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 8th day of April, 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 April meeting to order. If everyone could rise and join me in the Pledge of Allegiance.

      (Pledge of Allegiance)

MR. CRUSE:

      Okay. We’ll start with the roll call 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. PICOU:

      Stephen Picou.

MS. AMY:
Debbie Amy.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. I’ll accept a motion for the minutes of the regular meeting of March 11, 2015.

MR. SEGURA:

Move to accept the minutes.

MR. SKINNER:

Second.

MR. CRUSE:

We have a motion by Mr. Segura; a 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.

Okay. I don't have any comments on anything that's not on the agenda tonight. If there's any comments from the public from
anyone on an item that's not -- that does not appear on the agenda for tonight, now is the time to step up.

(No response.)

All right. Seeing none. Any comments from my fellow commissioners?

(No response)

All right. Director’s report.

MR. PICOU:

Thank you.

Good evening and thank you, Mr. Chairman and fellow commissioners, or commissioners.

Thank you.

First item is the relocation of administrative office and terminal upgrades. We are looking at possibly moving the floor people back to the terminal building. My goal is to be closer to the public, to our customers, have someone here that would be looking at contracts and having a person greeting people as they come in.

The area behind you is the area that we're looking at. We have worked with MBSB to get some pricing. I just wanted to let the commission know that's where we -- we have no
prices; no firm funding yet on that. So, I just wanted to get that as an agenda item for you know that it will be coming and so we will have those prices and present those at the next meeting.

I don't want to spend a lot of money due to the fact that we're getting ready to build a new terminal, but I think it does -- us and our public -- it's better customer service for our customers and the public that are flying in and out of this airport.

So, any questions on that? There are some other terminal upgrades, some items are in the security office that were addressed. We're looking at that. And also to make some upgrades to the business center. Currently pulling out some of the current cabinets that are located inside of there. That sink, making that a charging station. And then the wall closet that's located to the right-hand side is actually securing it because it is our WiFi connection. So, it is not in a secured environment. Securing it in the closet.

We can't put it in the ceiling due to the fact that the ceiling is -- limitations of
actually getting up there to try to reset it.  
So, those are some of the items that you'll see  
on that proposal that's coming.  

MR. SKINNER:  
Who do you plan on bringing up again?  

MR. PICOU:  
It would be myself, Ms. Renee Cotton, and  
Ms. Debbie Amy.  

MR. SKINNER:  
Got you.  

MR. PICOU:  
So, that would be the three that would come  
over. I would have an office here and an  
office at the airport, at the current  
administration area.  

Okay. Next item is termination of contract  
for GoDepot (sic). We appreciate the work  
they've done. What we're going to try to do is  
-- what we're going to do is go in-house.  
We've notified them per the contract  
stipulation and gave them thirty-day notice.  
They've done a great job. We just are going to  
try to move this in-house and move to a  
methodology of not verbatim where we have been.  
Cutting the package down. Give a synopsis of
what we are. And so we are moving that direction. We are leaving on good terms in the event that we -- it's more than what we can handle or it's not exactly working out. GoDepot (sic) has said they would come back. So...

Next item is the press conference in April 17th, LUS Fiber. That's in your packet. There is an advertisement for that. And I believe it was sent out to each one of you today, earlier. And it is included in the packet as you're invited to a special announcement LFT the one gig fiber service.

If you notice, some of our -- on many of our big screens, all our big screens and some displays out here are out of service. It's due to the fiber cut over. There's some things that are uploading onto the system at this time. So, that should be back up and running in no time.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Mr. Picou, I seen it had my name on there as a -- I think the Chairman's name should be replaced. And if he's not able to attend, then I'll be here.
MR. PICOU:

Okay.

MR. GUILBEAU:

It should be as a participant.

MR. CRUSE:

I think that's perfectly fine. You're the only one we know that will be here for sure because that was your baby there, so.

MR. GUILBEAU:

If you're here, I'll defer to you.

MR. PICOU:

Okay. All right. The next item is Fly Lafayette passenger statistics. SIDES, Robert Callahan, I believe is going to give the report on that.

MR. ROBERT CALLAHAN:

Well, because the meeting is fairly early in this month, we do not have the March enplanements from the airlines yet. But I did include a recap of the February ones in the packets.

As far as media exposure, we had coverage from a variety of sources on the start of the tax collection, the triangle disaster drill, and some early month weather impacts.
Fly Lafayette Club update. We're up to seven thousand seven hundred and fifty-five members. Had fifty-two winners out of six hundred and thirteen entries last month.

The last item I'm going to -- I have the press conference there as a reminder, but the last item is that the 2014 annual report will be inserted into the Advertiser on April 22nd. They're going to need twenty-three thousand copies. Then May 1st it will inserted into the Independent, which is another fifteen thousand.

So, we'll get a good coverage of people and people can see how last year was for the airport.

That's all I have.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Robert or staff, do we have any gauge on the Denver flight? I've had quite a few people ask me with the downturn in the oil industry it's probably a little early to tell.

MR. ROBERT CALLAHAN:

It's still -- it's still -- load factors are still over eighty percent, so that's pretty good. The airline is really making money at, you know, sixty percent and over. So, they're
happy. I think they've -- like to see it stabilize around eighty-five. So, that's what we're going to push for.

    Thank you.

MR. PICOU:

    In addition to the Fly Lafayette, we were contacted by another airport about our program. And directed them to Robert. Robert's helped them out in getting started. So, that's a good thing. Other airports are looking at how we run that program and how they can have a program or make theirs better. So, that's good. We're leading -- we're a leader on that.

    Also, you'll see in your packet the financials. Basically operations are -- revenues are up and expenses are down. So, six percent up on operation receipts and disbursements down by ten percent. So, that's good. We're running in the right direction. There's no indication right now with the downturn in the oilfield that this would impact us right now. Everything's still holding steady and growing.

    Any questions with those?

(No response.)
Oh, that's right. And in the financials also -- I'm sorry, I got that out of order. Yeah. There's a request to -- information about the fees that were paid to the attorney company. And those are included in your packet, as well.

MR. CRUSE:

Scheduled business.

MR. PICOU:

All right.

A. First item is Approval of New Hires, LAC Staff (Maintenance).

At March 23rd we met with the Internal Affairs committee. The recommendation was to authorize to go ahead and add two new workers: One would be a maintenance worker and one the maintenance worker two. Their job descriptions are updated and then put in here.

