The LAFAYETTE AIRPORT COMMISSION MEETING, held
before Lauren Alesi Gaspard, Certified Court
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Terminal Drive, 2nd Floor Main Conference Room,
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APPEARANCES:

DEBBIE AMY
MIKE BURROWS
TODD SWARTZENDRUBER
JOHN HEBERT
PAUL A. GUILBEAU, SR.
MATT CRUSE
PAUL SEGURA
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GENERAL AUDIENCE MEMBERS
MR. CRUSE:

I will go ahead and call the Wednesday, February 11, 2015 Regular Meeting of the Board. Please rise and join me in the pledge of allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance)

Okay. We'll start with a roll call starting from the 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. And I'll accept a motion for the January next.

MR. SEGURA:

Move to accept.

MR. CRUSE:

We have a motion by Mr. Segura.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Second.

MR. SKINNER:

Is that a regular meeting or a special meeting?

MR. CRUSE:

Both. It's both, actually, regular and special meeting.

MR. SKINNER:

I got just one quick question, if I could. On this special meeting there was a reference to contract. And is that -- I don't think -- and the question of this matter, I don't think we have a contract. It was just an employment agreement.

MR. CRUSE:

For what?
MR. SKINNER: And that's on the director --

MR. CRUSE: For Picou?

MR. SKINNER: Yeah. It said that a contract was signed.

MR. CRUSE: I mean, it was an employment contract that was signed.

MR. SKINNER: Or is it just an acceptance letter?

MR. SEGURA: It's just an offer.

MR. SKINNER: So, I mean, we can leave it. I'm just -- I saw a contract.

MR. GUILBEAU: You want to make a motion that we amend it to read that and we go with it?

MR. SKINNER: Shouldn't we?

MR. SEGURA: Please do.

MR. SKINNER: Okay. I'll make a motion that we amend the
term "contract" to employment offer.

MR. SEGURA:

Second.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. We have a motion by Mr. Skinner for an amendment and a second by Mr. Segura. Any further comments or questions from the Commission? Mike, do you know exactly what he's talking about, looking for the reference? Okay. All right. Any questions or comments from the public? All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS:

Aye.

MR. CRUSE:

All opposed?

(No response.)

Motion carries.

Okay. Now I'll accept the motion to accept the minutes from the regular and the special meeting.

MR. SKINNER:

I move to accept both the minutes of the regular meeting and special meeting.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. We have a motion by Mr. Skinner.
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?

COMMISSIONERS:

Aye.

MR. CRUSE:

All opposed? (No response.)

Motion carries.

Okay. The only comment I would have at this time is just to -- if everyone here is not aware already, Mike Burrows will be -- this will be his last meeting with us. He has accepted a position at Alleman & Butcher (phonetic) with the DOTD Aviation Department. Just tell us what you're going to be doing and if you're going to be --

MR. BURROWS:

I've taken a position as the Assistant
Aviation Director for DOTD here in the State.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay.

MR. BURROWS:

So I'll be overseeing the sixty-nine airports inspections and things like that.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. Well, perfect. Well, congratulations.

MR. BURROWS:

Thank you.

MR. CRUSE:

You know, I know we're going to try to bring you back for the next meeting to try to give you maybe a little presentation. But, personally, I think you've done an outstanding job --

MR. BURROWS:

Thank you.

MR. CRUSE:

-- in the interim serving as the interim director of the airport, exactly what we needed. You've been great during your time here. I appreciate everything you've done for us.
MR. BURROWS:

Thank you.

MR. CRUSE:

I'd like to give you a round of applause.

Okay. Any comments from the public on any item which is not on the agenda tonight?

(No response.)

All right. Commissioner's Comments?

MR. GUILBEAU:

I'll just take a minute here. Mike was my go-to man when I was chairman and sometimes he'd refer me to the Director, but Mike was always forward with me and gave me the information I needed. I'm especially happy he's going with DOTD. Y'all have all read in the paper the retirement fund is in a big deficit, so he's going to pay to it so I can keep getting my check every month.

MR. CRUSE:

I do have one more thing to say here, a little bit to do with Mike. But Mike -- I had Mike actually come with me to Washington, D.C. to meet with the FAA in January to go over the terminal project. We met with Mr. Watkins, another member who is actually in charge of
putting together the budgets and the pricing for this. It went really well. They were -- I think they were pretty impressed at the level of funding and commitment we have towards the project already. So I think Mike did a great job, you know.

At first I was looking at the budget saying, well, does Mike really need to go. And Mike said, well, you know, the first thing they might ask is how we're doing on other projects to do with the runway. Sure enough, I mean, after we sat down, the very first thing the guy wanted to know was, all right, the terminal is great, but I want to know how you're doing on all these other projects. So Mike was able to smartly answer those parts and I think it impressed them. So it was a really good -- a good meeting. So another kudos to Mike.

MR. BURROWS:

Thank you.

MR. CRUSE:

All right. Director's Report.

MR. BURROWS:

Okay. Transportation Security Clearinghouse Services – Fingerprinting System.
It's just an automatic renewal, April 13, '15 through April 12, '16. Fly Lafayette/Passenger Statistics, they were fantastic. But I'll turn it over to Robert for any report.

MR. CALLAHAN:

Robert Callahan, Sides & Associates. In January we had 37,852 passengers. That's enplanements and deplanements. Enplanements were up about fifteen percent over last January and the deplanements were up over twenty percent over last January. So it was a pretty outstanding month.

Load factors range from sixty-eight percent to seventy-two percent. The media coverage was, a lot of it was the terminal tax, letting people know that it didn't start until April 1st, the new director and the runway repairs.

Fly Lafayette Club, we have 7,645 members as of today. Have fifty-two winners and six hundred eighty-three entries in last month's drawing.

MR. CRUSE:

All right. Thank you, Robert.

MR. BURROWS:

Continuing on, Financials. As of right now
we're up about twelve percent on operations receipts. Operations disbursements, we're down two percent. Other income expenditures we're up about a percent. Total available from operations, thirty-five percent or 1,075,599.00.

