The LAFAYETTE AIRPORT COMMISSION MEETING, held before Lauren Alesi Gaspard, Certified Court Reporter, at the Lafayette Regional Airport, 200 Terminal Drive, 2nd Floor Main Conference Room, Lafayette, Louisiana, on the 11th day of March, 2015, beginning at 5:30 P.M.

APPEARANCES:

DEBBIE AMY
STEVEN PICOU
TODD SWARTZENDRUBER
VALERIE C. GARRETT
JOHN HEBERT
PAUL A. GUILBEAU, SR.
MATT CRUSE
PAUL SEGURA
CARROLL B. ROBICHAUX, JR.
TIMOTHY L. SKINNER

GENERAL AUDIENCE MEMBERS
MR. CRUSE:

    We’re going to call the Wednesday, March 11th, 2015 meeting to order. Rise and join me in the Pledge of Allegiance.

    (Pledge of Allegiance.)

MR. CRUSE:

    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.

MS. GARRETT:

    Valerie Garrett.

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

    Todd Swartzendruber.

MR. PICOU:
Stephen Picou.

MS. AMY:

Debbie Amy.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. I’ll accept a motion for the approval of the minutes from February 11, 2013.

MR. SEGURA:

Move to accept.

MR. CRUSE:

Motion by Mr. Segura.

MS. GARRETT:

Second.

MR. CRUSE:

Second by Ms. Garrett. 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.
All right. First of all, welcome everyone to the meeting. It’s been a long time coming, but it’s great to be able to introduce our new Director, Mr. Steven Picou. I’m sure most of you probably read a little bit about him, heard a little bit about him. We’ll be having a couple of different events over the coming weeks to kind of get him out into the community and meet everybody, but I’d like for him to just stand up just for a second, or sit down so we can hear you, just give us a quick bio about yourself and we can go from there.

MR. PICOU:

Thank you, Mr. Cruse. Steven Picou. I’m originally from Louisiana, raised in Cut Off. Went to Louisiana Tech. From there, got into airport operations at New Orleans International, five years there. Went to Albuquerque International for seven years, and then seven years in Amarillo. In Albuquerque wore many hats in construction, environmental issues, noise. And then in Amarillo, I was the Deputy Director of Aviation there.

So, thank you. Everyone’s been great. It’s been great to get back home and have some
good food. I appreciate it.

MR. CRUSE:

Steven’s been with us about two -- about exactly two weeks tomorrow. One of the biggest things we really wanted from the get go was someone that would live in the community, participate in the community, and be an active member in it. And, you know, Steven has jumped in with full force. He’s bought a house in Broussard. He’s got two children; one’s going to attend Comeaux and one in Youngsville Middle.

MR. PICOU:

Right.

MR. CRUSE:

So, his wife is going to be a school teacher. So, that’s pretty much the poster board for the all American, you know, Lafayette native, you know, native now. So, if anybody wants to meet him, shake his hand, stick around until after the meeting and I’m sure he will oblige.

Right now we’ll open it up for any public comments. That’s any comments from anyone regarding anything that’s not on the agenda for
tonight.
(No response.)
Nothing? Okay. We’ll go ahead and go to
the Director’s report.
MR. PICOU:
All right. Thank you Mr. Chairman. The
Director’s report, item number 1:
Classic Business Products-222 Tower Drive-
Copier Preventive Maintenance Contract. The
reason it’s in front of the Commission tonight
is because it is an automatic renewal and so
that needs to be approved — or Commission to
decide on that. This is for our copier
maintenance contract at the airport.
MR. CRUSE:
Okay. Next item.
MR. PICOU:
Okay. Second item is Trans States
Airlines. There was some communication about
Trans States. Trans States is a carrier for
United Airlines. They’re going to actually do
some of the flights, but there will be no
addition to the current flight schedule that
they have right now. They’re just going to use
their aircraft and this company will do the
flights for United on certain routes, on
certain flights.

MR. SKINNER:
Are they going to be marked different?

MR. CRUSE:
No. They’ll be -- they’re not -- I mean
they’ll still be United.

MR. PICOU:
They’ll still be United. They’ll be under
United delivery. There will be no change. The
public won’t see any types of changes. It’s
just going to be United is utilizing a
different company to fly this route.

Also, normally I know we usually do a Fly
Lafayette passenger statistics. That was an
error on our part, so we need to add that and
then --

MR. CRUSE:
Yeah, Robert, do you want to -- can you do
that for us, please?

MR. CALLAHAN:
Good evening. In February there were a
total of thirty-eight thousand two hundred
seventy (38,270) passengers. It’s the busiest
February in the history of the airport. Load
factors were all running between seventy (70%) and seven-three percent (73%). As far as media exposure, we had news stories about Mr. Picou’s arrival, some weather issues that we had that impact flights, and some stories about the start date for the new terminal tax, reminding people those won’t actually start being collected at the beginning of the year, but rather April 1st.

Fly Lafayette Club, we’re up to seventy seven hundred and four (7,704) as of this morning. We have fifty-six (56) businesses as sponsors. We had six hundred and sixteen (616) entries in February into the prize drawing and there were fifty-two (52) winners.

As far as the enplanements go, they’re running about fourteen percent (14%) more than they were last February. And if you remember back last February there were a number of cancellations due to weather. Deplanements are running about twenty percent (20%) over last year. So, it was a good month.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Did I understand to say it was the best month ever for February?
MR. CALLAHAN:

Yes.

MR. CRUSE:

It’s weird, though, because I drive, you know, here every day to go to the private side and for whatever reason, I don’t know if people are carpooling more now or maybe Uber’s had a huge effect or whatever, but there’s -- the parking situation has been much better. I mean, there’s like, there’s tons of extra parking spaces now, so.

MR. CALLAHAN:

Yeah. It’s going to be better for now, but come spring I think you’ll see it starting to fill up again.

MR. SKINNER:

It was just the best month for February, not the --

MR. CALLAHAN:

Yes, best month for February.

MR. SKINNER:

Not peak months where you still have --

MR. CALLAHAN:

Not the best month ever. That was May of last year.
MR. CRUSE:

All right, thank you.

MR. CALLAHAN:

You’re welcome.

MR. PICOU:

The other item will be financials, if you could look in your binder under the Director’s Report. It’s a preliminary and unaudited. There are some operations receipts, actual 2015 to -- budget is four percent (4%) and operations distributions minus two percent (-2%). Other income expenditures, thirty-four percent (34%), total available for operations, one hundred ninety-three percent (193%).

If we have some other questions, we can have someone from staff present if there are any questions related to the budget numbers.

MR. CRUSE:

So income’s up and expenses are down?

MR. PICOU:

That’s correct, yeah.

MR. CRUSE:

That’s good.

MR. SEGURA:

Wow, Steven, you’ve done an excellent job.
MR. CRUSE:

Okay. Discussion items.

MR. PICOU:

The first item is:

A/B Review of the Engineering Master Service Agreement Solicitation for Information.

Mr. Walt Adams will do a presentation and that will also kind of roll into the item B, which is the Terminal RFQ/RFP Status Update.

MR. ADAMS:

Good evening, Commissioners. We were tasked last month with a review of the current MSAs that are in effect, the Master Service Agreements for engineering, and the procurement process that went along with that to ensure that we were going to be abiding with any predetermined requirements in relation to that. So, we did a pretty thorough review of those, starting with the governing agency requirements, primarily FAA and LA DOTD Aviation Section.

And there’s really no variance from their requirements in the way that those were done. And it was about an eight and a half month process to make those selections. The
originals were authorized or when the contracts went into effect with UR -- three firms, excuse me, URS, DSA and LPA, and the effective date of three year contract with URS was 11/1/2011. And in June of 2014, a one year extension was approved, and it did not go into effect until one day after they had run their first three year contract. So, the one year extension will expire this coming November 1st at 2015.