What I've done with working with staff is we've come up with an area depository or repository, I should say, of areas where all of our job descriptions will be online or electronic. They were all in some old versions that we couldn't really -- so they were all in -- redone, retyped and things like that. So --
and they were going to be kept on our open drive, our “O” drive, which is our public drive for us. And those -- that's where they'll be deposited.

So, in the future there's no, okay, let's try to find. So, we're going to do that with all the job descriptions. Right now the maintenance worker, which is what's in front of you, it's been cleaned up and also the maintenance worker technician is also in there.

MR. SKINNER:

I would just add that these are replacement. Although they're new, they're just filling in vacancies.

MR. PICOU:

That’s correct. These are vacancies. These are not new positions. They're vacancies.

The next item is approval of a new hire for LAC staff operations. Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. GUILBEAU:

I move that -- well, I guess I shouldn't since I'm a member of Internal Affairs, but I'll move that we approve the recommendation of Internal Affairs including the job description.
MR. SKINNER:

Second.

MR. CRUSE:

Motion by Mr. Guilbeau; a second by Mr. Skinner. Any further comments or questions from the Commission?
(No response.)
From the public?
(No response.)
Hearing none. All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS:

Aye.

MR. CRUSE:

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

MR. PICOU:

B. Approval of a New Hire for Operations.

We have an individual that's leaving us at the end of April, who's going to serve in the military. And this is an operation specialist. We have three currently. And this would be a replacement of Joe when he does leave.

So, it came out of the Internal Affairs
committee to go ahead and hire one individual. That has been advertised. And also is the new job description that's behind it. That's also placed on the “0” drive for ease of access.

MR. SKINNER:

I think we're going to have a little bit of overlap in training period, assuming we can get the person in here on time.

MR. PICOU:

That's the goal is to have some overlapping training, so Joe can have some time with the new person.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. Just as a note on this. I met with Steven this morning and we're going to refer it to the Internal Affairs committee for a review, but we do need to -- we need to address our pay plan and how everyone falls into it, to make sure that, you know, our plan that we currently have was adopted by the Commission. We just haven't fully implemented it yet.

So, I don't want to delay the hiring of somebody coming in, but I do want us to address that issue because we need to move one way or the other. We either need to follow the plan
that was adopted or we need to look at another
option. But it was adopted so, in my opinion,
we need to take a look at moving towards
adhering to the policy, so.

I'll accept a motion for item Bravo.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Move to accept.

MR. CRUSE:

We have a motion by Mr. Robichaux.

MR. SKINNER:

Second.

MR. CRUSE:

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. Next item.

MR. PICOU:
C. Next item is 100 John Glenn Drive-Hangar 9 Demo-MBSB Group-Agreement and Discussion/Action.

As everyone knows that we have a hangar that's located, Hangar 9, it's currently occupied by UPS. It is somewhat of an eyesore. And the building needs to be removed and taken down. So, after meeting, we have a recommendation to go ahead -- a discussion and agreement with MBSB to -- for Eight Thousand One Hundred and Thirty-six Dollars ($8,136.00) to do -- approval and agreement presented to do construction bidding to remove that building.

UPS also, some side information, is UPS will be in a temporary location next to that 11, correct? Is that right, Daniel? Eleven or ten?

MR. DANIEL ELSEA:
Eleven.

MR. PICOU:
Eleven. They're at gate 11. And so we're working with them the bid and relocation process that goes out to UPS, allowing them in the next day or two, saying option for first they will be out.
MR. SKINNER:

And where are they going now?

MR. PICOU:

They're going to go to a temporary modular building.

MR. SKINNER:

Oh, okay.

MR. PICOU:

And that will be located next to Gate 11. Gate 11 was picked due to the fact that if the terminal building -- when the terminal building starts, if --

MR. SKINNER:

That's the gate over here by Hangar 11?

MR. PICOU:

Right. There's utilities there and also it's not in the way of any terminal building projects.

MR. SKINNER:

How is that going to impact the rental cars?

MR. PICOU:

It's going to be minimum. We have eighteen spots. I believe it's eighteen.

MR. SKINNER:
Well, they're parking in there now anyway.

MR. PICOU:
The rental cars?

MR. SKINNER:
No. I mean UPS is in there now.

MR. PICOU:
UPS. Yes. UPS. And there's -- I think it's twenty slots, actually. And they'll be on the far side of the parking lot closest to the gate. And rental car will be in that lot.

MR. CRUSE:
It'll actually make the situation better.

MR. SKINNER:
Yeah. Pretty much.

MR. SKINNER:
So they're going to store their equipment on the ramp, I guess?

MR. PICOU:
That's correct. For now.

MR. GUILBEAU:
I move that we accept staff recommendation.

MR. CRUSE:
Okay. We have a motion from Mr. Guilbeau.

MS. GARRETT:
Second.
MR. CRUSE:

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.)

Motion carries. Next item.

MR. PICOU:

D. Runway 4 Right-22 Left Improvements-Phase V Overlay-Strategic Committee Outcome- Discussion/Action.

The strategic committee met and was recommendation came from the strategic committee that we hire a third-party firm to actually go out and take a look at Runway 4/22 -- 422 Right -- 4 Right/22 Left, the popout situation.

That firm is actually onboard right now. They arrived today. They are on the airfield
at this time studying what's going on. At this point the firm will look at documentation paperwork. There are no destructive or non-destructive testing scheduled at this point. At some point I perceive that's going to be the recommendation, is to go that direction.

So they are a third-party independent firm that is going to give us a view, an overall view of the condition of the pavement of that overlay; if it meets specifications, if it does not meet specifications.

MR. SKINNER:

What's the timeframe on their completion of this, the first phase?

MR. PICOU:

I would say -- I'm speaking for him, so I would say within fourteen days.

MR. SKINNER:

So, we'll have a report back?

MR. PICOU:

We should have something, initial report. I'm sure the initial report will indicate that there needs to be some type of testing done of the --

MR. SKINNER:
So, we can start planning just to fast track this thing. I mean if we're going to assume that something is coming, can we at least plan for it? And I'm interested in -- I think we all are -- in getting something done quick.

MR. PICOU:

Sure. That's why we're moving ahead. We're trying to get something done and have that neutral third party come in and give an assessment of that pavement.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Do we know what the cost of the third party is?

MR. PICOU:

It's Six Thousand One Hundred Dollars ($6,100.00).