And then so right now we've got a net increase, or a decrease, actually, to cash of about forty-two percent. So we're looking really good. These numbers are not final. We do have the audit coming up soon. We look really good financially.

Next item, I'd like to introduce Mr. Ryan Martin with Bell Helicopters. He's here to discuss Tower Drive and proposing a name change.

MR. MARTIN:

Thank you, everybody. Thank you, the Airport Commission, for your time. I'm Ryan Martin. I work for Bell Helicopter in the Enterprise Asset Managing Department. I had a very snazzy presentation prepared, but, of course, I ran into some AV difficulties.

First, we're very excited about our future here at Lafayette Regional Airport. As you can
probably see, every time you drive up and down 90 we're making a significant amount of progress on the construction of the building. We are on schedule. We are on budget and things are moving along very nicely. And as we continue to move forward with our construction, as we near the point in which we put the finishing touches on the building, we are seeking some additional opportunities to enhance our brand and image here in the community.

So we have a proposal I would like to make. We had some discussions with Mr. Burrows and a number of other folks. Our proposal is that we would like to rename Tower Drive, in its entirety, east of U.S. 90 to Jet Ranger X Drive, which has the -- it's the same thing, same name as the product that's in the building. Why Jet Ranger X Drive? As noted it identifies strongly with our signature product at this facility one may ask why not Bell Helicopter Drive. There are three others within the United States. It's an excellent name which, of course, we'd be quite fond of. But it exists elsewhere and we want something
unique to this facility and to our presence here at the airport.

Why now? The process is appropriate for us to make this request so that way we can have everything in place for our grand opening which is planned in June. Some of the stuff we've taken to date, we have reviewed the proposal of all the other neighbors. There are no major objections. The primary objection was the cost of stationary, the cost to add the address on the facility on business cards and such. Bell Helicopters is willing to defray the reasonable costs associated with that change. And our formal request is that that the Airport Commission would endorse this change too. And I will take any questions.

MR. CRUSE:

I'm guessing the biggest issue would be stationary and the FAA, correct?

MR. MARTIN:

Yes, sir.

MR. CRUSE:

Yeah.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Mr. Chairman, I think in March it would be
okay to get us a resolution on the agenda in
support of the name change so he can use that
in going forward.

MR. CRUSE:

Well, I can add it to the March agenda.

Any other questions?

MR. GUILBEAU:

No.

MR. MARTIN:

All right. Thank you. I appreciate it.

MR. BURROWS:

All right. Moving on. Just as an update
to Diamond B, the runway repairs, Diamond B
will basically finish the intersection work and
everything north of the intersection. They
still have the south Runway 11-29 to complete.
They are requesting to work the 21st and 22nd,
which is not this weekend, but the following
weekend. So I bring this up just to -- my
understanding that the change order was
specific to the dates and Mr. Griffin may have
to go in to that.

MR. CRUSE:

So, Bill, in your opinion, do we need
action by the Commission to issue another
change order even though it's not -- we're not going to incur any additional costs with it?

MR. GRIFFIN:

Bill Griffin with AECOM. We need some sort -- we need a field order or something along that line. I don't know that we need a new change order. I would be happy to draft a new change order, but you wouldn't --

MR. CRUSE:

No. I just want -- I want to keep at the simplest level as possible.

MR. GRIFFIN:

We'll draft, with your permission, we'll draft a field order to that effect.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. There's no additional costs?

MR. GRIFFIN:

There's no addition cost, no, sir.

MR. CRUSE:

It just took them a little bit longer than what they thought?

MR. GRIFFIN:

Actually, they ran out of their goo.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. While you're up there --
MR. GRIFFIN

That's a technical --

MR. CRUSE:

I mean, is it working as good as you

thought it would or is it --

MR. GRIFFIN:

I've got to admit that I have not been out there. But all the reports that I have heard are that it has done what they said it would do. We'll see.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay.

MR. SKINNER:

Bill, if they ran out of their goo, did they underestimate or?

MR. GRIFFIN:

Yes, sir. They underestimated. There were, maybe not more instances, but they certainly were somewhat larger than they had thought.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. Does anybody have more questions?

MR. GUILBEAU:

I do.

MR. GRIFFIN:
MR. GUILBEAU:

I'm sure you have received an email I had sent to staff?

MR. GRIFFIN:

Yes, sir, I did.

MR. GUILBEAU:

I'm very concerned that we need to get all of that information prior to any recommendation of substantial completion.

MR. GRIFFIN:

I do understand that, sir. And I've had several conversations with the staff. Obviously, the staff is going to have to do some compilation on their side and we'll work it out.

MR. GUILBEAU:

And I guess I'll throw this in. We never accepted it so contract days in accordance with the specs, are still running.

MR. GRIFFIN:

We'll make a recommendation on that, yes, sir, for your consideration.

MR. GUILBEAU:

I just wanted to make sure we cover all
bases.

MR. GRIFFIN:

Yes, sir.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Thank you.

MR. CRUSE:

Does anybody have any issue with me authorizing them to continue that weekend, not this weekend, but the following weekend to complete the process?

(No response.)

All right. Okay. Next item.

MR. BURROWS:

The only other item I have is the request to pull item P under consensus items. It's Home Bank - Fiscal Agent/ATM Operations - Renewal, Option Year 2. So I feel it'd be best for Mr. Steven Picou to be able to look at this when he comes in to negotiate for Home Bank. I know Mr. Gary Broussard would like to speak.

MR. CRUSE:

Do you want him to speak now or when we get to the --

MR. GUILBEAU:

Let him speak now and then he can leave.
MR. CRUSE:

Okay. Go ahead.

MR. BROUSSARD:

Thank you very much. Good evening, my name is Gary Broussard. I'm the Market President for Home Bank here in Acadiana. I have with me tonight Ms. June Picard, who is the Relationship Manager who handles the relationship with the Airport Commission, and Ms. Tammy Theriot, who is our Treasury Management person at the bank.

I just want to say thank you very much for allowing us to serve you in the depository capacity. We appreciate your business and we look forward to extending that relationship. The bank -- I'll tell you a little bit about the bank. You can rest assured that your funds are in an institution that is very sound. We had an excellent year last year. We continue to grow. Our capital position is in excess of twelve percent, which is extreme, frankly. And so you have -- you have selected a very good bank.