There are a little bit of staggered dates in terms of when they actually were placed under contract. DSA was 11/9/2011 and their one year extension will also expire on 11/9 this year. LPA was on 12 -- excuse me, 10/18/2011 and 10/18/2015 respectively.

MR. SEGURA:

Okay. I have a question. They were all approved together --

MR. ADAMS:

But they were not contracted together. In other words, they went through the process with staff --

MR. SEGURA:

They signed their contracts on different dates?
MR. ADAMS:

Yes.

MR. SEGURA:

Is that an issue? Why wouldn’t you make them effective all on the same day?

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

It’s just the way they were -- they were --

MR. SEGURA:

Signed?

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

-- they were affected as of when they were signed.

MR. SEGURA:

Upon signature?

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

Yeah.

MR. ADAMS:

Since that time, there’s been quite a bit of an environmental change, both in the airport, the community and the region. And just to point those out, the economic landscape, as you all know, is continuing to evolve, but it’s certainly different than it was three and half years ago in relation to what you would have planned for a terminal.
The I-49 corridor program was a great concept and idea of trying to find legs. Today, it’s got legs, and it looks like it’s an extremely valid program that will require that the airport have a great deal of coordination with the I-49 design, particularly as it relates to the elevated section at Surrey and then also, ultimately ingress and egress from the airport terminal itself.

Most importantly, the penny tax referendum didn’t exist, the concept didn’t exist at that point, so that today you have a much more defined funding stream and pool of fund from which to plan and build your terminal. All those factors have driven an increased amount of security, excuse me, scrutiny from the public, from the media, and so forth that would behoove all of us to make sure that we’re addressing any requirements by any of the governing agencies and as well as any of the funding agencies to the letter as you move forward. So, the action I --

MR. GUILBEAU:

And --

MR. ADAMS:
-- I’m sorry.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Before you go forward, one question on the engineering contract.

MR. ADAMS:

Yes, sir.

MR. GUILBEAU:

They all expire somewheres around November.

MR. ADAMS:

This coming fall.

MR. GUILBEAU:

What’s the time frame that we have to make sure that we are on board with new engineering firms prior to November?

MR. ADAMS:

I can’t -- I’m a little bit aware of that but I would defer that to either Daniel Elsea or whatever.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Oh, okay.

MR. ADAMS:

We had some discussion this afternoon about that, but technically when they expire, you should have -- or you should probably be in that new solicitation process now.
MR. GUILBEAU:

You just answered my question. You said Paul shut up, the Director’s --

MR. ADAMS:

I just don’t have that type of answer for you.

MR. CRUSE:

I think when we spoke earlier, I think the last time we did the RFP, we made the selection in June -- or June, so there was a -- we’re probably almost to the point now where we need to issue the RFP to make a decision to have them in place for, before expiration.

MR. ADAMS:

Well, just as an aside, I’ll also mention the first time you did that was an eight and a half month duration to go through that process. I think it can probably be shortened to the twenty-eight week version, but there’s some mandates in terms of how much time you need to do that. The fallback position for you would be, and this bears a lot of discussion with staff, would be that you still have another year extension on those contracts if you decide to exercise those for any portion of those
projects in the pool.

The action I’m recommending is that we confer. And I’ve been with Todd on a couple of occasions here lately just trying to sort through the instruments that were the contracts that were exercised, so in an abundance of caution, I defer to Counsel to give you a firm legal definition as to what your ability to expand your search. From a business perspective, we wholeheartedly believe you should do so. We don’t think there’s anything, given the enormous change in scope here from what was originally contemplated, and the fact that you’re about to burn these contracts down.

I mean, they will expire about the -- within thirty days of the shortest time frame you can bring another team in under contract anyway. So, my recommendation would be to make the decision to open it up to a nationwide search for the highest and best firms and teams of design and constructors as possible out there.

If you were to do that, I think we’re -- are we one slide ahead? What would the world look like if you made that decision? Again, I
know you can’t read that. Let’s go back one slide, the time scale.

If you were to start that Monday, these are the milestones and the mandated intervals and periods of review study and issuance that the FAA, the LA DOTD, and the Louisiana Airport Manager’s Association not just recommend, but some of the funding is tied to this is mandated. It looks like an awfully long time, twenty-eight weeks to go through this process, but it is a complex endeavor that you’re about to engage in. And until we get some reading from any of the agencies that we can circumvent any of that, I think this is a worst case scenario, but I think you should plan on that. So that would -- if you started tomorrow you could execute the contract ostensibly by 9/7/15.

As we move into the next segment, I don’t know if there’s any questions before we move off this item, but this is a continuation of the same issue. In the new terminal issue, obviously, we’ll go to -- next slide. We’re going to talk about the project delivery model and solicitation process and our
recommendations, specifically.

The first is that we would work with the terminal, airport terminal committee, the subcommittee of the Board and staff to firmly define a program scope. The scope needs to be validated. There are quite a few numbers out there in terms of budgets and schedules and so forth that have been considered over the past few years, but the bottom line is you have a finite amount of funding and it’s our recommendation that before the RFQ and RFP packages go out, that you firmly define the scope of what you’re looking for, rather than ask for responses to tell you what you need.

The next is what project delivery model and in doing so, we went through quite a few -- we went through eleven different guides and interested parties and so forth in terms of what we would have to do to make that happen and what their preferences are. And our recommendation will be -- will definitely be some variation of a CMAR. There are more than one example of that and we want some time with staff to study that and Counsel to come up with what we think is absolutely the best tailored
that matches the scope of work and the funding that you have. I also recommend that staff and we can assist with developing a funding compliance matrix, which we don’t see any conflict between different agencies necessarily, but we don’t want to make any missteps that would prevent you from having the full, rightful funding that you’re after, and where you want to spend those dollars within your master program.

We’re also recommending a holistic master plan. There have been several master plans done in the past three years, mostly focusing on the terminal and the terminal area. Others looking at things, and there’s one in play right now that’s not complete, but with the advent of the I-49 corridor, we strongly recommend that ingress and egress to the airport and a direct connection to the interstate be considered as well as the internal traffic flow between general aviation in the terminal and an egress back out to that area without having to go through side streets and dead ends and a number of the things that you have to do right now.
I’m not prepared to say precisely which CMA model, CMRA model, AR model, but we’ve got -- that’s where we’re focused right now. We’ve got some discussion with FAA and other agencies to confirm our thinking, but we’re pretty confident with that.

So, we’ve talked about what we found in the MSA as they exist and given you what we think is our best project delivery recommendation. And I’ll be happy to answer any questions you might have, as well as, following those questions, I have some specific action steps to recommend to you.

MR. CRUSE:

Walt, you and I discussed earlier when I was looking at your brief, just kind of give us a little bit of a rundown on the CMAR process as far as where the CMAR contractor sits in regard to the flow or the work (phonetic) chart, basically. I know you lost your --

MR. ADAMS:

That’s okay.

MR. CRUSE:

-- slide disappeared, but --

MR. ADAMS:
Well --

MR. CRUSE:

It was new to me. I had never seen it that way before and it was kind of out of the box.

MR. ADAMS:

Well, construction manager at risk and there’s also a CMPM at risk that is a direct contract linkage to the owner. The design team, engineering teams and all the sub-trades and other contractors fit up under that CM at risk. That’s a total single source accountability model. Where we see problems evolve in many cases are where the design team is engaged early without that consideration and hope to, you know, forge that union downstream in more of a shotgun marriage fashion. And if that can be avoided, we strongly avoid -- we strongly recommend that.

I would much rather solicit, or recommend that you solicit whole teams of services that you can on balance look at and grade those accordingly. So, it is a single source accountability with a CMAR at the top.