MR. SKINNER:

Did you send that out in an email or was that in --

MR. PICOU:

I sent it out to the strategic committee.

MR. SKINNER:

Strategic committee, okay.

MR. SEGURA:
The issue was in the strategic committee, it was comprised of myself as the Chairman, Mr. Guilbeau as the -- Mr. Skinner. Was there was a request by AECOM -- I believe there is, what, Six Hundred Thousand Dollars ($600,000.00) about left to pay Diamond B from the original contract. And so the letter was a request to release those -- release all of those funds but Twelve Thousand Five Hundred Dollars ($12,500.00), which was -- I'm -- I just got the paperwork, so I'm trying to refresh my memory.

The Twelve Thousand Five Hundred (12,500.00) was for the various costs of --

MR. SKINNER:
I think administrative cost and maybe some -- mostly administrative cost.

MR. SEGURA:
Then there was some additional costs associated with the job that staff had recommended, had put up. Fifteen Thousand (15,000.00)?

MR. PICOU:
Yes. There was some cost associated with staff.
MR. SEGURA:

Well, let me ask you. I'm trying to
refresh my memory. What was the -- oh, yeah.
Fifteen Thousand One Hundred and Ninety-nine
Dollars and Eighty-six Cents ($15,199.86),
which those costs included LAC staff costs,
legal fees, inspection fees for the popout
repair, construction management, inspection,
materials and testing, but there was also
Forty-five Hundred Dollars ($4,500.00) in --
from being late on completing the repairs. Was
that right? Seven Hundred and Fifty Dollars
($750.00) a day, if I recall.

MR. PICOU:

I don't recall right offhand.

MR. SEGURA:

So, anyway, there was Six Hundred Thousand
Dollars ($600,000.00) that, you know, that was
being -- is still being held, that was being
asked to release everything but the Twelve
Thousand Five Hundred (12,500.00) by AECOM was
recommending. Staff was recommending the
Fifteen One Hundred Ninety-nine (15,199.00)
plus the Forty-five Hundred (4,500.00). Was
it? Am I right? If I'm not --
MR. PICOU:

That’s correct.

MR. SEGURA:

So, but there begins some other discussions about, you know, the popouts took a little longer than they thought. The other thing was when they started there was two thousand popouts. When they finished, there was three or four thousand. And so, you know -- and we had mentioned about, you know, this repair being some sort of compromise for what went on with the deficiencies in the runway.

So, our question was, and we had some discussion -- Todd was there as well -- about our original warranty, and then our warranty -- am I saying it right? The warranty for the repairs and what covers what. That the warranty for the repairs probably only covers popouts that are coming up, right?

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

Correct.

MR. SEGURA:

But the warranty for the substantial completion of the project only covers --
Well, it will cover everything.

MR. SEGURA:

Yeah. But for only one year.

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

Right.

MR. SEGURA:

But if you recall the repairs, they guaranteed three years with two one-year options. So, but that’s only concerning these popout issues. So, what happens if we have some other problems beyond the year?

Then in AECOM’s letter there was a note of -- I’m trying to find it. About some unevenness or a dip in the runway that some of the pilots --

MR. PICOU:

Yeah.

MR. SEGURA:

An additional issue has been recently identified that we would wish to call the commission attention to. The LAC staff reports that several pilots have offered evidence regarding a surface discontinuity in the form of a dip on the northern end of the runway.

With the staff’s assistance AECOM personnel
reviewed both plans and conditions of the field. Our conclusion is that there is some evidence that the area in question does not meet the surface smoothness criteria of the specification. We recommend that correction of this issue, if required, be handled under the project warranty provision.

So, as you can see, there’s a lot of different issues concerning the runway. And there was some concern in the committee meeting that, okay, we fixed the popouts, but you know, is this going to be an ongoing problem and is there something wrong with the original integrity of the job so that we -- the committee just decided to hold off on paying and also staff recommended maybe that we get a -- or we did. I can’t remember if we did that in that meeting -- get an outside party to come give us an evaluation of what we’re dealing with and what direction we should go.

MR. PICOU:

That’s correct. In that meeting we discussed all of those items and actually the item of hiring a third party, an independent third party.
MR. ROBICHAUX:

Question. In your additional cost, construction management, inspection and materials testing, is that Sixty-one Hundred (6,100.00) included in that Nine Thousand (9,000.00)?

MR. PICOU:

No, sir. Not at this time.

MR. SEGURA:

That, I believe, just dealt with the repairs and the popouts.

MR. PICOU:

Repairs.

MR. SEGURA:

Repairs of the popouts.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

And I don’t know what -- I guess that --

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

If you notice this letter is dated --

MR. ROBICHAUX:

This is the first I’ve seen the letter.

MR. PICOU:

Yeah.

MR. SEGURA:

The letter probably should have been in the
package, but it was given to us at the committee meeting. That’s what we kind of -- our whole --

MR. ROBICHAUX:
Okay.

MR. PICOU:
-- discussion --

MR. CRUSE:
Well, there’s no action required tonight.

MR. PICOU:
Yeah.

MR. CRUSE:
We can’t do anything until we get the results back from the third-party inspection.

MR. ROBICHAUX:
Is there anything in our contract with Diamond B or whoever to make them responsible for that Sixty-one Hundred Dollars ($6,100.00) for our inspection fees?

MR. PICOU:
I believe that that would be something I would have to defer to legal counsel for. I would have to review that.

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:
I’d have to look at the contract to see if
there’s any provision in there for additional expenses incurred.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Can you please do that?

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

Sure.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Also, I’m just looking at this letter for the first time. Is this the correct date that they were scheduled to complete the work on November 21, 2013? And the final walk-thru was November 25, 2013?

MR. SEGURA:

No. That -- I think that was probably should have been ‘14.

MR. CRUSE:

No. It’s the correct date.

MR. PICOU:

That’s correct?

MR. CRUSE:

‘13 is the correct date, yeah.

MR. SEGURA:

Of the original work. Okay.

MR. PICOU:

Yeah.
MR. SEGURA:
I thought we were talking about, popouts.

MR. ROBICHAUX:
So this job was supposed to be completed --

MR. CRUSE:
It was completed.

MR. PICOU:
It was and the thing is, we’re still having popouts.

MR. CRUSE:
We still -- I mean we still --

MR. PICOU:
That’s a misconception. It was completed then that’s when the popouts started.

MR. SEGURA:
But there was -- the repair took longer than we expected as well.