We look forward to the future. We look forward to talking about any change in terms
and so forth that we will propose, as far as your depository. So, again, thank you and we appreciate our relationship very much.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Mr. Broussard?

MR. BROUSSARD:

Yes.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Just real quickly, would you read the commissioners -- we got, hopefully, a big amount of money coming in this year.

MR. BROUSSARD:

Correct.

MR. GUILBEAU:

And to reassure everybody that you have the governmental authority to make sure they all are insured.

MR. BROUSSARD:

Right. That's correct. We participate in a -- it's called a Primatory Program, if I'm using the correct language. And that program allows us to insure every bit of every cent of your deposit. Your current deposit and any future deposits. Basically, it's a nationwide program that banks across the country
participate in and every bit, every cent will be insured, FDIC insurance. So safe and sound. Any other questions? Again, thank you very much.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Thank you.

MR. CRUSE:

He wants five percent on it.

MR. BROUSSARD:

So do I. Thank you.

MR. CRUSE:

All right. Thank you.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. We'll go ahead and pull Item P from the agenda.

MR. BURROWS:

Okay. And that includes the Director's Report.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. Scheduled business.

MR. GUILBEAU:

I've got one question. Ms. Mary, on the financials. Do we have any tab, excluding state or federal agencies, that are forty-five days behind in their payments?
MS. GREEN:

No.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. Scheduled business.

MR. BURROWS:

Okay.

A. Tab A, Selection/Replacement of Third Party Consultant to participate in RFP/RFQ Process, and provide at-will consulting to the LAC-Approval.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. I had staff put this item on the agenda. I sent out an email to all of the commissioners. We lost Mr. Mollier. We didn't lose him; he recused himself. So that left us with just one consultant to help us with our RFPs and RFQ process, which is Tony Tramel.

I wanted to add, I felt that Walt Adams was a really good fit for to help us with, specifically, some of things we've got coming up here in the near future with the terminal design and some of the other things we have going on. And I asked if anyone else had any recommendations. Mr. Skinner came back with one as well. John L. "Jay" Chase, Jr. And my
opinion is, I mean, I don't think we're limited in how many we can have. I think we'd be better served having three than two.

So, at this point, it's up for questions, for discussion. I know Walt is here. I'm not familiar. Is Mr. Chase present? No. Okay. We've got his information. If anybody has any questions or comments, you know, we can discuss it right now. Otherwise, you know, it's up for motion.

MR. SKINNER:

I move that we accept both parties as a third-party consultant for the RFP/RFQ process.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Mr. Chairman --

MR. CRUSE:

We have a motion by Mr. Skinner.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Yeah, I'll second it. But maybe -- on page 3 of 4 on schedule of invoices --

MR. CRUSE:

Let me address that first because if Walt - - Todd and Walt got together today?

MR. GUILBEAU:

Yeah.
MR. CRUSE:

Okay.

MR. GUILBEAU:

He said he couldn't make it.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Well, it's not amended in our packet, but I just wanted to put up our opinions. Instead of invoices will be submitted on the first day of each month, required on or before the 10th day for payment, I would recommend that you include in your motion payments will be made within thirty days upon reception of invoice. And I'll second that motion if you accept the change.

MR. SKINNER:

Okay. So I'll amend my motion to include it on Walt Adams --

MR. GUILBEAU:

Yeah.

MR. SKINNER:

-- not on the other, that payment be made within thirty days of receipt of his invoice.

MR. GUILBEAU:
Yeah.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. We have a motion by Mr. Skinner and a second by Mr. Guilbeau. 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. Next item.

MR. BURROWS:


MR. CRUSE:

Okay. Once, again, I had the staff put this on the agenda because I feel like we're at a crossroads and we got to -- this is really the first decision we have to make moving
forward towards the new terminal. Obviously, we have a process in place that's approved by the Commission, utilize the three firms that are preselected to do the type of work we're talking about here, specifically, new terminal design.

    Todd brought it up to me and we've spoken about it a couple of times and I'll let him elaborate on it. But at a minimum we need a decision from the Commission as a whole to decide if we're going to -- if we're going to veer from our approved policy and open it up to any firms outside of those three. We have to come to that conclusion as a Commission.

    Todd has a couple of things that have happened in the past with regard to the FAA that I want him to just discuss briefly because it may or may not be an issue. So go ahead.

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

    My thought on this was because the new terminal is listed on the request for qualifications that was done in 2011, wherein, the Commission selected the three firms that you have now on your list. Opening it up -- well, at that time as, you know, most of you
will remember a fourth firm was added to that. Then the FAA came back and said that they would not fund any projects using that consultant or that firm.

So my concern with opening up would only be to check with the FAA and make sure that they would be okay with the Commission opening this up to more firms and list the three that were previously selected. That's just to make sure that you get the funding that you need for this project. That was the only thing that I had.

MR. CRUSE:

Yeah. Personally, I'm okay with whichever direction the Commission wants to go. We just need to decide.

MR. SKINNER:

What is our normal -- how many -- for every so many years we do the RFQ, correct? So do we have a set time that we do them or do we just do them when we think it's necessary?

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

The contracts that were done in 2011 were three-year contracts, I think, with two one-year options. So next year, I think, will be -- the Commission will be selecting firms
again.

MR. SKINNER:

Okay. So I guess that implies that we should not just open up other RFQs. So our policy is to follow through on those contracts and then go through the RFQ process again?

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

Yes.

MR. SKINNER:

Okay.

MR. CRUSE:

As long as it falls within the scope of that agreement, which the new terminal design is specific to the scope of work.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Mr. Chairman --

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

The request for proposals, and I've got it here, it listed a number of projects that the airport had foreseeable that it might do during that period of time and the new terminal was one of those.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Mr. Chairman, could we put Mr. Adams on the spot right now? I have a question for him.
MR. CRUSE:

Sure.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Mr. Adams?

You've heard the discussion. Would by next meeting at the latest, would you be able to give us an answer if we go nationwide or working with Todd and the FAA or if we are restricted to stay within our grading?

