeling. The process is the process. I think we may have even given an indication, and I could be wrong, that we might recommend, or suggest, that the three come.

If it's for expeditious purposes and you guys are fine with what you see, you're ready to take a vote, I am also like Tim -- I wasn't prepared to make a vote or a motion on a person tonight, but I was prepared to have a discussion about it.

I just think that this is too important. And in building an airport and the movement that have committed to the community, I think that we just need to be extremely cautious and fair to all applicants, and fair to the community, by seeing the three. That's my opinion.

MR. SKINNER:

I'll just -- you know, in fairness, I think we've treated them all equally.
MS. GARRETT:

I don't dispute that.

MR. SKINNER:

Yeah. So -- and I'm not -- I think they've all been treated equally. They've been given equal opportunities. I was part of the process; so I know that they were --

MR. GARRETT:

I don't dispute that at all.

MR. SKINNER:

I don't disagree that it would be nice to have them here, but I personally don't -- I think I've seen -- I was personally involved; so I don't think I need them here.

MS. GARRETT:

I do agree. We did extensive work on it. And it was important what we did. My hat's off to Larry. My hat's off to Mr. Guilbeau. He kept us on task. He kept us moving. But, again, that is my personal feeling that I think you need to bring them. But, again, I was not prepared to take a vote tonight on a particular individual but to have some discussion about it.

But I -- based upon what I've seen and
know, I could vote on it. I just think it's a
better process if they came. That's my
feelings and my beliefs from being part of the
process.

MR. SEGURA:

Anyone else? I'm just wondering --

MR. GUILBEAU:

Go ahead, John, and I'll --

MR. HEBERT:

Just to pipe up and get my opinion on the
record, I agree with Matt that the videos were
very informative and very well done, and, in my
opinion, enough for me to make a decision on
it. So I don't see -- I understand there could
some value. I just don't think it would be
enough value to go through the time and the
expense of having everyone come in.

MR. CRUSE:

Mr. Guilbeau?

MR. GUILBEAU:

I've been silent because I think I should
be. I'm the only one that's met all three of
them. I will say this, that when the committee
came with the idea that the chairman would
visit all four at the time, I was not a
proponent of it. I was the chairman. I was trying to get out of it. One thing I could say, if anybody would talk to me about the value of what happened in going on-site and visiting, my thoughts have completely changed. I think it was very positive. I don't want to comment on the material we submitted, because that's all individual consideration they had.

I don't know how I would feel if I would be sitting behind this chair and I would be Mr. Hebert or Mr. Robichaux or -- because they didn't see the candidates personally. I had the occasion to do it. Obviously, I'm prepared to vote tonight, because I saw all three, and I know all three. And I feel they're kind of part of the family right now, because we had some pretty good discussions with them.

So I just wanted to let the public know that -- why I was being a little quiet.

MR. CRUSE:

Yeah. My personal opinion is I do -- I do see value in meeting people face-to-face as well. And I think if it would have -- if it would have come down to a point after I digested all of this information and watched
the videos, spoke to all the members of the
selection committee, that one didn't just
standout to me so far above the others, as far
as what I want to see in a new director, I
would probably be more on the fence about
wanting to personally meet one -- probably one
of the others as well. But, in my opinion, one
was pretty well heads and shoulders above the
rest. So I'm personally comfortable choosing,
you know, if -- I would like to be part of the
vote tonight, just so I can have it in there,
even though it didn't really require it.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Well, let's see how it goes. It might be
time.

MR. CRUSE:

Well, we have a motion. We have a second.

MR. SEGURA:

I would like to say too, though, that all
three of them were very good candidates. And
I-- Valerie, you make some good points in it.
And if that's what the Commission chooses to
do, then see them, or maybe you just want to
meet with them, that's fine with me. But if we
want to vote too, I kind of feel like Matt. I
kind of have a preferred candidate, but I don't have to vote tonight, --

MR. CRUSE:

But we have to (multiple speakers).

MR. SEGURA:

-- but I can. So I'm just saying --

MR. GUILBEAU:

Yeah. Ms. Garrett, I think you would probably agree with me, when we got down to the eight, probably the feathering came a little more complex, --

MS. GARRETT:

Uh-huh.

MR. GUILBEAU:

-- you know, the elimination process.

MS. GARRETT:

Yes.

MR. GUILBEAU:

I think when we got to eight, we had some good candidates.

MS. GARRETT:

Yes, we did.