MR. ROBICHAUX:
Todd, would you just check into that additional cost in case we incur some more additional costs?

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:
Sure.

MR. SEGURA:
Anyway, I just wanted to explain what went
on at the meeting so you have an idea what we were up against or deciding.

MR. CRUSE:

We can do that.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Mr. Chairman, I’ll make a motion that we ratify the committee’s recommendation so the director can spend the money and have a report for us hopefully at the May meeting.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. We have a motion by Mr. Guilbeau.

MR. SEGURA:

Second.

MR. CRUSE:

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

MR. ROBICHAUX:

So it would be Six Thousand (6,000.00) or Fifteen Thousand (15,000.00) or --

MR. GUILBEAU:

Well, it would be Six Thousand (6,000.00) plus any testing if they’re required to do any.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

So, what amount are we voting on?

(indiscernible - multiple speakers)
MR. ROBICHAUX:

I was not at the meeting. I have not seen anything on it. What am I voting on?

MR. SEGURA:

He’s voting on ratifying -- well, you tell him. You made the motion. He’s voting on ratifying the -- the committee made a recommendation --

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Sixty-one Hundred (6,100.00).

MR. SEGURA:

-- and the recommendation was to not pay any of the money and to get this third party. We didn’t know the amount of the inspection at the time of the committee meeting. Now, we do.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Right. I was not at this meeting. I don’t know what we’re voting on. I would like to know what we’re voting on. What y’all ratified. I’m not going to vote on a ratification --

MR. SEGURA:

That’s what I explained. AECOM was asking to release the Six Hundred Thousand (600,000.00) that’s being held except for
Twelve Thousand Five Hundred Dollars
(12,500.00).

MR. SKINNER:

Weren’t they asking for a substantial
completion as well?

MR. CRUSE:

Right. That’s what they were asking for.

MR. SKINNER:

So they were asking for substantial
completion which releases the retained --

MR. SEGURA:

Right.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Todd, shouldn’t the motion state what we’re
voting on, just not just ratification of the
strategic committee’s meeting since I was not
at the meeting? Shouldn’t it specify what I’m
voting on. I’m ratifying something, but I
don’t know what I’m voting.

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

It can or the discussion can say what was
done at the strategic meeting.

MR. SEGURA:

I thought I explained that.

MR. ROBICHAUX:
It’s three different amounts so far. One was Sixty-one Hundred (6,100.00). Now we’re talking about not paying them the Six Hundred Thousand (600,000.00). I wasn’t at the meeting so I don’t know what we’re talking about.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. So the recommendation was not to grant substantial completion and to authorize the expenditure of Six Thousand One Hundred ($6,100.00) something dollars to go towards a third-party inspection. Now, I would recommend that we don’t cap it at Sixty-one Hundred (6,100.00) because we already know that there’s probably going to be some non-destructive and/or destructive testing required on a portion of that, that if we don’t -- if we don’t authorize that then we’re going to be sitting here at the meeting in May still with no answer.

MR. GUILBEAU:

I would have to make a motion that we say not to exceed Twenty Thousand (20,000.00). That should take care of the testing too, if it’s required. And just to be fair, Mr. Robichaux, I’m looking for reimbursement of all
of our expenses.

MR. SEGURA:

But none of those costs of this third party was discussed at the committee meeting because we didn’t know those at the time. What went on at the committee meeting was AECOM was asking us to grant substantial completion, release all of the Six Hundred Thousand Dollars ($600,000.00) except for Twelve Thousand Five Hundred Dollars ($12,500.00) because of these three items here. And the staff was also recommending another Fifteen Thousand One Hundred and Ninety-nine Dollars and Eighty-six cents ($15,199.86) be held back, which was -- I’m sorry. Nineteen Thousand Six Hundred and Ninety-nine Dollars and Eighty-six Cents ($19,699.86) in addition to the Twelve Thousand Five Hundred (12,500.00).

So, in our discussion we -- the committee decided to not give substantial completion and not release any of the funds, and that we would get a third party to inspect. So that’s what Mr. Guilbeau’s motion was, is to ratify the committee’s action, which I’ve just explained, and then I guess you explained to cover these
costs for the inspections.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Yeah, being that the cost wasn’t discussed.
And I would put Twenty Thousand (20,000.00)
tops for the third-party inspection and any
necessary testing.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

Twenty Thousand (20,000.00) plus Fifteen
(15,000.00)?

MR. SEGURA:

No. The Fifteen Thousand (15,000.00) was
only an amount to be held back from the Six
Hundred (600,000.00).

MR. ROBICHAUX:

We're holding more than that. We're
holding Six Hundred (600,000.00). Six Hundred
Thousand (600,000.00).

MR. SEGURA:

That's not a payment. That's just cost
that were incurred by us for the repairs.

MR. CRUSE:

So to clarify your motion, and correct me
if I'm wrong, it's not granting substantial
completion and an amount not to exceed Twenty
Thousand Dollars ($20,000.00) for third party
testing of the runway.

MR. SKINNER:
I'll second it.

MR. CRUSE:
Is that correct, Mr. Guilbeau?

MR. GUILBEAU:
Yes.

MR. SEGURA:
Which is to accept the committee's recommendation, was what that -- was what it's doing.

MR. CRUSE:
Okay. We have a motion by Mr. Guilbeau and a second from Mr. Skinner.

MR. SKINNER:
Correct.

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

MR. SKINNER:
Yeah. One comment. Can we, as soon as the report is back, I would like the strategic committee to meet immediately after that; review those and then move forward as quick as we can.
MR. CRUSE:

I agree.

MR. PICOU:

And whatever comes out of that strategic committee, we'll make sure it gets to all the commissioner.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

I would appreciate that. Like this letter was in the meeting, that's the first I've ever seen it, so I don't know what I'm voting on, really. I understand now, but I shouldn't have to come to a meeting --

MR. PICOU:

Right.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

-- and get explained what I'm voting on. It should be in the packet.

MR. SKINNER:

I think that -- wasn't that letter in the last package --

MR. PICOU:

It was.

MR. SKINNER:

-- at the last meeting?

MR. PICOU:
That letter was last month's package.

MR. SKINNER:

Yeah. Because we -- it was in the last package and we deferred it to the strategic committee.