MR. ADAMS:

I certainly can.

MR. GUILBEAU:

I'm thinking probably we need that answer.

MR. CRUSE:

Well, I would not give them a month to do that. I would give them a very short period of time to come up with that answer. Because I think we need to -- we'll just keep deferring this and putting it off. I mean, I was hoping, and this is hoping, to be in a position to select a design firm in April. Now, it's February now. I know March is way too soon. April is probably pushing it. But, I mean --

MR. SEGURA:

I think we should move forward, but
research what that process of those contracts are specifically as it relates to those three engineering firms. If it was a mere mention of projects that are coming up or if that was the specific work that those companies were going to do and are somewhat bound to be able to do. But I think we ought to clear that with the FAA. But I know we have some capable firms. But, just because of this scope of the project and all, it may behoove us — well, it may be in our best interest to spread our wings a little and see what else is out there as well.

But I think that's why we have Walt onboard to help us with process and come analyze any plan on what we ought to do. But to not, surely not stop the process, but keep going with it in a very planned and laid out course, which has been discussed before.

MR. ADAMS:

In terms of the aspect of the legality in the requirement from the FAA, you know, certainly that would be Counsel's recommendation there. With regard to the practicality of the scope and scale of the work and the fact that you've entered into an
agreement with the community to fund, I think I would take the most conservative view that we need to look, first and foremost, at the firms that are already qualified.

MR. SEGURA:
    Right.

MR. ADAMS:
    But not limit it to that.

MR. SEGURA:
    Right.

MR. ADAMS:
    I'm speaking strictly from a business perspective, not from a legal perspective.

MR. SEGURA:
    Right.

MR. ADAMS:
    And as soon as I can dive into what you've already done in terms of documentation, we can ensure or answer that question that you were going to give us the special meeting. I'm certain within two weeks we can come back for a recommendation about that, as well as what we think are the most appropriate contracting models.

    The first question I'd have for the three
firms that are already prequalified is their experience in the most appropriate model. There's been a lot of discussion about CMAR. There are other models out there. I don't know what I would come back and recommend to you at this point, but the other aspect of that is how balanced that group of three are in terms of that level of experience, the scale of this project or maybe all three, or what experience maybe all three are. I don't know. I'm not familiar with it.

But I think as far as the legality of it, that's fairly, you know, should be the Counsel's decision. But I can certainly work with staff and come up with a, from an industry perspective, in terms of what I think your next best step would be.

MR. CRUSE:

Walt, let me ask you this. Whether or not we limit it to the three firms we have preselected or we went out nationwide, would that affect the putting together the RFQ package? I mean, it's still going to be --

MR. ADAMS:

No.
MR. CRUSE:

   It's going to be the same whether we go to three?

MR. ADAMS:

   Precisely.

MR. CRUSE:

   So, in that case, I would like for you to just go ahead and get -- let's get the ball rolling on putting the RFQ package together --

MR. SKINNER:

   RFP.

MR. CRUSE:

   -- while we're --

MR. ADAMS:

   Analyzing.

MR. CRUSE:

   -- making some of these decisions. So when we get to that point, hopefully we'll be at a point where we can just issue it.

MR. ADAMS:

   We can devote full resource, whatever time is required in the shortest period of time to do it effectively. And but I would say it would -- I would say a two-week window is probably going to be practical.
MR. CRUSE:

Okay.

MR. SKINNER:

Just for clarification --

MR. SEGURA:

Mardi Gras is next week. Are you sure?

MR. ADAMS:

I'm factoring that in.

MR. SKINNER:

The RFP would be for the actual project.

MR. ADAMS:

The RFP would. The RFQ would be the
request for qualification.

MR. SKINNER:

For qualifications to the firms.

MR. ADAMS:

Right.

MR. SKINNER:

Right. So we'd be -- you want to do the
RFP is what you want to start working on for
the terminal.

MR. CRUSE:

The criteria for the selection of a design
firm.

MR. ADAMS:
MR. CRUSE:

Yeah.

MR. SKINNER:

So it'd be the RFP.

MR. ADAMS:

It's really a two-step process, but it can be fully, literally integrated. In other words, the same documents and all the reference materials for the request for qualifications will indicate what's going to be in the RFP and it will also indicate a time line of when the RFQ process closes and the time line to go immediately to RFP.

MR. SKINNER:

I would make one other suggestion then. As another scenario, keep the existing three. That we're not eliminating the existing three, but allow us to look at others as well. If we could do that. Since we've got the contract with them, leave them on.

MR. SEGURA:

If you can determination from the FFA first.

MR. SKINNER:
Yeah. But I'm saying, you know, ***.

MR. CRUSE:

Yeah. It just worried me when Todd brought that up to me and said, you know, if you remember correctly, you know, when we added the Shaw Group as a fourth company the FAA actually came to us and said, hey, you guys can do that, but we will not -- we will not -- you will not be reimbursable for any work that that company does because you've gone outside the scope of your --

MR. SEGURA:

Well, someone else came to us first and then the FAA.

MR. CRUSE:

Well, however it happened, but it did happened.

MR. SEGURA:

Yeah.

MR. CRUSE:

So okay.

MR. SKINNER:

Can we just call a special meeting to vote on it and get it done?

MR. CRUSE:
We'll try.

MR. SEGURA:

Let see where it runs. The quicker the better.

MR. CRUSE:

But regardless, I mean, you can be full speed ahead on putting together the material --

MR. ADAMS:

We can start whenever you're ready regardless of that. But I think the real crux of it is, what is the actual procurement model that's going to be the most effective and the most safe for you --

MR. SEGURA:

Right.

MR. ADAMS:

-- as you go through this process.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. Thanks, Walt.

MR. ADAMS:

Thank you.

MR. CRUSE:

All right. So we will just defer a decision on this item until we get a legal opinion.
MR. GUILBEAU:

    Well, I thought we made a step forward.

MR. CRUSE:

    Yeah, we took a step. It was very small, but.

    Go ahead, next item.