MR. GUILBEAU:

I think any one of them would have done justice to this airport. It just comes to be
that we got to pick one, and -- but I think 
when we came down to eight, we were still in 
good shape, very good shape.

MS. GARRETT:
Yes.

MR. CRUSE:
Okay. Any other comments or questions 
from the Commission?

MR. SEGURA:
If we're voting on one person, which is 
that's what the -- that's what the motion is, 
as opposed to rating them, then, do we need to 
do, like, a roll, you know, rather than a group 
yay or nay, a --

MS. GARRETT:
Yeah.

MR. SEGURA:
More of a roll call and each person has to 
say --

MS. GARRETT:
And what is the motion, again, 
specifically?

MR. CRUSE:
The motion was -- do you want to read it 
back as the director, --
MS. GARRETT:
Yes, please.

MR. CRUSE:
-- then we'll settle it?

MR. BURROWS:
The motion was "The executive committee will start the process to offer the job to Mr. Picou."
That's pretty much what I have.

MR. ROBICHAUX:
Yeah. Start negotiating --

MR. GUILBEAU:
I would -- I also would include -- I think he had included legal in it, in case it passed?

MR. CRUSE:
Yes. He did.

MR. ROBICHAUX:
And offer him -- My motion was to offer him the job as soon as tomorrow. If he accepts, then the executive committee and the legal -- and legal start the process of the -- of the financial, whatever we need to do, to get him.

MR. SEGURA:
Negotiate the finer points?
MR. GUILBEAU:

Negotiate the finer points. And, then, if we have to, we can either come back to the full commission after this is done, but I don't think we have to. If the executive committee agrees on everything and he agrees on it, I think we need to do it as soon as possible.

MR. SKINNER:

Is the pay not have to go before the Internal Affairs, but not on -- not on the director?

MR. GUILBEAU:

No. Mr. Robichaux, may I add -- I seconded it. I think, when both parties agree, I think we should call a special meeting, and let the full Commission vote on the offer. There would be a chance the Commission would say no. And, then, obviously, we would have a hiring date included in it. I think we could have a special meeting really quick. Knowing the guy, I think we could get him pretty quick, so --

MR. SKINNER:

Are you gonna add that in the --

MR. CRUSE:
Yeah. I'm sure we will --

MS. GARRETT:

So I'm trying to be clear. You're moving to offer Picou the job and to start the negotiations of salary and the compensation packet. Okay.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

If he -- offer him the job tomorrow. If he accepts the position, then we start -- the executive committee and legal start the negotiating of salary and benefits.

MS. GARRETT:

Are you bringing him here to do that, or you just doing that by phone or video?

MR. ROBICHAUX:

We can let -- that would be between legal and the executive committee to do it by phone. Or he can come down, and we would offer him a certain amount of salary, and he can counter, and whatever we can do -- I don't see what the purpose of bringing him down is.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Let me --

MS. GARRETT:

I'm asking.
MR. GUILBEAU:

Let me dive in. I'll dive in.

MS. GARRETT:

Okay.

MR. GUILBEAU:

I -- and this is my personal observation. I think if this motion pass, then I think we offer him to come down and every Commissioner would have a chance to meet him. We would negotiate. And if I'm involved in the call, I would suggest that he picks a date ASAP, because that's the reason I think the motion is being made tonight. But I think we should bring him down and let the full Commission look at him. You know, the decision would be made that we offer him the job, but I think the full Commission has to vote on the package that we would agree on --

MS. GARRETT:

Before he comes down?

MR. GUILBEAU:

No, I think we would negotiate it here, when he's down here.

MS. GARRETT:

The full Commission?
MR. GUILBEAU:

No, the executive committee.

MS. GARRETT:

Okay. When he comes down here?

MR. GUILBEAU:

Yes.

MR. CRUSE:

Then the full Commission would ratify his --

MS. GARRETT:

Right. All I'm trying to do is get the clear steps of what we're doing. So it's the motion just seems, like, okay, we offer him the job and have that conversation and go, but that's not what we're doing?

MR. ROBICHAUX:

No.

MS. GARRETT:

So we need to be clear --

MR. ROBICHAUX:

So the executive committee --

MS. GARRETT:

-- on what we were doing.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

So the executive committee and legal
negotiate the terms of his contract.

MS. GARRETT:

But we bring him down?