MR. SEGURA:

It would have been nice to have it and have what the committee's recommendation was in the package, so that the other members that didn't attend would know.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. 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. PICOU:

E. Next item is the New Terminal Initiative-
Recommendation for Procurement of Design
and Construction Service. Mr. Walt Adams
with EnGarde Consulting will have a
presentation.

MR. WALT ADAMS:

Good evening. This is in your packet. And
it's titled, “The Recommendation for the
Procurement of Design and Construction
Services,” which really addresses the process
in which to do that, as well as the specific
methods. The background, just to refresh your
memory, you had previously tasked us with or
charged us with review of the master service
agreements that were in place or are already in
place for architectural engineering planning
services that were originated in June of 2011,
and to make recommendations as to their
continued validity.

We determined that the expiration of the
three-year contract terms and one-year contract
extensions of those agreements will coincide
with the RFQ and RFP solicitation schedule as
mandated by all relative governing authorities.

We were then tasked with developing the
most expeditious methods of procurement of new
design and construction professional services
utilizing optimal contracting model for
efficient delivery of the new terminal and all
related facilities.

I will note as an aside here, it's not my
area of concern, but just as we work on that
analysis with staff, you're existing MSAs will
expire this fall. Just to remind you of that.
And the work that I'm addressing in this
recommendation does not include all the other
peripheral work that will be going on at that
terminal at the same time the terminal is being
designed.

So, that needs to be addressed in terms of
whether you're going to extend it another year
or you're going to go out for the services
separately. But this recommendation is
specifically for the terminal and the directly
related facilities only.

The project definition was a little bit of
a challenge to get our arms around because
there are a lot of different documents, a lot
of ideas, a lot of things published. But I'm
going to read to you what we've come up with as
a basic project definition that we'll build on
this in the RFP/RFQ.

The new terminal and related facilities, which includes, but is not limited to the aircraft parking area and terminal apron, passenger terminal building, terminal curb frontage, automobile parking, and other support facilities will constitute a separate capital improvement program apart from ongoing engineering and design and construction programs occurring on Lafayette Regional Airport property during the same term.

The new terminal and related terminal facilities will provide the community and its visitors the best function with the following key attributes: Appropriate size and capacity based on current and future demand for terminal area forecast, TAF, and other related current data and projections for the usable lifespan of the new construction.

User experience is defined as the location and arrangement of each new terminal facility we establish to allow the best ingress and egress for users. The ingress and egress wraps will provide any new or returning visitors and community visitors a great first and last
impression of Lafayette. Ingress and egress wraps will incorporate the new I-49 corridor changes, existing airport facilities, available land, and other relevant issues.

And just as miscellaneous notes, we also picked up that, you know, it will be mandatory that those that would participate or be selected review all preliminary programs and all previous studies regarding the new terminal airport master plan prepared by others that must be performed for purpose and for orientation.

The following design must allow for construction to occur with the least amount of disruption to airport operations.

I'm not asking you to validate or ratify that, but I'm just giving you an update as to where the definition sits tonight.

2.0 is the procurement recommendation. It's the design and construction delivery model. The recommended delivery model illustrated below, which is -- it's a very conventional organization, illustrates what I would term a conventional architecture and engineering design team working in tandem with
a construction manager at risk.

Both entities contract directly with the owner to perform in close coordination the maximize process efficiency and the value of the facilities to be delivered. In the past most owners have relied on the experience of the designer to provide a complete and responsible set of contract documents.

Recently, more and more owners which plan programs of this complexity and speciality, have found the value in utilizing advice and expertise of those with overall process program and construction management knowledge during the design phase, not after. The scenario is allowable under all governing authorities that you're dealing with here, affords the owner the advantages of pre-construction services in the form of schedule budget constructability advice during the project planning and design phase and then additionally enables you to fast track the program with early construction components such as any demolition required, site work, foundation packages, and the like prior to the complete design taking place. So you gain a substantial amount of schedule performed.
The specific selection process and award of contract we spent a lot of time with the FAA requirements, Louisiana Airport Manager Association's recommended guidelines, LADOTD aviation section guidelines and, of course, the facilities plans and construction division of division of administration for the state of Louisiana. And we tried to wash through all of those and make sure none of them were conflicting with the other.

And our recommendation is that the procurement schedule that follows on the next page will last approximately twenty-eight weeks, as prescribed by those organizations. It's very detailed in terms of the steps you have to go through and the durations for those periods. I'm not saying we might not improve upon that time line, but all the steps have to take place and that's their recommendation for the most expeditious schedule. There is another one for thirty-four weeks.

We're recommending that the design and services time line for picking the design team proceeds the construction selection, construction manager selection by about two
weeks, just to offset the workload for those
two committees over that twenty-eight week
period.

We're also recommending that following a
meeting with FDNC that the design services
procurement requirements will be based on the
specification mandated by LA Code 35. I won't
go into the detail of that, but basically it's
the state guideline for selection of
professional services for public contracts, to
the extent practical.

In other words, their process requires
utilization of their selection committee in
Baton Rouge that's appointed on an annual
basis. We're not suggesting that. But in
talking with them, we think the same guidelines
that committee goes through, apply here, and
apply both to the CMAR as well.

The -- to give you a little bit of detail,
the selection committee for both design
services and construction services shall
consist of no more than five individuals as
follows: One licensed design professional in
the discipline, but not involved in the
project; one licensed contractor in the
discipline, but not involved in the project;
one representative of the owner, which we
assume and suggest that would be Steven Picou,
your executive director; and then two members
at large. And it's recommended that community
stake holders be chosen.

That we concur with that recommendation.
We think that's a manageable selection
committee size. I'll caution you that I think
until that selection committee is formed, and
I'm not sure how you're going to go about
forming or selecting those committee members,
but I think everything we're recommending in
terms of the process for delivering the
construction and design needs to be discussed
in detail with that committee and have them
also endorsed to you that this is the
appropriate delivery model for the airport, for
the new terminal.

If you were to start, if you want to take a
look at the time line, if you were to start
tomorrow, this is what I -- this is a
perspective time line. You would finish
selection and design services, including
execution of the contract somewhere in mid
October.

I've listed down at the bottom all the commission meetings so you can have an idea of what would be -- we would be asking you to identify or we would give you an update at each one of those meetings as to where this process is progressing.

The -- and then with the construction agreement sometime in mid November. Again, if we can economize on that and -- for instance -- I'm sorry. It's showing a creation of twenty work days to create the RFQ and RFP, but we've already begun that work. I don’t know of any reason why that has to -- we have to do that. The advertising duration is the short list. You know, we're dealing with recommended guidelines here until we go back to those agencies and say, “Here's our actual schedule. Do you concur?” I'm basically giving you the worst case scenario here.