MR. CRUSE:

Yeah, I was just -- I guess -- and there’s
been a lot of information being floated around out there, but I was under the assumption that with the CMAR process that the designer had to be a certain percentage complete with the design before you brought the CMAR contractor onboard, so you -- that, that’s --

MR. ADAMS:

There are some regs that call for that in certain instances and we’re sorting through that, but we’ve also seen where exactly what I’ve described is in action right now. So, again, I’m not prepared to give you the exact model of that, but it will be some variation of CMAR.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. And I’m assuming that Louisiana’s CMAR legislation is what drives our process, correct?

MR. ADAMS:

Well, in terms of your state component funding under FPNC, yes. They have a different name for it, but they, you know, there’s a -- recent legislation calls for early contractor involvement with a design and there’s all sorts of models, but they are certainly utilizing
that model on a number of projects, yes.

MR. CRUSE:

Yeah, I’m just trying to figure out where -- who actually sets the guidelines or the standards for that process because I’ve seen the process that the Louisiana State Legislation approved for use as it relates to, I’m assuming, FPNC funding. And I’m assuming that’s what New Orleans -- it was written, basically, for that project and I’m assuming that’s the flow that they’re using, but as a -- where do we fall in there since we’re, you know, you’re going to have basically three different funding sources in there?

Do you go with the -- I mean, is the FAA’s guidance on CMAR any more or less restrictive than the State’s or is that something you’ve still got to look into?

MR. ADAMS:

They’re fairly consistent in that regard. The only thing is in time process. I’m not sure I’m going to answer your question correctly, but I would say that if your funding streams are such that you can dedicate the FAA component of that funding to non-terminal
issues, it’s logical that the terminal will be
built faster and will be with lesser
bureaucracy than it would otherwise be, but
that doesn’t mean we won’t get completely
waivered.

Again, that’s the purpose of, you know, a
funding compliance matrix, to make sure we’re
not leaving anybody out and it’s in priority of
who’s the most important, where the dollars are
coming from. So that’s a strategy that the
Director and I touched on this afternoon. Yet
to be developed. We really don’t know the
extent of all the funding streams and we’re
just examining all the requirements in every
area to make sure there isn’t a misstep before
we make a final recommendation on the
procurement process and the best model to get
you there.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay.

MR. SKINNER:

Matt, I just -- the advisory circle has a
CMAR section and I think it does address, to a
small extent, governing authority, who takes
precedent over who. There was an addendum to
that advisory circle, so there is some guidance
in there from the FAA.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay.

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

If I might add, also. The public bid law —
and this is actually what you had sent me an
e-mail on a few months back — provides for a
CMAR to be used now. And that’s really kind of
separate from the whole funding/compliance
issues. That’s just complying with the public
bid law. So, there is going to be a structure
set out in the statute that you have to follow,
which I agree, from everything I’ve seen, it
all kind of works together. You know, the FAA
says okay you can do this, you know, refer to
your state laws on that, that sort of thing.

MR. SKINNER:

That’s correct.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay.

MR. ADAMS:

And any other questions you might have?

MR. GUILBEAU:

I had one and it’s related to I-49 and I
guess I want to drill into my fellow
Commissioner’s mind because I discussed it with
the District Administrator this week. We’re
kind of an elite structure here and they’re
going to try to direct or pay us to do the
things that they will take away from us. And
they -- a lot of times they use the sequence
that they don’t have professionals on board to
design a runway. And if we have to extend our
runway, that’s one of the issues I have. We’ve
got to require DOTD to replace us in kind. We
don’t want to accept any money from them. Do
what it takes to replace it, whatever expertise
it takes because there’s a lot of consequences
involved.

So, I would want to replant that in my
Commissioner’s mind because I’ll probably be
gone when that happens. I-49’s not being built
tomorrow, but we need to get the DOTD to
replace us in kind and not accept the money
because there’s two challenges. We might not
get enough money to replace this. You know, I
don’t know how deep you’ll be involved, but I
just wanted to...

MR. ADAMS:
Well, I think all that’s worth considering in your, what I refer to as globally as a holistic master plan because, again, you don’t want to misstep and lose out on some funding or spend dollars you don’t need to spend. I think already Staff has determined that there’s going to have to be a shift of that runway. It’s got to be shortened on this end in order to accommodate the height of an elevated I-49 at Surrey on that approach. So, it’s got to be moved a certain degree already. And that’s something that has to be folded into the overall master schedule of events. With that, I’ll just -- if there’s anything else -- I will tell you that specific recommendations from this point forward involve a what I would call standing up to the terminal committee. You need a committee to work with staff, to work with us, on almost a, not a daily, but a routine basis to form up not only the scope of work and identify the best process to be recommended and ratified by the full Board in terms of how to go about. In relation to that, I am advising you that you would do well as has been done in many other areas of the states
with these types of projects and public funding, you have a lot of resources in Acadiana that could be helpful to you in terms of people that purchase construction and design services on a regular basis, whether it be the university, hospital systems, the consolidated government, but considered loaned executives from those entities that could be an advisory only, no power, just an advisory ad-hoc committee to work with the terminal committee in terms of narrowing the field of contenders to going through the process and so forth.

And I think that would be a really good statement to make to the public that’s funding a large portion of this or most of it. And then I’d -- one other thing, I spoke with some of you earlier. You might want to go to the Charleston Airport website, they’ve got a major expansion going there. It’s not too dissimilar from this airport in terms of size and location.

They’ve done an extraordinarily good job with the website called Trip that you can, anybody can go there, see what’s going on, what decisions have been made, you know, see the
progress of what’s going on. It’s a really
good response to their local sales tax option
and how they inform the public. So, I’d advise
that.

And then the last thing, is just to be very
clear, I advise you to open up this process and
search for the most qualified teams of
resources out there that can get the job done
in the most expedient fashion at the best cost
with great competition. You know, that is not
to preclude anybody that’s currently involved.
They certainly are invited to participate along
with anybody else. And I think there will be
quite a response out there from the -- in terms
of competition, so that’s what we were charged
with. That’s what I’ve recommended. And I’ll
be happy to work with Staff moving forward to
initiate that at your direction.

MR. CRUSE:

I do have one, because I’m still -- with
the process that you had laid out and the time
line that we looked at, is that --

MR. ADAMS:

Do you want to bring that back?

MR. CRUSE:
-- getting us to a point where we already
have the contractor and the design firm --

MR. ADAMS:

Yes.

MR. CRUSE:

-- chosen by September?

MR. ADAMS:

That’s what we would recommend, yes.

MR. CRUSE:

If we follow your time line, by September
we would have the contractor and the design
firm in place?

MR. ADAMS:

That would be our --

MR. CRUSE:

The team? Except for the subs and that
comes later.

MR. ADAMS:

Subject to further discussion and strategy
with the terminal committee, that would be our
goal. I would tell you, this is probably as
good as you’re going to get. It may be longer.

MR. CRUSE:

Do we have a hard copy of that?

MR. ADAMS:
We have all the documents that we excerpted this from.

MR. CRUSE:

Can you just email us --

MR. ADAMS:

Sure.

MR. CRUSE:

-- a copy of your --

MR. ADAMS:

Yeah. It's directly out of the Louisiana Airport Manager's handbook which references FAA circulars and the LA DOTD.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. So, this --

MR. ADAMS:

And this is the abbreviated version.

MR. CRUSE:

Yeah. But, I mean, in reality, I mean, that's really better than what I thought as far as I didn’t think we would have a contractor on board probably until --

MR. ADAMS:

Ostensibly, depending on the model that we recommend to you.

MR. CRUSE:
Yeah.

MR. SEGURA:

But that’s part of the CMAR, is having a contractor help you in the design.

MR. ADAMS:

Well, CMAR, Construction Manager At Risk. They’re at risk for the bottom line; therefore, it’s our contention that they need to not just have the input into the design, they need to control the design.