MR. BURROWS:

C. Okay. Tab C is Taxiway Sealcoat Project - Pavement Maintenance Unlimited - Change Order #1 - Discussion/Action.

    Change Order #1 is necessitated by unforeseen changes in the project phase scheduling and phase additions/deletions, such as sealcoating around the T-Hangars. These changes are related to concurrent airfield project conflicts, such as Taxiway Mike construction.

    Also, additional costs would be incurred from the contractor due to previously unanticipated required night work associated with closing Runway R4-22L and 11-29. Associated cost increase will be covered in the FAA AIP Grant #45. Notice to proceed is scheduled for February 18, 2015. The total cost increases $15,478.72.
MR. SKINNER:

Taxiway Foxtrot, in this sealcoat we're not sealcoating Foxtrot?

MR. BURROWS:

No, sir. Because we have a project on schedule for our next PFC project to be the widening and strengthening.

MR. SKINNER:

Okay.

MR. BURROWS:

We thought it would be a waste to do it when we're going to rip it up.

MR. SKINNER:

So was it pulled from this or we didn't -- or we're not involved in RFP to do the sealcoat originally?

MR. BURROWS:

No. We pulled it to -- to basically -- I mean, this is adding in the T-Hangars area.

MR. SKINNER:

Are we swapping the Foxtrot for T-Hangars or?

MR. BURROWS:

Pretty much.

MR. SKINNER:
Okay.

MR. BURROWS:

It was just an additional -- since we had some additional monies in it, it was -- we asked basically can we do the area around the T-Hangars since we had some additional monies that were allocated from the Foxtrot's removal.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Mike, the way I understand it, prior to the change would we have had the funds to do the sealcoating around the T-Hangars?

MR. BURROWS:

Correct.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Okay.

MR. CRUSE:

Basically just swapping asphalt for asphalt.

All right. I'll accept a motion.

MR. SKINNER:

I'll move that we accept as presented.

MR. CRUSE:

Motion by Mr. Skinner.

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?

COMMISSIONERS:
Aye.

MR. CRUSE:
All opposed?
(No response.)
Motion carries.

MR. BURROWS:

D. Tab D, Runway 11 West End Design - Phase 2 of 2 - AECOM - Work Order #4, Change Order #1 - Discussion/Action.
Change in FAA direction precipitated a deduction in scope for Runway 11 West End Design Contract, essentially allowing an interim non-standard undershoot for Runway 11 where a 600 ft displacement was previously required.
Thus, the change necessitated the deletion of specific engineering tasks and costs as
previously approved. Work Order cost covered
AIP Grant 45. Cost savings to be allocated to
Runway 29 East end work as to be discussed in
the next item, Item E.

MR. SKINNER:

What's our displacement going to be?
MR. BURROWS:

Total?
MR. SKINNER:

Reducing it from six hundred feet, right?
I know we've discussed this before.
MR. GRIFFIN:

Bill Griffin with AECOM. There will be no
displacement. Basically, they -- I say there
will be no displacement with regard to
improvements on the 11 end or the western end
of the runway. They agreed to basically
postpone the requirement for the six hundred
foot safety area prior to landing threshold on
the basis that the I-49 project was on the
horizon and it was going to require unknown
adjustments to that threshold anyway. So the
idea was that it would not be in this project.
And that makes the whole project a lot simpler.

MR. SKINNER:
So the threshold will stay where it is and
the EMAS will be from the west?

MR. GRIFFIN:

Yes, sir. The EMAS will be between the
existing threshold and the fence line or
between the existing threshold and the
perimeter road.

MR. SKINNER:

And we'll maintain the full length of the
runway?

MR. GRIFFIN:

Yes, sir.

MR. SKINNER:

Okay. Thank you.

MR. CRUSE:

And I guess we found out this on another
note. Is the 717, can it operate off of 11-29?

MR. BURROWS:

Yes, sir.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. All right. Let's have a motion.

MR. SKINNER:

I move that we accept Work Order #4, Change
Order #1 as presented.

MR. CRUSE:
Okay. Motion by Mr. Skinner.

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?

COMMISSIONERS:
Aye.

MR. CRUSE:
All opposed?
(No response.)
Motion carries. Next item.

MR. BURROWS:
E. Tab E, Runway 29 East End Design - Phase 1 of 2 - Work Order #4, Change Order #2.
The FAA has requested the LAC to consider all incremental improvements and report any assessed impacts in achieving a compliant Runway 29 Runway Safety Area in accordance with the Runway Safety Area Mandate, deadline end of year 2015.
The FAA suggests utilizing the Engineer of Record for Runway 11 West End Design to undertake Runway 29 East End Design Phase 1 of a possible two-phase project to provide the necessary site documentation for an FAA determination.

Phase 1 design is essentially a design study which will assess the site perimeters off the end of Runway 29, as well document the requirement set forth by FAA regulation. The ultimate goal of Phase 1 is to provide a synopsis of conditions and justification for a request of modification of standards to extend the 2015 deadline requirement until more information is provided for the impacts of the I-49 project.

Following an official FAA response to the design study, Phase II will include design of a Runway Safety Area System as directed by the FAA of which would require an RFP process and a separate contract. The FAA plans to incorporate the cost associated with the Phase I Design Study into AIP Grant 45.

MR. SKINNER:

So are we asking for both Phase 1 and 2?
MR. BURROWS:
Right now we're asking for Phase 1 --

MR. SKINNER:
Phase 1.

MR. BURROWS:
-- just to basically AECOM to provide us
with what is out there right now currently, to
provide that to the FAA so that they can tell
us what are we going to need.

MR. SKINNER:
And then that -- the change order to the
66,000.00, is that for Phase 1?

MR. BURROWS:
Correct.

MR. SKINNER:
Okay. And that's going to be reimbursed?

MR. BURROWS:
Yes, sir.

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

MR. SKINNER:
I guess I'll keep going. I move that we
accept the Change Order #2 for Phase 1. Wait.
We have Phase 1 -- correct. We have Phase 1
and 2 Work Order 4, Change Order. So does that
need to be Phase 1?

MR. SEGURA:

Phase 1 of 2.

MR. SKINNER:

Okay. I'm sorry. All right. So I move that we accept Phase 1 of 2, Work Order 4, Change #2 as presented.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. We have a motion to accept by Mr. Skinner.