And with that, I realize that you -- that's a lot of information to digest. I'm not necessarily asking you to approve that tonight. That's up to Mr. Cruse and Mr. Picou, but I will tell you that I have gotten the message
loud and clear that this is a matter of expedience. It needs to move forward as soon as possible. There's an expectation in the community regarding taxes collected and the opportunity to move forward is apparent.

So, we are prepared to do just that and start tomorrow, but I would say the first two weeks of the process should be focused on the selection of the selection committee and a thorough understanding of the process and the contract models. There are many different documents that refer to CMAR or refer to the design services. And the articulation of those very specific documents and all the language within those will take a bit of time for everyone to understand before you select someone.

If you have any direct questions right now, I'll be glad to take those. If not --

MR. SKINNER:

I've got a few of them. Did you have any matrix or anything comparing all delivery methods? I envisioned this would be a much more complex issue trying to come up with the pros and cons of each delivery method.
MR. WALT ADAMS:

We utilized, not only all covering agency requirements, and the advantage of this, you know, but basically we based our opinion most directly on the CMAA, which stands for the Construction Management Association of America's project -- owner's project delivery recommendations in terms of different models.

MR. SKINNER:

So, was that specific to airports or terminal buildings?

MR. WALT ADAMS:

It's specific to any complex project.

MR. SKINNER:

I think what I was looking for was some comparison to other model so we can truly see where the pros and con or the risks, whether it benefits other different models, just picking one.

MR. WALT ADAMS:

Well, my suggestion that we would give that very detailed review, which could be hours, in terms of the selection of the selection committee once that is organized and established. And then once they comprehend the
complexity of the decision and understand it
and are prepared to recommend it to the full
commission, I think that's -- I would suggest
that would be the process.

If you want us to -- I mean it's very -- I
would be happy to provide a compendium of the
information it was based on, but that's not --

MR. SKINNER:

Yeah. I got to look at more for comparing
to the other delivery models, so we can truly
see what are the true benefits of this model
versus other models.

MR. WALT ADAMS:

Well, I can attempt to speak to that
tonight if you like. I mean it was basically
three models. You have design bid, which is
the mostly lengthy, the most conventional, the
most time tested. It works quite well. It
also has a whole host of down sides. And
mostly they're dealing with the progression of
work and the time line to produce the work.
It's not optimal at all. It is the most
commonly used. And it’s --

MR. SKINNER:

I understand the different methods and the
pros and cons in general. You know, I'm more
interested in how the different models affect
this specific project. So, I understand the
general pros and cons, but I was more
interested in seeing the different models as it
pertains to this contract or to this deal,
including funding, you know, different funding
sources.

MR. WALT ADAMS:
    Well, we --

MR. SKINNER:
    Or financing sources.

MR. WALT ADAMS:
    Well, I would tell you that that was our
first -- first of all, we believe that the
construction management working in tandem with
the design team is the best method.

MR. SKINNER:
    But we need proof. And I mean we're -- we
don't have the experience you do. We need the
proof. We need to be able to see the
comparisons of other processes so we can make
an informed decision. And without having the
information it's hard for us to vote on that.

MR. WALT ADAMS:
Well, I --

MR. CRUSE:

That's what he did in the first
presentation that he had last month.

MR. SKINNER:

Yeah. But I don't think it was --

MR. WALT ADAMS:

It wasn't to the detail I think you're
asking for now, but I would again suggest this
isn't the appropriate forum to try and do that.
And it is largely -- I mean there's a lot of
material to digest. And I think we would do
better from a half-day workshop, which I also
recommended that we try to do because I mean it
is -- I firmly believe this is the appropriate
recommendation; however, I understand --

MR. SKINNER:

We just need to validate it.

MR. WALT ADAMS:

-- your concern.

MR. SKINNER:

I mean it needs to be validated for us to
be able to vote on it, or at least for me to
vote.

MR. WALT ADAMS:
Well, again, I can provide a number of documents highlighted with the pros and cons of each. And I can --

MR. SKINNER:

I agree that in general I understand those, but I’m more specific to this project, the type of project, the timeframe, this -- you know, we got three different funding sources. You know, which one comes first. I mean to me there are just a lot of questions. And I don’t know all the questions yet, but I’m starting to --

MR. WALT ADAMS:

Well, again, I think the way to do that is to have a workshop and let us go through it.

MR. SKINNER:

I think we need to have a lot of workshops. Let me ask you one other question. I was just looking at the minutes from the last meeting. In there you said that the subcommittee or the board statutes firmly define the program scope.

MR. WALT ADAMS:

Yeah.

MR. SKINNER:

So it needs to be validated before we go to the RFP/RFQ process or even before we decide
upon a delivery method. So I’m struggling with that as well. I’m not sure that we know the entire scope of the project. And to me I think that’s what we need to narrow down and focus on and get comfortable with that. And then we can move to the next thing.

MR. WALT ADAMS:

Well, the URS report, AECOM offered a variety of options there. And the one that we based our recommendation on I don’t recall the specific number. I think it was 9.4, but it is very clear about the scope of the work at that time. I would say that since that time the I-49 corridor has gone from a concept to an actual plan being designed. And I think it would be imperative that there be a dedicated exit into the airport rather than deal with some of the things you’re familiar with going into the New Orleans airport, for instance.

But again, I think that’s the -- I think your terminal committee and your selection committee really need to invest the time to go through that. It’s basically a process to make that decision.

MR. SKINNER:
The selection committee you said for the RFP and RFQ process could be the same as for the selecting the contractor.

MR. WALT ADAMS:

I think the makeup of the selection committee should be the same, yes.

MR. SKINNER:

Okay. So, and so we would not be able to follow current policy on the RFQ and RFP process. You know my question on there was, was that mandated by the CMAR method?

MR. WALT ADAMS:

It is mandated by the CMAR method as it relates to Louisiana Code. And that is very specific for that. It’s also adopted by the others in the same manner, largely. It may not be identical, but it is -- it’s probably the most rigid.

MR. SKINNER:

Okay. And then one final point. The FAA funding, and I think this might be a question for Daniel or Steven, the FAA funding does not -- or FAA will not fund on CMAR projects.