MR. SEGURA:

Right.

MR. CRUSE:

So we’ll be putting together the RFD and the RFQ for the entire processes?

MR. ADAMS:

We will. And this model, from the manager’s handbook, really addresses that, that you can close it from thirty-four to twenty-eight weeks by making that one uniform process. And basically we do that anyway, you just go through a lot of analysis and then you crank up the proposal process. It’s kind of ridiculous. You need to -- whoever’s going to submit for their qualification needs to understand the
entire process and what’s going to be required
and how it’s going to be scored very
transparently. So, that’s how we would
recommend it happen in any type of project of
this scope.

MR. CRUSE:
Okay.

MR. GUILBEAU:
One more comment that you touched on from
Picou’s information. I was asked this
afternoon if we have a link on our website when
the progress would start that people could go
to look at.

MR. PICOU:
That’s correct. We’ll have a link. I
already have one for the terminal for the tax.
That was already there, so we’ll use that same
link. So there will be a link on our web page.

MR. ADAMS:
There’s one final recommendation I make and
I’ve discussed with Mr. Picou as well as Todd.
There are very, very strict rules with Code of
Federal Regs in terms of communication with any
employee, anybody directly, indirectly, any
Commission member, any selection member, having
any contact from the point you make the
decision that you are going to release an RFP
or you’re going to have a competition for these
types of services. Communication has to be
isolated. And they’re -- Steve and both Todd
have these documents that I suggest they
distribute to everybody, but it would preclude
any vendors, anyone trying to approach this
body from this point forward or the point where
you move to move forward with this process, for
any communication whatsoever.

I further recommend that all communication
in that regard be directed solely to the
Executive Director who will file it
electronically and it will be there.

MR. SKINNER:

Let me ask you a question on that, Walt. I
mean we interact with a lot of these guys in
the community now, so is that including just
general conversation or just specific to the
airport? It’s going to be hard for a lot of us
not to --

MR. ADAMS:

Well, let me give you an example. Let’s
say, you know, people are going to approach
you. Obviously, they’re trying to develop their business and there are people in the community that are interested and they’d like to have a piece of -- I’m not suggesting that that be totally closed off, I would just recommend you be very careful. Anything in writing, anything that can be recorded is discoverable and it’s not so much that you’re going to do something that’s inappropriate, it’s more in my mind where I’ve seen it, the major problem, is when you have someone disgruntled because they felt they were disadvantaged in the process, they bring that to light, share it with the media and then you’ve got a serious problem on your hands.

That’s just good policy to just direct it to the Director.

MR. CRUSE:

Question on the time line. So we have April 27th as the point where we can advertise the RFQ and RFP. In order to meet that deadline, how -- is that an achievable deadline? And if it is achievable, I mean, how much -- I want to kind of define -- let’s take baby steps and define that process first.
MR. ADAMS:

Okay.

MR. CRUSE:

Is that something -- I’m guessing that the first steps probably need to be yourself, Steven, staff, get together and start structuring the RFQ. And then at some point you’re going to need the terminal sub-committee involvement to validate your, the process more.

MR. ADAMS:

Not only validate the process, but more importantly validate the --

MR. CRUSE:

Scope.

MR. ADAMS:

-- the scope. You know, what is it you want to build here. You’ve got a lot of -- you have a lot of great information that’s been generated to help you make that decision, but that decision hasn’t been made. You haven’t made a selection based on what you can afford at this point. So there’s a financial model there and obviously I would think you would want to build as fine and serviceable a terminal as you could possibly build with what
you have. So, it’s -- I think we’ve got to key
in on the scope issue right up front and at the
same time we’re probably going to work the
Terminal Committee a little bit because I don’t
think we could possibly do this if we didn’t
have contact with staff and them at least twice
a week, you know, to go through where we’re at
in the stages.

This is doable. It has a lot to do with
the availability of who’s involved. I have no
lack of confidence that -- just having the
interaction with staff this past week, I’ve got
to tell you, Dan Elsea has just done a yeoman’s
job of pulling all kinds of documents and
records together for us. And they’re, you
know, they’re going to do their part. And we
can, you know -- if we were to say we’re going
to come back to you every month and report
where we’re at, you’re not going to make the
schedule. There’s going to have to be called
meetings. There’s going to have to be
committee meetings and strategy sessions to get
where you want to be.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay.
MR. ADAMS:

In terms of the format and the language and, you know, the outlines of the RFP’s, that’s the easy part. The tough part is setting the grading scales and weighting those to something that makes sense for you. What makes sense in Kansas may not make sense in Louisiana. Catch my drift? It just depends on what your objectives are.

We almost having to have a little planning retreat here, how you’re going to do this.

MR. SEGURA:

And let me ask you, Walt, while the advertisement of the RFQ will what the intention is to seek as many qualified parties to do this work, you do want to define the scope so that you don’t get everybody and his brother that has no business or doesn’t even know how to build a --

MR. ADAMS:

Right.

MR. SEGURA:

-- or tackle a job like this. So that it kind of weeds out -- I don’t want to say weed out, but you know what I mean, that you don’t
get just every proposal from literally everyone.

MR. ADAMS:

   Well, that’s the reason --

MR. SEGURA:

   That doesn’t have the qualifications.

MR. ADAMS:

   Yeah, the RFQ has to be written so succinctly that that’s not possible. I mean, lots of people respond that aren’t qualified, but the purpose of I would say both the Advisory Committee and the Terminal Committee as those come in, you know, we weed through those as quickly and whittle it down to a manageable size. And then there’s a very structured interview process. There’s a, you know, analysis period.

   The things that aren’t malleable, can’t be any less than you see here, are the periods of advertisement and review.

MR. SEGURA:

   Right.

MR. ADAMS:

   Those are not -- you can’t change those up.

MR. CRUSE:
Because one of the things I saw in the state statute as it relates to CMAR is we’re going to have to -- it’s very definitive on who is a part of that selection committee. You know, it actually defines --

MR. ADAMS:

Yes.

MR. CRUSE:

It’s got to be one of the members of the committee has to be a contractor that does similar work, that’s not interested in bidding on this project. You know, I mean so we’re really going to have to --

MR. ADAMS:

We’re just -- we’re just pulling that stuff together right now.

MR. CRUSE:

Yeah, okay, so.

MR. ADAMS:

And it will take a little bit to make sure we’ve got all those bases covered. But you’re correct and I think --

MR. CRUSE:

I guess do they don’t have to be involved with the -- I guess our homework is to define
the scope and write the RFP and RFQ. They get involved --

MR. SEGURA:

From an advisory standpoint as he mentioned earlier.

MR. ADAMS:

Yeah, in the analysis phase analysis and recommendation, you know.

MR. CRUSE:

Yeah.

MR. ADAMS:

On the selection --

MR. SKINNER:

Right. The committee, the Selection Committee is ultimately responsible for voting on the criteria such -- all the criteria and scope, so I think what you’re saying is the terminal committee will come up with it, but the selection committee will have to adopt it and vote on it.

MR. CRUSE:

So the same selection committee that will be responsible for evaluating --

MR. ADAMS:

That’s correct.
MR. CRUSE:

-- the RFQs --

MR. ADAMS:

Right. That’s the authority.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay.

MR. SKINNER:

That’s the ultimate authority, so whatever
the terminal committee does, you can just make
the selection committee the same as the
terminal committee and --

MR. CRUSE:

Well, no, because, I mean, there are --

MR. SKINNER:

We’d have to add some independent
consultants.

MR. CRUSE:

There’s actually very few members of the
this commission that will be part of that
selection committee from the way I read it.