MR. ROBICHAUX:

We can bring him down, or if he -- and

that's up to the executive committee --

MR. SEGURA:

Bring him down --

MR. ROBICHAUX:

-- to bring him down or --

MS. GARRETT:

We need to bring him down.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

That would be up to the executive

committee to make that decision, --

MS. GARRETT:

Okay. But can we --

MR. ROBICHAUX:

-- but we want to start the process.

MS. GARRETT:

Can we amend the motion to include that,

we bring him down?

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Yeah. I mean, if --

MR. CRUSE:
Well, this is the executive committee right here. So we will bring him here to negotiate the terms of his --

MS. GARRETT:

Okay.

MR. CRUSE:

-- contract.

MR. GUILBEAU:

I think it's only fair.

MS. GARRETT:

But I want to know that y'all are going to bring him down, because I'm still part of finding him. I need to know --

MR. CRUSE:

No -- yeah. Well, that's what I'm saying.

MS. GARRETT:

-- we're going to bring him down.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

We start --

MS. GARRETT:

Okay.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

-- we start the negotiating process.

MS. GARRETT:

All right.
MR. ROBICHAUX:

We offer him the job tomorrow. We start the negotiating process. Bring him down. And he can meet with the executive committee. And we can come back to full Commission. Ratify it --

MS. GARRETT:

And I would like to meet him when he's down. That y'all make me aware.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Well, I mean, he's the chairman.

MS. GARRETT:

Okay. I'm just making the chairman aware --

MR. CRUSE:

Absolutely.

MS. GARRETT:

-- that I would like to meet him.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Or we can -- Mr. Chairman, if we want to, we can call a special meeting when he comes down and have the whole committee -- Commission there.

MR. CRUSE:

We will, yeah, but we'll need to, to ratify, if we can come to terms. But he may
very well come back to us with a term that's not acceptable.

MR. SEGURA:
    Right.

MR. CRUSE:
    He may come back and say, "I can't start for a hundred and twenty days." You never know.

MR. ROBICHAUX:
    That's why we don't know until we offer him the job.

MR. CRUSE:
    So until we come to terms, both of us, then we'll bring the entire Commission together to ratify the decision and bring him on board.

MR. ROBICHAUX:
    And the reason I said bring it to legal, because he's going to do the legal offer letter when we agree on all of the aspects of it.

MR. CRUSE:
    Okay. Any further comments or questions from the Commission?
    (No response.)
    From the public?
    (No response.)
All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS:

Aye.

MR. CRUSE:

All opposed?

(No response.)

Motion carries.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Thank you.

MR. CRUSE:

Next item.

MR. BURROWS:

F. Tab F: FAA RTR Cable Relocation, Diamond Electrical, Notice to Proceed Postponement, Discussion, Action.

A second group construction meeting was held on Friday, January 9, 2015, to discuss with FAA Engineering Services and Diamond Electrical Company, the anticipated schedule of activities for the project.

During discussion it was noted that the notice to proceed was given for Monday, January 12, 2015. The contractor, however, is requesting the notice to proceed date to be issued for January, at the time January 23,
2015, in order that he has the time for his
invoice to be submitted and approved and to
account for changes that were discussed by the
FAA engineer at the meeting. These changes
were a manhole depth cable location in one area
and the requirement of concrete stabilization,
all of which has to be approved by the FAA.

And we did receive a letter, just
basically, on the 12th. And he's actually
requesting for twenty-six days for assembling.
So he's requesting for an additional sixteen
days from the notice to proceed, which would
put him approximately at the 28th.

And so here with us is Mr. Michael
Broussard with Diamond Electrical Company. And
Adam Thibodeaux with DS&A can also speak on
this as well.

MR. CRUSE:

I don't have any questions. I mean, it's
pretty straightforward.

MR. SEGURA:

I had a question. Did you discuss this
with Bell --

MR. BURROWS:

Yes, sir.
MR. SEGURA:

-- since a timeline is critical for them?

MR. BURROWS:

I spoke to Mr. Vadari shortly after I spoke with you. And he said that, you know, it seems there wasn't really much we could because there have been some changes that have been implemented by the FAA. And the fact that we are still pushing forward with the utility conflict reimbursable agreement, which we just had our meeting Monday, and the FAA is working on getting that to us as soon as they can. So, you know, that utility conflict resolution will help their timetable, even though we may have, you know, a delay in this.

MR. SEGURA:

And the completion ends up being, like, a three-week difference?