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?

COMMISSIONERS:

Aye.

MR. CRUSE:

All opposed? (No response.) Motion carries. Next item.
MR. BURROWS:

F. FAA Cable Relocation – Approval of Amendment #1 to the Small Scale Reimbursable Agreement for Construction Oversight.

Staff received Amendment #1 to the FAA Reimbursable Contract between the FAA and the LAC at a cost of $35,609.60. This Amendment is needed by the FAA for the additional work in the no construction zone, engineering and installation support for the relocation of the FAA field communication and control cable currently located within the Bell Helicopter leasehold. This is an increase to the current reimbursable agreement.

MR. SEGURA:

I move to accept.

MR. ROBICHAUD:

Second.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. We have a motion to accept by Mr. Segura and a second by Mr. Robichaux. 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. Next item.
MR. BURROWS:
G. Item G, Change all LAC Policies, Procedures
and other Documents from "Director of
Aviation" to "Executive Director" -
Discussion/Action.
MR. HEBERT:
I make the motion that all references to
the Director of Aviation and Commission
ordinances, resolutions, by-laws, policies,
contracts, and other similar documents now in
effect shall hereinafter mean the Executive
Director, except where the context clearly
indicates a different meaning, and, where
necessary or appropriate, Commission
ordinances, resolutions, by-laws, policies,
contracts and other similar documents now in
effect may be revised or amended without further Commission action to give full force and effect in the change in title from Director of Aviation to Executive Director.

MR. GUILBEAU:

I second.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. We have a motion by Mr. Hebert and a second by Mr. Guilbeau. 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:

H. Tab H, LUS Fiber - One Gigabyte - Marketing and Service Agreement - Discussion/Action. Actually, I mean, I can read all of what will be provided, if you want, or I can --
MR. CRUSE:

No. Mr. Guilbeau can give us a quick summary.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Mr. Segura can too. You want me to do it?

MR. SEGURA:

You want me to make a motion?

MR. CRUSE:

Go ahead.

MR. GUILBEAU:

The City approached us to furnish one gigabyte of wi-fi in the terminal in return for some consideration in marketing. And we had a challenge with a Clear Channel. Commissioner Segura and I and staff and Terry Huval with utilities had a conference call. We got that all ironed out and they gave us permission to do it.

It'll be an even swap. I think it to be $1,200.00 a month charge for the wi-fi and they'll pay us $1,200.00 a month for the marketing. Our savings is going to be the existing charge of the wi-fi, which I believe is just in the middle of $100.00 a month. But they want to use it in marketing and we could
use it in marketing. Terry Huval tells us that we'll be the only terminal in the nation that has one gigabyte of wi-fi. So they're going to use that for marketing.

MR. SEGURA:

But the issue was that Clear Channel handles all their advertising. And this isn't necessarily advertising. It's just a promotion. A promotion that this is the wi-fi that's being used.

MR. CRUSE:

So Netflix will work very well in the terminal.

MR. GUILBEAU:

So I move that we authorize the Chairman to sign the agreement between LUS Fiber and Lafayette Airport.

MR. SEGURA:

Second.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. We have a motion by Mr. Guilbeau and a second by Mr. Segura. Any further comments or questions from the Commission?

MR. SKINNER:

One question. Any hardware upgrades cost?
MR. BURROWS:  
LUS did come and visit and look through the terminal to see what equipment, but they're providing the equipment.

MR. SKINNER:  
They'll provide it. Okay.

MR. GUILBEAU:  
In an email today from Terry to me, after our luncheon was that if it's approved tonight, they'll order the equipment immediately. Now, I understand staff said there's only certain equipment we can furnish, but I think that we got all that ironed out.

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

COMMISSIONERS:  
Aye.

MR. CRUSE:  
All opposed?
(No response.)
Motion carries. Scheduled Business.

MR. BURROWS:

Okay. Scheduled Business-Consensus Items.

I. Tab I, RTR Cable Relocation - Diamond Electric - Change Order #1 - Approval.

J. Tab J, PFC Amendment 11-07-C-01-LFT - Approval.

K. Tab K, PFC Amendment 08-06-C-01-LFT Approval.

L. Tab L, Main Entrance Sign - Final Acceptance - MBSB Group - Approval.


N. Tab N, Overhaul - Tower and Terminal HVAC Compressors - Approval.

O. Tab O, Terminal Sprinkler System (Mid-South Fire Solutions, LLC) - Preventative Maintenance - Automatic Renewal.

P. And then skip item P.

Q. Go to Q, Sugarland Exterminating - Contract Amendment.

R. And, Tab R, Pitney Bowes - Contract Amendment.

That completes the Consensus Items.
MR. ROBICHAUX:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to pull Tab M for discussion.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay.

MR. GUILBEAU:

I'd like to pull Tab N.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay.

MR. GUILBEAU:

And I just got a quick question on Q. Mike, are we still ongoing for time to consolidate all --

MR. BURROWS:

Yes.

MR. GUILBEAU:

-- we've got a bunch of exterminating contracts. So this is going to all fall in line.

MR. BURROWS:

We are still trying to do that.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Thanks.

MR. CRUSE:

I'll accept the motion to approve Items I
through R, with the exception of M and N.

MR. SEGURA:

  Move.

MR. CRUSE:

  We have a motion by Mr. Skinner.

MR. BURROWS:

  And P.

MR. CRUSE:

  Oh, P was pulled, okay.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

  Second.

MR. CRUSE:

  We have a motion by Mr. Segura, a second by Mr. Robichaux. 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. Item M.
MR. ROBICHAUX:

Mike, on Item M, I see on -- they're supposed to come do inspections bi-weekly, correct?

MR. BURROWS:

Correct.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Okay. I'm looking on the worksheet. I see the charges are a pretty good overtime rate for 12/6 for the service calls. I saw it in the payables. I guess that's the same thing.

MR. BURROWS:

You saw it in the non-occurring?

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Right.

MR. BURROWS:

Well, it's --

MR. ROBICHAUX:

I'm guessing it's the same date.