MR. ADAMS:

Right, right. I think that -- I think that
you can -- as long as they’re not paid and as
long as they have no connection or any benefit
from the selection process, you can certainly
involve and appoint ad hoc committee members in the selection process. It’s done every day on major projects with the state universities and so forth. They purposefully draw in that talent and it also provides a degree of insulation from any appearance of impropriety to have that much community involvement in it. But you’ve got the expertise in Lafayette to do this, without a doubt.

MR. CRUSE:

Yeah. I just want to make sure we don’t start doing something and we have to backtrack and --

MR. ADAMS:

Right.

MR. CRUSE:

And Todd actually has a -- can you read the?

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

Yeah, I have the statute of -- I think it’s just --

MR. CRUSE:

As it relates to the members of the --

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

Right.
MR. CRUSE:

-- committee.

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

What we’re looking at here is because the statute says you’re going to pick the design professional the way you normally do. So that’s going to go through the Commission’s normal Selection Committee. As far as picking the CMAR, that contractor, the committee shall consist of no more than five individuals as follows: One design professional in discipline of, but not involved in the project; one licensed contractor in the discipline of, but not involved in the project; one representative of the owner, which is the Airport Commission; two members at large. And that’s it, five people; only one of which is going to be from the Airport Commission.

MR. SKINNER:

We’re looking at two separate Selection Committees then?

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

This is what the CMAR for the contractor, the construction manager at risk.

MR. CRUSE:
Or could it be --

MR. ADAMS:

Well, I think -- Well, that’s one of the of the things that we’ll have to run to ground, but I think in combination those statutes may not address the single source accountability issue there. That doesn’t mean it’s not qualified, but I think you’d have to merge those requirements into one, but I think you can accomplish that with what we’re suggesting at this point. We’re going to make sure with Counsel that’s the case. But I would also say that whatever -- our recommendation is the Terminal Committee and the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee bring to the full Board a recommendation. And it takes the full Board to make that decision at several intervals in this process.

It’s just that the full Board is not burdened with an awful lot of day-to-day minutia to get to those decisions.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay, well, we’ll get to -- then we’ll start it immediately and we’ll make it happen. So, you’re going to get with staff --
MR. ADAMS:

If that’s your directive.

MR. CRUSE:

-- soon. Yeah, absolutely. I mean, let’s start the process.

MR. ADAMS:

Okay.

MR. CRUSE:

And then as needed we will put the Terminal Committee or any substitutes in there to get a subcommittee of three of us together as quickly as possible whenever necessary to try to drive this -- try to put somebody driving the bus, so.

MR. ADAMS:

Well, we’ll put it full bore and make sure that what we can do will happen. We won’t delay anything, but we want to be cautious and thorough in terms of what we advise you to. Again, I think that both Steve and Todd have those, these regs that they’ll distribute to you directly.

MR. SKINNER:

And what’s your recommendation? Who can we refer everybody to? Will it be the --
MR. ADAMS:
The executive director.

MR. SKINNER:
Okay. All right.

MR. ADAMS:
Any questions?

MR. CRUSE:
Thanks, Walt, I appreciate it.

MR. ADAMS:
Thank you.

MR. GUILBEAU:
Mr. Chairman, I have one quick question.
What if we amended the selection committee?
Are we a selection committee as a whole, the whole commission? Is that what happens?

MR. SKINNER:
We amended the policy, but that policy can have up to all the commissioners --

MR. CRUSE:
Up to all.

MR. SKINNER:
-- it can be fewer.

MR. CRUSE:
We’re not restricted to only three. What we may -- we need to make sure that we don’t
start down a road to find out that we may have
gone a little bit too far before we brought on
other people that have -- are mandatory members
of the selection committee, so I just want to
make sure we don’t do that.

MR. GUILBEAU:
I just want the Director to tell us where
we’ve got to turn in our cell phones when this
starts.

MR. CRUSE:
No personal emails.
Okay, next item.

MR. PICOU:
C. Item C, Home Bank Fiscal Agent ATM
Operations Renewal.
Make a motion that that be moved due to the
fact that -- not a motion, I’m sorry, make a
recommendation that it be removed. There was
some more information that came out and that we
learned through this and so we were going to
hold out.

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:
We don’t need any action.

MR. PICOU:
We don’t need action.
MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

We’ve just decided not to take it up.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. We’ll table it and move on.

MR. PICOU:


This Capital Improvement Plan presents, outlines, proposed funding for capital expenditures for 2015 through 2019. CIP as a plan and in no way serves as an obligation for the Commission or designated allocations specifically with regards to future debt service.

We recommend, staff recommends approval and the CIP to be submitted to the FAA for inclusion in the Airport Capital Improvement Plan, as well as basis to begin the process for garnering appropriations through the other -- through other requested funding agency. Inside of that you’ll see in your documentation we were notified by FAA that we needed to get some information filled and from Daniel, FAA, and Louisiana Department of Transportation, we need something to them by March 15. So that was
just came to us last -- late last week, and so
daniel worked and got this together.
as you look through the documentation, you
can see there are many funding sources that
daniel looked at and recommended that we look
forward to -- move forward in trying to reach
out and get those funding sources. they're
outside of just the faa normal lines, so lines
of where we get funding normally get funding.

so if there are any questions on that?

mr. guilbeau:

i move to approve.

mr. cruse:

we have a motion to approve by mr.
guilbeau.

mr. skinner:

second.

mr. cruse:

second by tim, okay, mr. 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.)
    Motion carries. Next item.

MR. PICOU:
    Okay.

E. Next item is Runway 4 Right-22 Left Improvements-Overlay-Diamond B-Change Order #10.

This Change Order provides for additional work hours not anticipated in the original pop out Change Order #9. Two additional days were allowed to complete the work. The substantial completion walk-through is scheduled for March 6th, which occurred and will verify the repair work completion.

Mr. Cruse was privy to the development and approval of Change Order 10, so recommend ratification of the Chairman’s actions.

MR. CRUSE:
    Yeah. If anyone has any questions, Daniel can answer them. Daniel and I kind of worked on this. This was in the period when Mike was
gone and basically there was -- I think there
was a weather issue that pushed them back and,
you know, plus they needed a couple of
additional days to get it done. So, we made
the decision to move forward and to get it
done.

MR. SKINNER:

I’ll make a motion that we accept the
ratification Change Order #10.

MR. CRUSE:

Motion by Mr. Skinner. Do we have a
second?

MR. GUILBEAU:

Second.

MR. CRUSE:

Second. Was that you?

MR. GUILBEAU:

Yeah.

MR. CRUSE:

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

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Are we going to have any additional costs
involved in this? Staff or -- for two more
days?
MR. PICOU:

On this particular project?

MR. CRUSE:

Not for the repairs of the pop outs. The contractor is paying -- is doing that at their own cost and they’re paying the engineer for their time and services for those repairs.

MR. ROBICHAX:

What about staff? Do we have anybody on staff that’s at projects? On weekends do we have to call somebody out on overtime?

MR. ELSEA:

One of the requests that were -- Daniel Elsea with LAC staff. One of the requests that was made to compile the costs that we have incurred from November of ’13 when we first did the original substantial completion walk-through to the point where we are at now, we’ve worked with AECOM and compiled the costs for them, for us, for legal fees and that was an item to be brought up in the next agenda item, but we’ll wait for that action.

But we have -- it’s in the neighborhood of Fifteen Thousand Dollars ($15,000.00).

MR. CRUSE:
Yeah. So, let’s address -- we’re going to address -- it’s going to be addressed in two separate items. 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. PICOU:

F. Item F, Runway 4 -- Runway 4 Right-22 Left Improvements-Overlay-Diamond B-Substantial Completion.

Mr. Chairman, I recommend we defer this to the Strategic Committee for further discussion.

MR. GUILBEAU:

I move.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. We have a motion by Mr. Guilbeau to defer this to the Strategic Committee for --
MS. GARRETT:
Second.