MR. ADAM THIBODEAUX:

Total, yes. I think so.

MR. SEGURA:

In what was originally planned?

MR. ADAM THIBODEAUX:

Correct.

MR. SEGURA:
Okay.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Todd, one question. Again, a notice to proceed was already given. Can we just change it? Can we just change it?

MR. ADAM THIBODEAUX:

We didn't -- we didn't issue that paperwork.

MR. BURROWS:

Yeah. It was discussed that --

MR. ADAM THIBODEAUX:

It was discussed --

MR. BURROWS:

-- that it would be, the notice to proceed, would be 12th, but it was still up for discussion. At the time of the construct -- the pre-construction meeting, we had anticipated getting it for the 12th, but the contractor, with all of the changes brought up by the FAA, it was -- it was -- he was asking, basically, you know, Look, we're not going to be able to meet that schedule. We're going to need at least some time frame to go back.

One of the items that was brought up with the concrete stabilization requires a longer
time frame for an open trench, something that
the contractor wasn't anticipating to have. So
he's having to go back and figure out how much
cost of steel plates it's going to be for to
cover the trench during that time frame in the
safety area.

So there are some issues that he didn't
anticipate having to work on as well.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

I was just reading. It says, "Notice to
Proceed was given."

MR. BURROWS:

Well, it was -- it was talked about.

MR. ADAM THIBODEAUX:

Well, what happened is, is that we knew
that -- this is Adam Thibodeaux with Domingue &
Szabo. We knew that the project was critical.
So in the -- when the project went out to bid,
in the pre-bid meeting, we referenced the
proposed schedule. And we told them when we
would issue the notice to proceed. Then we had
a pre-construction meeting to try to get him
started and the paperwork going, as much as he
could, in between the -- right before the
holidays. And I think we had it December 22nd.
The FAA couldn't attend. So we talked again about issuing notice to proceed. And the contractor was hesitant, but he said he thought he could make it, but there was a -- he thought he would have issues with delivering any shop drawings of the concrete junction box. It's a pre-cast box.

Then when we had -- then when the FAA became available, we had a second pre-construction meeting to coordinate more specifically with the FAA. And that's when they noted that we needed to make some changes to the plans. And that was just last Friday, so.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Thank you.

MR. ADAM THIBODEAUX:

So we didn't physically issue a notice to proceed. The thing is is that we had it in the construction documents, which is unusual. We kind of had it in the bid documents that the notice to proceed was expected to be issued on a specific date. And then we deviated from that. We just wanted to bring it to y'all.

MR. ROBICHAUX:
Thank you. I move we accept the change of the notice to proceed. Add an additional sixteen days?

MR. BURROWS:

Correct.

MR. SKINNER:

Second.

MR. CRUSE:

We have a motion by Mr. Robichaux; a second by Mr. Skinner. Any other comments or questions from the Commission?

(No response.)

From the public?

(No response.)

All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS:

Aye.

MR. CRUSE:

All opposed? No? Motion carries.

Scheduled business.

MR. BURROWS:

Yes, sir. Scheduled business, consensus items.

G. Item G: Bernhard Mechanical Terminal and Air Traffic Control Tower HVAC
Preventative Maintenance.

H. Item H: FlightView, Incorporated, Addendum to License Agreement for Additional Features.

I. Item I: John Glenn Drive Parking Lot Modifications, Bid Acceptance.

J. Item J: Louisiana Compliance Questionnaire, LAC Fiscal Year 2014 Audit.

K. Item K: PHI, Incorporated, Request to Add Concrete Tow Lane; and

L. Item L: Landmark Aviation, Request to Install Carport Structure.

That concludes the consensus.

MR. SKINNER:

Can we just discuss either "L" or pull it and vote separate?

MR. CRUSE:

Yeah. We can do it either way.

MR. SKINNER:

I guess -- I just have two questions: One, the -- I know their -- have their wind rating, but are they going to properly secure it? Is that --

MR. BURROWS:

The way the motion is right now, we have
Landmark Aviation is requesting to install an eighteen foot (18') by twenty-one foot (21') metal carport structure over the wash rack area north of their main hangar. This carport would be utilized to park the ground services equipment and other equipment that Landmark maintains. Therefore, if approved, staff will coordinate the review of the project with our architect. And if approved by the architect that it meets our requirements of wind rating, and things like that, then we -- you know, we can give approval to Landmark to install the structure.