MR. BURROWS:

It's actually a separate call out. Under the --

MR. ROBICHAUX:

If that is a separate call, we had to pay them overtime. I understand that. But why --
okay. On this sign in sheet Schlinder Elevators, they show a date 10/15 they came out. 10/23 they came out, 10/30, 11/14. They don't show coming out until 12/10 again for inspection. What happened between 11/14 and 12/10? Did they do an inspection?

MR. BURROWS:

I'm not sure. I'd have to look at it.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Look at the sign in sheet. Schindler Elevator preventative maintenance program sign in log.

MR. BURROWS:

Yeah, I'm there.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

They got 12/6, that's a Saturday. We paid them on overtime to come out, but the last sign in was 11/14 for inspection. They don't have another inspection until 12/10.

MR. BURROWS:

I'm not sure. So I'll have to look into that one of why it didn't happen.

MR. SEGURA:

Is he here?

MR. CRUSE:
MR. LUDWIG:

Hello, I'm Nick Ludwig from Schlinder Elevator. I'm actually a new account rep. On 11/14, that was an overtime preventative maintenance at 4:30. I guess the office closes where y'all have the sign in log. So we have those work tickets, Hugh has them. And then 11/26 was the other visit that was on overtime.

MR. ROBICHAUS:

11/14, it doesn't show overtime. It shows time in at 12:00 something.

MR. LUDWIG:

Oh, it was overtime on us, not on y'all. So you guys weren't charged for it, it was under the agreement.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

I understand, for preventative maintenance. But if y'all are supposed to do it bi-weekly, what happened between 11/14 and 12/10?

MR. LUDWIG:

We did the maintenance. It's just not in the log because it was after 4:30, so we didn't sign the log.

MR. BURROWS:
Our office was closed so they couldn't come. The book that they sign in, that's what he's explaining. The book that they sign in --

MR. ROBICHAUX:

How do we know when they showed up?

MR. LUDWIG:

We have tickets. So there was tickets generated that I can provide, if necessary. They go to Jennifer and to Hugh, so --

MR. BURROWS:

The only other way that we know is that, basically, when they would come here, we'd have to discuss with security or somebody.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

On their contract, what is the specific time they're supposed to come? During working hours or they can come anytime they want? I mean --

MR. LUDWIG:

Yeah. It's from 7:30 to 4:30, but we can still come after hours to do preventative maintenance. And I talked to Jennifer about possibly having a sign in log at security here so that you guys know that we're here if we have to come after 4:30.
But our tickets on our technician's links, it says when they actually show up on site and they logged in on here and they did the maintenance. After they close out their ticket, then it sends it automatically to Hugh for him to review for the pay.

MR. SEGURA:

Do those tickets -- do those tickets eventually get to our office?

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, yes, in order for him to process it.

MR. SEGURA:

So shouldn't we have it anyway, whether he's signed in or not that I was here?

MR. BURROWS:

Correct, we do.

MR. SEGURA:

So why -- what's the problem then? I mean --

MR. ROBICHNich:

The question is --

MR. CRUSE:

It didn't show up on the log.

MR. SEGURA:

Right. But you all have --
MR. CRUSE:

They have it.

MR. SEGURA:

You know?

MR. BURROWS:

Yes, we know. The reason why this was put on the agenda was because the issue was, is that if they did the PM within nine days, not actually the two weeks.

So we've had the discussion of, you know, we spoke with both MBSB group and LAC legal about what would be the best item to do. The only reason it was -- well, one of the items was, we know that we've had issues beforehand, so we thought, you know, if there were any questions, we'd put it up for discussion with all of you.

To date, they have been, since we did have discussions with them, we met with them, they have been providing it as close as possible within the two-week time frame. It's just that we had one incidence where it was done within nine days and not necessarily within two weeks. And I think that was a miscommunication, I guess, on one of the workers.
MR. LUDWIG:

Yeah. It was the week of Christmas, so they did it on Friday, instead of the Tuesday. And I let Jennifer know that -- I think on the 24th our guys are on double time. So they missed it by two business day, I guess. Because the weekend we don't come out and do maintenance.

But we hit every single -- I met with Mike and a bunch of other people on November 6th.

MR. SEGURA:

So you did come?

MR. LUDWIG:

Yeah, yeah, we definitely came.

MR. SEGURA:

It's like one time you didn't come on the right day?

MR. LUDWIG:

Right, right. We came --

MR. SEGURA:

Is that when we were moving here?

MR. BURROWS:

Yeah.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Well, what does it specify --
MR. SEGURA:
   They came, right?

MR. GUILBEAU:
   That's my --

MR. BURROWS:
   What's that?

MR. GUILBEAU:
   What does the spec require?

MR. BURROWS:
   Two weeks. The reason that it was -- the reason why it was put on the agenda is because it was within a -- it was done in nine days.

MR. GUILBEAU:
   So, essentially, y'all are requesting -- need a vote on violating our specifications?

MR. BURROWS:
   It was brought up for discussion on there.

MR. GUILBEAU:
   Yeah, I understand.

MR. ROBICHAUX:
   Well, my main question, I didn't see anything on the sign in sheet. But I do see a bill where they came for not quite three hours and the bill was $1,305.00, overtime call and same one I see it on sign in sheets.
MR. LUDWIG:

For which date?

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Well, it shows 12/6 y'all came on a service call, which was a Saturday. I have right here --

MR. LUDWIG:

I'd have to look that up. I know I talked to Jennifer about all the bills. Some of them, it just depends on what it is.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

I'm showing technician arrival 12/6 at 1254. Technician departure at 1435, so that's two hours. And the bill is $1,300.00.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

We have no service contract with Schlinder. So when we do call them for service after, you know, during hours of outages, they bill us separately on that, which can occur for those. But, normally, this contract right now is for preventative maintenance. There's two separate issues.

MR. CRUSE:

That was for a trapped passenger.

MR. ROBICHAUX:
I understand that. But on this question on
the sign in sheet it shows no visits from 11/14
to 12/10. But it shows a $1,400.00 bill for
12/10. That's my question.

MR. LUDWIG:
Yeah, we have all those. All the visits
are documented.