MR. CRUSE:
-- further discussion. And a second by Ms. Garrett. 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. PICOU:
G. Mr. Chairman, Item G is Solicitation of Request for Proposals for Runway 11-29 Rehabilitation.
Staff requests approval for a solicitation of request for proposal to design the rehabilitation of Runway 11-29 in accordance with the State DOTD line item appropriation for 2013-2014. The solicitation will be a dual-
phased approach, with phase one involving a pavement condition study to determine the correct methodology of rehabilitation. Phase two would encompass the design of the project based on the recommendations from the pavement study, consideration of funding, state statutes mandates a grant process before June, 2016.

Would you like me to go through the next one?

MR. SKINNER:

I’m going to have questions on this one. Can we just go through this one first?

MR. GUILBEAU:

I would suggest we handle them separately.

MR. CRUSE:

Yeah, we can separate them.

MR. GUILBEAU:

And maybe Mr. Picou, just maybe next time on the agenda separate them, so we’re going on them individually.

MR. PICOU:

Okay. Yes, sir. Got it.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Thank you.

MR. CRUSE:
Okay. So, you want to make a motion or ask your question first?

MR. SKINNER:
I’ve got a question on the second one.

MR. CRUSE:
On the second one? Okay. Any questions -- well, let’s -- I’ll take a motion on the first item. I’ll accept a motion for approval.

MR. SKINNER:
I move that we approve the Runway 11-29 rehabilitation request for proposal, or solicitation for request for proposal.

MR. CRUSE:
Okay, we have a motion by Mr. Skinner.

MR. ROBICHAUX:
Second.

MR. CRUSE:
Second by Mr. Robichaux. Anyone comments or questions from the Commission?

MR. GUILBEAU:
One quick question, Tim. The selection of that’s going to be as per we just discussed, it could be the whole -- it could be the total of the whole Commission?

MR. CRUSE:
Could be.

MR. SKINNER:

What we’ve done in past is the Chairman appoints the Committee and then the Commission approve that Committee, I believe.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Well, I just want to make sure we abide by the amendment.

MR. SKINNER:

We have -- the Committee has to be appointed by the Director, by the Chairman, himself, according to the new policy.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Okay, I’m good.

MR. SKINNER:

And my recommendation would be to stick with what we did in the past. One commissioner, one staff member, and one independent person on this particular one.

MR. SEGURA:

But the motion is just to solicit the proposals.

MR. CRUSE:

Yes.

MR. ROBICHAXU:
But they’ve got to start them.

MR. SKINNER:

So we have to put the committee together to do it.

MR. CRUSE:

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.

MR. PICOU:

Next item under G was North GA Aviation Improvement Phase III, which we will separate out next time into -- that will be next letter down.

Staff requests approval for solicitation of RFP to design the third phase of improvement for North GA Aviation apron in accordance with
the State DOT line item appropriations for 2014-2015. Solicitation will be a dual approach. Phase I will only consist of alternative market analysis to recently completed master plan.

This analysis will seek to determine the specific future uses of the improvement area, integrating current tenant demand and aircraft constraints, developing an airport based subdivision parts of development. Pending consensus of the analysis findings, Phase II will encompass the design of the apron improvement.

MR. SKINNER:

Daniel, come on up. This is something that’s been recommended a long time ago and then we kind of put it on hold because we were trying to figure out what we were going to do on the North GA ramp and build a new hangar. So, what’s the status of our current hangar request? Are we still working on it?

MR. ELSEA:

I think there was an application to lease, but I don’t think we’re any further along than we were.
MR. SKINNER:

    Okay. So, what I -- and I’m assuming you
    wrote this?

MR. ELSEA:

    I did, yes.

MR. SKINNER:

    Okay, so the intention is to get the -- to
    figure out what we need to do there first?

MR. ELSEA:

    Yeah. I would say that we, admittedly,
    don’t have the expertise in house to determine
    if we need a subdivision plan.

MR. SKINNER:

    Right.

MR. ELSEA:

    We did reach out to certain consultants and
    they say that’s not a good idea, other
    consultants say it is. But they’re basing on
    other airports’ approaches. We have things
    that are unique here. You know, you’re seeing
    a shift in larger aircraft, but that might not
    precipitate 100 x 100 foot subdivision, so it’s
    best to look at it outside house. And I think
    there was a budget amendment back in September
    allocating -- it wasn’t dedicated to this, but
it was Fifty Thousand Dollars ($50,000.00). My
intention is to go after State funding to pay
for it --

MR. SKINNER:

Right.

MR. ELSEA:

And if not, the market analysis will be
covered by us.

MR. SKINNER:

Okay. That was one of my other questions.
We did budget out specifically for that
project, but if you can run it through the
State, now I think that would be better and we
can put that money somewhere else. Are we
going to request a plan first?

MR. CRUSE:

It wasn’t budgeted for that project, it was
budgeted for basically looking at and doing an
analysis of that area, but not as it relates to
the apron, specifically.

MR. SKINNER:

Well, it was part of it.

MR. ELSEA:

And we can integrate other portions. We’ve
looked at where the self-serve fuel tank is,
would it be financially feasible to move that
somewhere else and put a hangar there; would be
something on our master plan that shows
development moving out towards where the T
hangars are. There were some talks of covered
tie downs. I think there are a lot of things
that the master plan that we just finished was
limited in scope. We could have progressed in
that alternative, but the budget wasn’t there.
So, this is taking that out and looking at it
like Walt said, holistically. Just looking at
that project.

MR. SKINNER:

So we look at just at the right there by
Hangar 11 would be the only section?

MR. ELSEA:

Well, it’s phase three. I think we can --
that was the next approach. The pavement there
is somewhat in bad condition, but doesn’t
necessitate that we use it there. We can use
it by the T hangars -- there’s options.

MR. SKINNER:

Our intention was to do this analysis to
figure out where we could put everything:
Future T hangars, shade hangars, regular
hangars.

MR. ELSEA:

If we want that in the scope, sure.

MR. SKINNER:

I mean, that was our intention and that’s what I like to see.

MR. ELSEA:

Okay.

MR. SKINNER:

And then the second phase of this would be to actually do the design work for whatever they come up with?

MR. ELSEA:

I would say to focus on -- there was Two Million Dollars ($2,000,000.00) appropriated in the ‘14-‘15 priority program as to how to appropriately use that funding. So, if it’s to do a subdivision plans, asphalt, concrete, if that’s the plan or whatever comes out of the study, that most effectively uses that.

MR. SKINNER:

So then my final question would be: Could this be added onto the master plan update or do we need to do this separate?

MR. ELSEA:
At this point, it’s probably best to do it separately.

MR. SKINNER:

Do it separate. Okay. I’m good.

MR. ELSEA:

We paid for the master plan mostly in house. We sought Five Thousand (5,000.00) for State monies. We could reach out to them and ask if we can use Domingue and Szabo and RS&H to do that and just do an amendment to the contract. It’s something we could ask.

MR. SKINNER:

I mean, they’ve already done the GA ramp analysis, you know, it would be nice if they could do the rest of them. I mean, it would be easy for them to come in and do.

MR. ELSEA:

We can look into it.

MR. SEGURA:

I’ll make a motion to approve staff’s recommendation with the solicitation of the request for proposal.

MR. CRUSE:

We have a motion by Mr. Segura.

MR. ROBICHAUX:
Second.

MR. CRUSE:

Second by Mr. Robichaux.

MR. GUILBEAU:

I have one question for the Commission. How did the Fifty Thousand (50,000.00) get in the budget?

MR. CRUSE:

As long as we're just joking, you can put a port-a-let -- you can put a port-a-let in place of that self-serve fuel tank and it would get used more than the self-serve fuel tank would by the way, so.

Okay. Any further comments or questions from the Commission?

MR. SEGURA:

We need a second.

MR. CRUSE:

We already seconded it.