MR. PICOU:

The initial response from FAA usually it’s
the no, it will not. There are some
opportunity that we could work through the FAA
and through the various entities and work with
someone, but FAA says no, they do not do CMAR.

MR. SKINNER:

So, I think what we had talked about before
is maybe phasing thing where some of it was
done with the tax money and some of it’s done
with the federal government money. That would
have to be done outside the CMAR method.

MR. WALT ADAMS:

Well, in discussion with staff, I can speak
to that and I think we’ve determined that your
best strategy would be to isolate the terminal
itself, the new terminal, from FAA purview as
it relates to funding. You have enough of
other conventional work that has to be
processed through the FAA. That will do one
major thing. It will lighten the burden of all
the agencies you have to go through for
approval that equates to time. You know, time
is money. And we have a tentative decision to
explore that, that FAA may not be involved in
the funding process for the terminal itself.

MR. SKINNER:
All right. But I mean I think first to make a decision we need to -- we got an idea of where it’s coming from -- and surely you don’t want to get down the road and have to change our delivery method. If in fact the FAA -- if we need more FAA money or the FAA gives us more money, we don’t want it to be in a model that’s not going to allow us to use that money.

MR. WALT ADAMS:

Well, I would agree that you have a lot of conflicting dynamics here.

MR. SKINNER:

Yeah. I agree. And that’s why I’m -- I mean I’m -- I don’t want to say I’m confused. I just don’t feel that I’m fully informed, you know, to be able to make a decision.

MR. WALT ADAMS:

Again, I don’t -- I think a lot of information to digest, but I think it’s going to be best digested in a workshop.

MR. SKINNER:

I agree, a bunch of them.

MR. SEGURA:

Walt, are you familiar with the Taylor project at LSU?
MR. WALT ADAMS:

    Yeah, Paul F. Taylor.

MR. SEGURA:

    Yeah. And there was a problem there where it’s a CMAR project, where they had a problem which the estimates were a lot more than what they budgeted. With the picked designer and the --

MR. WALT ADAMS:

    In my opinion what happened --

MR. SEGURA:

    -- contractors.

MR. WALT ADAMS:

    -- and I discussed with FPNC last Monday in detail, and looked at the actual contract language in the model and what happened there. In my opinion, it worked beautifully because the construction manager or the CMAR at risk, and I underscore at risk, had a requirement to maintain the costing and the communication with the design team. And there was a non-recourse clause in the contract that said if you do not do that we can say goodbye. And that’s what they did.

    And they brought -- by their own policy,
they brought in the next bidder that was
originally the number two in that. And they’re
now negotiating the project with him. They did
not release the design team. I don’t think
there was an intention to do so. But that’s
the reason why I recommend that the earlier the
contractor fall the better it is. They didn’t
really pay much attention, in my -- this is
just my personal opinion. It’s not technical.
From my question and discussing it with state
officials is that there wasn’t the level of
communication that should have taken place and
that’s the reason they diverge between the
project design and the actual cost of what was
being designed.

It takes a lot more, in my view, a much
more managed program of oversight to make those
two contracts work. And I think they would
agree with that today. But the good news is
they’re not going to be Ten Million Dollars
($10,000,000.00) over budget. They have
another -- they have a methodology to get back
to the budget. And that’s what I would
recommend here.

MR. SEGURA:
The point was, is that when they had a problem such as that it wasn’t a big, long, drawn out argument on how to cut ties with one and get -- and replace them with someone else.

MR. WALT ADAMS:

That’s right. I mean because it’s one of those deals where you can spend years trying to arbitrate or negotiate or litigate.

MR. SEGURA:

What was -- do you know the size of that project?

MR. WALT ADAMS:

I’m going from memory. I believe it was about Ninety-five Million (95,000,000.00) was the budget and they came in somewhere over closer to a -- within Ten Million (10,000,000.00). I’m not certain of those figures.

MR. CRUSE:

Walt, wouldn’t you agree that regardless of what methodology we choose for construction, we've still got to pick a design firm. And wouldn’t it be helpful, in my opinion, for us in the scope, definition, and actual layout of the terminal if we had that -- if we worked
with that design firm in that process or is
that something that you think --

MR. WALT ADAMS:

I think the design firm needs to be fully
contracted with you and at your direction.
And, you know, I am recommending that we offset
in terms of how you select them slightly, but I
think the earlier -- I mean the actual code is
early contractor involvement is the actual
legislation that the State passed last year.
The earlier the involvement, the greater
the value of that type of contract. And that’s
not to say that you couldn’t go ahead and hire
a design team. Personally and professionally
my recommendation is that you don’t sign ink on
either one of them. You don’t put anything in
ink on either one of them until they know who
the other partner they’re going to be married
to for the next five years is, rather than it
be a --

MR. SEGURA:

An arranged marriage?

MR. WALT ADAMS:

-- an arranged marriage downstream. That’s
when communication problems originate.
So, I think going along with the process of selecting a design team, get after it. If you have some reservations or concerns about CMAR, you can certainly go -- I mean the reason I'm with CMAR is the word “at risk.” If you’re just going to have an agency CM do this, you’re going to have an open-ended program in terms of how to control a budget.

MR. SKINNER:

I just think there’s a lot of unanswered questions. I’ll give you another one. How would the bond rating companies rate the different methods? Is there any --

MR. WALT ADAMS:

Very high. The bond rating companies like as much control as they can get.

MR. SKINNER:

Okay. So, I mean those are the kinds of things that I want to see. I want to understand because if we select the wrong method, there’s a lot of things go wrong. If our bond rating goes up because of a bad selection process, it’s going to cost us more money. So that’s -- I’m just -- there’s so
many things that I don’t see here that I would like to see in some matrix that puts everything out there, so we see all the pros and cons of all the methods.

MR. WALT ADAMS:

We have that data. We can put it into a document for you. I think a more expedient method would be two things. One is to let’s just have a workshop and go through it, just as though it’s a mini course in this. The other thing is that I can, and certainly I haven’t had a chance to discuss this with Todd, but there are some construction litigators out there.

There are some construction counsels that are specifically tailored to this level of project and this vein of project that would be -- I would recommend be brought on as a subconsultant to your house counsel. And I think they can articulate better than I with the advantage of specific contract language.

MR. SKINNER:

I agree with that.