MR. ROBICHAUX:
Well, Mike, next time we have something on
the agenda like this and you want me to approve
something, I want all the information. I still
don't know they came. I'm just taking
somebody's word that he said they printed out a
ticket. I'm approving $1,400.00 in overtime.

MR. CRUSE:
That's actually not what we're approving,
though.

MR. ROBICHAUX:
We are approving -- we approving --

MR. CRUSE:
The issue was --

MR. ROBICHAUX:
I know. But I'm questioning why --

MR. SEGURA:
Let me ask you something. This is an issue
that they just didn't come on the right day,
but they came the right number of times, right?

MR. BURROWS:
Correct.

MR. SEGURA:
You can't handle this administratively --

MR. BURROWS:
We do, but --

MR. SEGURA:
-- by the time they come before the Commission?

MR. BURROWS:
But one of the reasons that would come up
is because we had issue with it before and if
there was another issue that came up, it was to
be brought back up to you. That's what the
motion was.

MR. CRUSE:
Yes.

MR. BURROWS:
So that's why --

MR. SEGURA:
I understand that. But --

MR. BURROWS:
I was following the resolution at the time.

MR. CRUSE:
That is correct. Were you hear when the night when we had all that happen?

MR. SEGURA:
Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah.

MR. CRUSE:
Yeah. That's where that comes from. Okay. Does anybody have any issue with paying them for coming five days early?

MR. SEGURA:
I move to accept paying them. Now --

MR. CRUSE:
We'll just move to approve tab M.

MR. SEGURA:
Move to approve tab M.

MR. SKINNER:
Second.

MR. CRUSE:
We have a motion by Mr. Segura, 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?

MR. ROBICHAUX:

No.

MR. GUILBEAU:

No.

MR. CRUSE:

We have Mr. Robichaux and Mr. Guilbeau has the No's. Motion carries. Item N.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Mike, on the tabulation on Bernhard, it's dated April 25, 2014. Is that still good?

MR. BURROWS:

Yes, sir. If you look one more page, we actually ask Bernhard if the quote was still good and he said the price is still good for both. There should be an email from Mr. Brad Stokes. It was one of the questions that I asked about the quote myself.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Okay. I'm good. I'll move that Tab N be accepted.

MR. SKINNER:

Second.
MR. CRUSE:

Motion by Mr. Guilbeau, 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 response.)

Motion carries. Reports.

MR. BURROWS:

Okay.


V. Tab V, Lafayette Airport Monthly Fiscal Review for January. That concludes the reports.

MR. CRUSE:

Project Updates.
MR. BURROWS:

Okay. Under Project Updates:

W. Tab W, Taxiway Mike (Parallel Taxiway).

X. Tab X-ray, North GA Phase II.

Y. Tab Yankee, Perimeter Road Improvements.

Z. Tab Zulu, Master Plan Update.

AA. Tab Alpha Alpha, Noise Study - Work Order #8.

AB. Tab Alpha Bravo, Taxiway Seal Coat Project.

AC. Tab Alpha Charlie, Cargo Facility.

AD. Tab Alpha Delta, Air Traffic Control Tower Interior Upgrades 2014.

AE. Tab Alpha Echo, Main Terminal Interior Upgrades.

AF. And, Tab Alpha Foxtrot, LRA Signage Upgrades.

That concludes Project Updates.

MR. SKINNER:

Where are we on the cargo ramp facility, the cargo facility?

MR. SEGURA:

I had a discussion today with -- I had a discussion with UPS a week ago telling them that we would provide them with a proposal. I had a briefing today with the soon-to-be
incoming Executive Director concerning the
history of the project and where we are and the
specifics. And so he's going to be -- I'm
getting him all the information on the cost
that has come up with MBSB, the plans for the
project, as well as our upcoming proposal, you
know, that we may be battling to get his input
with it. Also, MBSB has come up with plans
that we have submitted to facility planning,
you know, to get everything in the shoot.

MR. SKINNER:

Are they both still onboard?

MR. SEGURA:

Yes, they are. So we should send that
proposal to them for them to start the process.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Mr. Chairman, if we could, I'd like to get
Adam with Domingue and Szabo to give us an up-
to-date status on AA tab, John Glenn Parking.
We've been having all that beautiful weather
and I don't see anything going on.

MR. THIBODEAUX:

They haven't done much. They went in, I
guess, it's the eastern portion of the lot.
They barricaded it all and they cleaned it
We haven't had any -- I haven't touched base with him again. I think we gave the motion to proceed last week.

MR. BURROWS:

They were out there today.

MR. THIBODEAUX:

They were out there today? So the next phase is to do the asphalt patching and then they will be able to do the striping. However, the wheel stops will require us to install, to be able to install the wheel stops, the contractor will have draw pins in the asphalt substantially long and there's an issue. The FAA came over into the area. Mike has been in contact with the FAA to get them to locate to locate the cable. But it's --

MR. SPEAKER:

We can move the cable.

MR. THIBODEAUX:

It will be weeks before they're able to assign somebody to locate that cable. So the earliest day they could possibly could have somebody is February 23rd.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Can't we reduce the length of those
anchors?

MR. THIBODEAUX:

The question is, is that within the corridor the FAA is really cautious about us doing any kind of excavation, so.

MR. GUILBEAU:

How about getting the contractor cutting the tree at 2:00 in the morning at four corners to come do it? Are we counting contract -- there's a dispute?

MR. THIBODEAUX:

Yes.

MR. SEGURA:

Do you have to have it at the wheel stops?

MR. THIBODEAUX:

No. What we told our contractor to do is just go ahead and do any striping that he needs to do, do the asphalt patching, do the striping. And we might have to flop a lot. In other words, start using that portion and then we can do the western side. And then we might have to wait until the FAA cables are marked to put the wheel stops in but the lot will be able to be used without those stops.

MR. GUILBEAU:
I'm good. Thank you, Adam.

MR. CRUSE:

Accept a motion to adjourn?

MR. SEGURA:

Move.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Second.

MR. CRUSE:

Motion by Mr. Segura, second by Mr. Guilbeau. Any 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 adjourned.

(Adjourned at 6:30 p.m.)
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