MR. SEGURA:

Okay.

MR. CRUSE:

From the public?

(No response.)

All in favor?
COMMISSIONERS:

Aye.

MR. CRUSE:

All opposed?

(No response.)

Motion carries. Next item.

MR. PICOU:

Okay, Mr. Chairman. The next item is Scheduled Business Consensus Items.

H. H is request for Bell Helicopters-Renaming of Tower Drive to Jet Ranger X.

I. And the item is Daily Landscape Management-Exercise of First Option.

J. J is Lafayette Coca-Cola Bottling Company-One Year Contract Extension.

K. PHI, Inc.-118 Shepard Drive-6th Year Option Renewal.

L. Southern Sweets-One Year Contract Extension.

M. La Petite Cajun Café and Bar-Month-to-Month Contract-Approval.

MR. SKINNER:

I’ve got some individual questions, I don’t want to pull any out.

MR. CRUSE:
Okay.

MR. SKINNER:

That Coke machine, that’s the same one
that's always empty? Does anybody know?

MR. ROBICHAUX:

The one in security?

MR. SKINNER:

I know we’ve got one that’s always empty.
I get pictures of it all the time.

MR. PICOU:

Where is it located?

MR. CRUSE:

It’s in the secure area.

MR. SKINNER:

And that’s the one that’s always empty.

MR. CRUSE:

Yeah.

MR. PICOU:

Okay.

MR. SKINNER:

So, I mean, should we maybe do something --
well, then I tell you, I want to pull J.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay.

MR. SKINNER:
And then L, Southern Sweets, are they in that secure area? Is that the same? Who are they?

MR. PICOU:

Downstairs near bag claim.

MR. SKINNER:

Okay. All right, I’m good.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Question on M.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

We’re going to go on the café month to month. What’s the notification time on month to month? Does it go revert back to the original lease on notification of wanting to cancel? Is it sixty days or?

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

Typical month-to-month, I believe it’s a ten-day notice period or maybe it’s thirty. I’d have to look in the code to see, but it wouldn’t be more than thirty days or one month. And the reason -- I don’t know, the reason I guess it says it in here is because we needed to request a proposal because this lease is up
again, so in order to keep them running until that process is done, that’s why it’s going to be month to month.

MR. PICOU:

Mr. Robichaux, our plan is to go out to get the RFP out on the street for a concessionaire -- the concessionaire come in and do a nationwide search.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

My major concern is I hate to get a thirty-day notice and we be without anybody in there for three, four, five months.

MR. PICOU:

There would be a transition. We would not give the thirty-day notice until we had the other team in place --

MR. CRUSE:

If they give us --

MR. ROBICHAUX:

No, if they gave us --

MR. PICOU:

Oh, if they give us -- Yeah.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Tomorrow we got thirty days, we can’t have anybody in place to even serve coffee.
MR. PICOU:

There’s been indication that she is
interested in making a proposal to us, so the
current vendor is interested in continuing
those operations under a new contract.

MR. SEGURA:

But they could walk in thirty days?

MR. PICOU:

They could.

MR. CRUSE:

Let’s pull it.

MR. SEGURA:

What’s their cancellation requirements now?

MR. ROBICHAUX:

That’s what I was asking.

MR. SEGURA:

The lease, to serve out the term of the
lease?

MR. CRUSE:

The lease is up.

(Indiscernible - Cross Talk.)

MR. PICOU:

We’d have to look it up. We can get that.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

In fact we can -- I’d like to pull it and
request from Mr. Hebert and Ms. Hebert about possibly doing a ninety-day extension while we’re in the process of doing the RFQ’s or whatever we have RFP’s.

MR. PICOU:

      Okay.

MR. ROBICHAX:

      So we can have that in place and not take a chance of not having anybody in there for thirty days, sixty days.

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

      What we can do is do a lease amendment, whether it’s month to month or ninety days or whatever, similar to what we did with the rental car agencies. We’re going to have something in writing. We’re not just going to let those go month to month under operation of law so, you know, we can put something in there to protect the Commission as far as notice requirements for termination.

MR. ROBICHAX:

      That’s what I would like, either that or see if they would do a ninety-day extension. To me that would be the easiest way to do it, just have them do a ninety-day extension.
MR. GUILBEAU:

Commissioner Robichaux, she called me on this and obviously I referred it to Mr. Picou, but she related to me she knows it’s going to the RFP. She related to me that her liquor license expires in November and December, which would fit in with the RFP. Her insurance was due April 1st. She knows she can get a rebate on that and she told me there was no -- you know, she has no concern of giving it up and submitting to RFP. But I agree with Todd, you know, if we need to go legal. She was afraid she’d renew liquor license and couldn’t get reimbursed.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

What we’re doing by either the ninety days or something, we’re protecting us and we’re protecting her, basically, giving her ninety days instead of month to month. That helps her make up her mind on liquor license --

MR. CRUSE:

We’ll pull that motion -- we’ll pull that item and then make a motion to authorize staff to execute a ninety-day term.

MR. ROBICHAUX:
We didn’t make a motion yet.

MR. CRUSE:

Well, that’s what -- but we’ve got to pull it and handle it separate.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Okay, let’s pull it.

MR. SKINNER:

I make a motion that we approve H, I, K and L. Pull K and M.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Second.

MR. CRUSE:

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

MR. GUILBEAU:

I would just like to inform the Commission on the H. I guess, Brian -- Ryan Martin has been communicating with me and the renaming has been approved by zoning, but they also requested that their address be 505. I don’t know if Mr. Picou’s aware, but they want to change it to a 500. That poses a problem with 911. They went to 911. The fire chief happened to call me today, so he’s the Chairman
of 911 so I broached the subject and that’s
going to change all of the other numbering.
But zoning was concerned that when the fire
truck would turn in, they’re looking for a one
hundred number. And the fire chief assured me
there would be no problem.

MR. CRUSE:

They look for the smoke, huh?

MR. GUILBEAU:

So all the numbers are going to change
including the street. So it looks like it’s a
done deal.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Would that affect the tower? Is the tower
-- do we have to talk to FAA about that?

MR. CRUSE:

Already done. It’s going to cost a fortune
to redo all of their stationary and everything,
but Bell’s paying for it.

MR. SEGURA:

But it will take two years for them to
approve it.

MR. CRUSE:

Yeah. 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 J.

MR. SKINNER:

J, I guess -- I mean, that machine’s always up there. I don’t know if we need to renew with these guys. I don’t know if there’s anybody else that can do it.

MR. SEGURA:

My question is does Coca-Cola have other machines right now?

MR. CRUSE:

It’s in a secure area.

MR. SEGURA:

I mean, you know, why deny them if they just have other machines. I understand the point.
MS. COTTON:

The vending machines on the first floor that’s in the baggage area are contracted to the Commission. The vending machines in the stairwell area and the vending machines in the area next to the restaurant are contracted to the restaurant owner, so she is in charge of those.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

That’s what I thought. The restaurant’s in charge of the ones in secure area also.

MR. SKINNER:

Okay, so the Coca-Cola Bottling on the downstairs?

MS. COTTON:

Yes, that’s the machines --

MR. SKINNER:

And we’ve had no problems with those?

MS. COTTON:

Had no problems.

MR. SKINNER:

Okay. You should have said that earlier, I could have --

MR. SEGURA:

You didn’t ask.
MR. SKINNER:

These contract is going to one machine
downstairs?

MR. PICOU:

The one machine -- the machines downstairs.

MR. SEGURA:

Move.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Second.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. Motion by Mr. Segura, 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 passes.

Item M.

MR. ROBICHAUX:
Mr. Chairman, I’d like to make a motion that staff approach La Petite Café and see if they’ll do a ninety day, a ninety-day extension to their lease, in place of a month to month.

MR. SKINNER:

Do we have time for that? Is there adequate time?