MR. SKINNER:

All right. And not that I'm opposed to it, but this is not a typical structure we would have on the airport. I mean, our -- typically, we would like things designed and built a little nicer, but I surely understand. It's just for support equipment.

MR. BURROWS:

And he did state in his letter that, you know, he would ask for the Airport Commission to pick the colors of it. You know, my thoughts are that we just stay with the same
colors as the hangar, you know, to match.

MR. SKINNER:

I don't think we need to get involved in the colors --

MR. BURROWS:

Right.

MR. SKINNER:

-- but, you know, we want it to look nice and some of these things, I guess, do and some of them don't.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Mike, is that -- the property where they want to build that, is that included in that leased --

MR. BURROWS:

Yes.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

-- in some properties?

MR. BURROW:

Right now I believe it is.

MR. SKINNER:

It is. I double-checked. And we had talked about it before, about maybe locating a hangar right there. It's part of their lease.

MR. CRUSE:
Okay. Any other questions?

MR. HEBERT:

I have a question on Tab I, the parking lot modifications. If you would have, like, maybe a rough estimate of how long it would take and when the rental cars would be moved again.

MR. BURROWS:

I'm not sure, sir. I might have to ask Adam to come on up, because he actually put together...

MR. ADAM THIBODEAUX:

I apologize. I forgot what the contract term is. I think it's either sixty or ninety days. I think it's sixty days to get it done.

MR. BURROWS:

I think it was sixty days, but I'm not sure either.

MR. ADAM THIBODEAUX:

I think it's sixty days.

MR. HEBERT:

That's fine. I just wanted to know --

MR. BURROWS:

But I know shortly thereafter, we planned to get the -- the car rentals pretty much know
that it's coming, and we're actually working right now for the car rental negotiations to start.

MR. ADAM THIBODEAUX:

Now, the -- just to let you -- I mean, we're striping it, but there's some -- what happens is that -- we just put it in a parking lot down -- so we'll put the stripes and the arrows and the wheel stops. Typically, what happens is that the rental cars want some additional signage. Like, they put the little numbers, and they might go back and color-code things. So there's some -- depending on which rental car, which area, there could be some more work before the day is ended, so -- and I don't know if y'all talked about it.

MR. BURROWS:

We've not coordinated that yet, because we're going to start negotiating a new -- a new agreement, and depending on how that agreement falls determines how many parking spaces they get. So they may not want to do anything at this time.

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

Mr. Hebert, I had gotten an email earlier,
because I'm working on the bid document for the rental cars, and I was told that the contract end date for this would be March 28th. Does sound about right, Adam?

MR. CRUSE:

That would be sixty days.

MR. ADAM THIBODEAUX:

Uh-huh. Yeah. That sounds about right.

Thank you, Todd.

MR. CRUSE:

Are there any other questions on the consensus items?

(No response.)

I'll accept a motion for approval.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

I make a motion we accept Items G through L.

MR. SKINNER:

Second.

MR. CRUSE:

We have a motion by Mr. Robichaux, a second by Skinner. Any further comments or questions from the Commission?

(No response.)

From the public?
(No response.)

All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS:

Aye.

MR. CRUSE:

All opposed?

(No response.)

None. Motion carries.

MR. BURROWS:

Moving on to reports.


MR. CRUSE:

Updates.

MR. BURROWS:

Project Updates.

Q. Taxiway Q -- I'm sorry -- Tab Q, Taxiway Mike (Parallel Taxiway).

R. Tab R: North GA Phase II.

S. Tab S: Perimeter Road Improvements.

T. Tab T: Master Plan, Update.
V. Tab V: Taxiway Seal Coat Project.
W. Tab W: Cargo Facility.
X. Tab X-ray: Air Traffic Control Tower Interior Upgrades 2014; and
Y. Tab Yankee: Main Terminal Interior Upgrades, 2014; and
Z. Tab Zulu: Let's see. LRA Signage Upgrades, Update.

That concludes project updates.

MR. CRUSE:
Okay. I'll accept a motion to adjourn.

MR. SEGURA:
Move to adjourn.

MS. GARRETT:
Second.

MR. CRUSE:
We have a motion by Mr. Segura; a second by Ms. Garrett. Any other comments or questions from the Commission?
(No response.)
From the public?
(No response.)
All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS:
Aye.

MR. CRUSE:
   All opposed?
   (No response.)
   Meeting is adjourned.
   (Meeting adjourned at 6:26 p.m.)
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