MR. CRUSE:

April 8th is when it expires.

MR. SKINNER:

When?

MR. CRUSE:

April 8th.

MR. SKINNER:

Okay. So we can have it in by the next one. No, we can’t have it in by the next one.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

We can do an extension with --

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

Do you want to authorize the extension to be signed before the next meeting as well or do you still want the?

MR. ROBICHAUX:

That would be fine.

MR. CRUSE:
I mean, if there’s no change in terms.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

If there’s no change in terms, the Chairman has the authority to sign it.

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

So, ninety-day extension.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Ninety-day extension from April, May, June to July. And in the meantime we can put out the RFPs, and we should have that -- when could we put our RFPs?

MR. PICOU:

I would say within the next --

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Next ten days?

MR. PICOU:

Yes, ten days.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

That takes six weeks?

MR. GUILBEAU:

I know you had a goal in mind, does that give you time, Steven, to accomplish what you had in mind or do you need more than ninety days while we doing it?

MR. PICOU:
We’re working on it together.

MS. COTTON:

Probably ninety days, we should be able to do it in ninety days.

MR. CRUSE:

Why don’t you make it one hundred twenty days just to cover yourself?

MR. ROBICHAUX:

I mean, whatever it takes, let’s make -- I’d just rather, prefer it not to go on month to month. That puts us both -- and it doesn’t protect her and it doesn’t protect us. If I remember right, I was on the Commission the last time we did the restaurant deal and I think we had two RFPs and it was tough to get those two.

MR. SEGURA:

Month to month and she has to have a hundred and twenty day cancellation.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. So, a motion by Mr. Robichaux for one-hundred-twenty-day extension with no change in terms.

MR. SKINNER:

Second.
MR. CRUSE:

Second by Mr. 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).

Motion carries. Reports.

MR. PICOU:

Reports.

N. Item N. Ms. Bobbi Hess is our grant facilitator and I think she has a quick presentation for you at this time.

MS. HESS:

Good evening. Just quickly. You have my monthly report in your thing. This last month we did have to submit our annual ACBBE Report, which is all of the vendors within the terminal, the only non-concessionaire or non-car rental was the café and, of course, she did
not have any DBE vendors and it’s -- DBE vendors for this area are very limited.

The car rental agencies, they exceeded again. We base that on historical data and the goal was supposed to be seventeen percent (17%). They were able to achieve a twenty eight point five percent (28.5%) DBE participation. So, they do a good job in that sense of working to try to get that.

I think what significantly for this area and everything to note, too, that they have to report their gross revenue and for last federal fiscal year, the six agencies reported that they brought in or accrued about Nine and a half Million Dollars ($9,500,000.00) in gross revenues from just those six car rent for this area. So, almost Ten Million Dollars ($10,000,000.00) of revenue from six car rental agencies for this area. So, that’s a nice impact when you think about, you know, do they really do? Yeah, they’re doing a good business here.

So that basically -- they did achieve, they worked hard at getting their DBE of vendors as best they can. They’re making good revenue and
so that’s a good thing. I did get a chance to
meet with Mr. Picou and Daniel yesterday and, I
mean -- yeah, yesterday. And it was a nice
meeting just to get to know each other and talk
about not just DBE but, you know, the grant
funding. And it’s going to be an exciting
couple of years coming up with everything.

One of the things with the DBE, just
quickly, that we are going to be in the
process, every three years we have to renew the
goal. This is our year to do it. And it’s
going to be, I guess, a lot more intense
because of the terminal project. Normally,
when we’ve done our DBE goal, the projects have
been very similar and much smaller.

We’ve never had this large of a project.
And, of course, it’s going to be national in
scope. So the DBE goal is going to take a lot
more involvement of calculating the methodology
of it and how it will look. It will be totally
different. But in a good way, it’s a good
thing that it’s happened, the timing is
happening because if we had already established
one last year and bring in this new project, we
would have had to redo it anyway.
So that’s a good thing, but it will be a much more involved process getting this goal set for the next three years because we’ve never had such a large project that is going to be part of that DBE goal.

And that’s it. If you have any questions?

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Ms. Bobbi, ten million, you said, on the rental cars. That’s not just airport profit; that’s the Lafayette area?

MS. HESS:

That’s what they reported, the six agencies, as their gross revenues for here.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

For the airport or for Lafayette?

MS. HESS:

For here, for their airport operations here. So, that’s what they’ve reported for their agencies here and what they purchased for here in -- for these agencies here.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Thank you.

MS. HESS:

Thank you.

MR. CRUSE:
Thanks, Bobbi.

MR. PICOU:

Next item.


P. Item P is The Picard Group-Monthly report. It’s also in the binder. I believe we have a representative of Picard tonight.

Q. Then item Q is the Airport Monthly Fiscal Review, which is also in your binder. These are non re-occurring expenditures for February, so.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. Project updates?

MR. PICOU:

Project updates.

R. Item R, Taxiway Mike (Parallel Taxiway)-(DSA), ongoing

S. S is North GA Phase II-(DSA)

T. T is the Master Plan-(DSA)

U. RTR Cable Relocation-(DSA)

V. V is the John Glenn Drive Parking Modifications-(DSA)

W. Noise Study-Work Order #8 (AECOM)-Update

X. X is Taxiway Seal Coat Project (AECOM)
Y. Runway 11-29 RSA Improvements (AECOM)
Z. Cargo Facility (MBSB)
AA. ATCT Interior Upgrades 2014 (MBSB)
AB. Alpha Bravo, Main Terminal Interior Upgrades 2014 (MBSB)
AC. Alpha Charlie, LRA Signage Upgrades also.

MR. CRUSE:

Thank you. Any questions on project updates?

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Question. On tab V, on the John Glenn parking for rental cars.

MR. PICOU:

Yes, sir.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Do we have, or who answered, do we have a date of approximately when this is going to be ready for to move the rental cars?

MR. PICOU:

We’re moving ahead quickly. I know there’s some more -- go ahead. He’s better at --

MR. THIBODEAUX:

Adam with Domingue Szabo and Associates. The contractor has completed just about all the work. He has to file one parking stop.
There’s a truck in the way, so he has to wait for that truck to move, then all the physical work will be done. He might have a few punch list items and he has to go back and grout the little pin. So, what we were tasked to do with the re-striping, that’s complete. To get the rental cars over, I don’t know what they have to do.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

We need -- I don’t know if we’ve contacted the Republic Parking yet, but we should contact them so they can have someone either come down or do a study on how we’re going to put a gate arm where the rental cars are now. We’re going to use that for short-term parking. That’s an open entrance. And they’ll have to put an arm or block that entrance and use another entrance some kind of way. We have to get that ready before we can use that lot.

MS. COTTON:

We have worked with Republic Parking on a plan for the entrance and exit of that area. The only thing we’re waiting for now is to complete the rental car bid process in order to move the rental cars over. So, Republic is on
board. They know what the plan is for entrance
and exit on that area. Everything is just on
hold waiting for the rental car bid process to
be completed.

MR. ROBICHAUX:
    Well, they’ll have everything ready when
    the rental car move?

MS. COTTON:
    Yes.

MR. ROBICHAUX:
    When they’re moved, we’ll have the gates up
    with barricades, so they’re on board?

MS. COTTON:
    Yes, they’re on board.

MR. ROBICHAUX:
    Thank you.

MR. HEBERT:
    Are we keeping the rental car agencies
    apprised of the progress and any impending date
    that they’ll have to take action?

MR. PICOU:
    Yes, we’re working with them.

MR. HEBERT:
    We’re not just springing them.

MR. PICOU:
We’re going to notify them in about five minutes.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Thank you. I move we adjourn.

MS. GARRETT:

Second.

MR. CRUSE:

We have a motion by Mr. Robichaux, 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 6:49 p.m.)
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