MR. SEGURA:

But it would seem what’s important to get
moving is if there’s a need for workshops to
better understand some of these processes,
that, but also get moving on formulating this
committee so that you can get this time line
moving. I think you can decide what method you
want, but --

MR. WALT ADAMS:

Before the RFQ/RFP, and it is a two-step
process, but it’s one linear process, one
linear document, before that goes out, those
decisions have to be made and you have to have
certainty. I agree with Mr. Skinner that you
need to understand how that works and endorse
how that works.

But we have a little bit of time to get
there while we’re putting it together.

MR. SKINNER:

I mean we need to define the scope and then
get to the RFQ.

MS. GARRETT:

So, it doesn’t matter what process you
select, you’re still going to have to have
those five people?

MR. WALT ADAMS:

Yes.
MS. GARRETT:
-- the same.

MR. WALT ADAMS:
Yes.

MS. GARRETT:
So, those five people are necessary no
matter what?

MR. WALT ADAMS:
Yes.

MR. SKINNER:
That’s if we agree to that method.

MS. GARRETT:
Well, no. That’s what I’m asking.

MR. WALT ADAMS:
Well, it would be our recommended method.
That’s the most conservative method. That’s
what we would recommend.

MS. GARRETT:
But so it’s not those five people
regardless of the method. It’s if you use this
method those five people?

MR. WALT ADAMS:
This one is specific --

MS. GARRETT:
That’s my question.
MR. WALT ADAMS:

This method is utilized fairly commonly.
Okay? For where --

MS. GARRETT:

I understand, but that’s not my question.

MR. WALT ADAMS:

When are you going to pause that buzzer?
It is -- if -- to answer your question, I don’t
know that there’s any way to determine any
other standard method of the selection
committee. Usually -- I mean I can tell you
how --

MS. GARRETT:

The question is --

MR. WALT ADAMS:

-- Lafayette should --

MS. GARRETT:

-- whether or not the standing committee,
that committee that you’re talking about
creating, those five people, whether that
committee would be created regardless of what
method you used.

MR. WALT ADAMS:

In my view, yes.

MS. GARRETT:
Okay.

MR. SKINNER:

Then we can go by commission policy and use our existing policy, which is different from that.

MR. SEGURA:

Yeah. You’re going to have some sort of committee. The question is, is what is the makeup of that committee. We had a policy that we were trying to mirror as some of the FAA circulars, I believe, and improve on what we had before, but the CMAR requires some different participants than that, right?

MS. GARRETT:

And that’s what I’m trying to get at.

MR. WALT ADAMS:

It’s actually it’s just what’s -- in my view it’s what is spelled out in their requirements, but it’s not unusual for that type of committee. When you’re dealing with quasi-public agencies dealing in public money, publically funded, that approach that are laid out there seems to cover all the bases in terms of their requirements. I believe that it does.

MR. SKINNER:
My only concern is that in essence the commission will have a one-fifth vote in that committee. So, as a commission, and I say a vote, and if Steven is -- if we appoint Steven to that position, he votes and the commission has no say-so. So, we are taken out of the process, period. I mean we cannot vote on this. And if the recommendation --

MR. CRUSE:

That’s correct. And if we go with the CMAR method that is correct. And there’s a thousand different ways that we can take an easy process and make it more difficult, which is exactly what we’re doing now. A thousand. We can make -- we can turn this thing into the Taj Mahal and make it the most difficult process ever conceived on the planet or we can take it in its most basic sense, take it step-by-step, move forward, make a decision and at least be moving in a direction and making some decisions along the way or we can sit here and debate this and end up in September, October, sitting here at the same desk without a decision being made, which is what I’ve seen over and over, which is exactly what the road that we’re going
to head down if we just keep pushing this off, is exactly that.

MS. GARRETT:

   Well, you got to make an informed decision. Not to push off. You have to make an informed decision --

MR. SKINNER:

   That’s right.

MS. GARRETT:

   -- have some valid information to substantiate what your decision is, but not a decision that’s going to create such convoluted problems that you can’t even get to the next point. I understand what the Chairman is saying, because he -- move is important. And not just asking questions just or creating problems to delay.

   But you can answer my question, Todd, that I asked earlier?

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

   Yeah. As far as those specific five people on that committee, that comes from the state statute for the CMAR method. If you were to use a different method, that statute wouldn’t apply.
MR. SKINNER:

We could use our process.

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

You wouldn’t be stuck with that. You could still use that process or that make up for that committee.

MR. SKINNER:

So during that decision we need to decide if we want to go the CMAR method of the committee or do we stick with the commission’s policy?

MR. CRUSE:

And so what amount of information is it going to take for you to make that decision? Because Walt has provided us all that information. Steven’s got very concise chart that outlines each method, the advantages, the disadvantages. I believe it was in the presentation from the last meeting we had. I mean at some point we got to, you know, how much information do we need. Is one workshop going to be enough --

MS. GARRETT:

Okay.

MR. CRUSE:
-- or do we need ten?

MS. GARRETT:

Todd’s trying to answer my question. If he can finish?

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

I left one thing out, though. Those five people, that’s just for the committee to select the construction manager at risk. That statute doesn’t require you to use that committee for the design professionals.

MR. SKINNER:

I think Walt was saying otherwise.

MR. WALT ADAMS:

No. I’m saying I recommend you follow the same guideline because of the level of profile that this project will receive. I urge you to be as conservative as possible. The reason that they have outlined that five-person committee, selection process is because any CM at risk affords more control to the contractor. Okay? It’s not as conservative as a hard bid scenario out there.

So, what they’re trying to do is make sure that no one can game the system. They want it independent of any public body making a
decision itself or they don’t want to fund it.
Now, let me just add, though, in terms of not
of the commission, the whole commission, not
being involved in my view is not the case.
This selection committee is a subcommittee.
And they’re required to come back to you and
present their findings and their recommendation
and you ratify those. They are not in charge
of actually selecting and contracting that --
those entities; you are.

So, I think that -- and I would, even if it
weren’t a requirement, I would recommend that.
I wouldn’t want -- I wouldn’t want to be
sitting in your place and not understand how
the decision was made and both the methodology
as well as the selection, but I think the
purpose of a subcommittee is to just an economy
of time that you can’t do this on a monthly
basis and expect it to be -- to progress
anywhere.

So, I think if you select the selection
committee as close as -- if you want to use
CMAR in Louisiana and get the Seventeen Million
Dollars ($17,000,000.00) I think that’s
earmarked from the state on this project,
you’ll have to follow that explicitly. If you’re not going to be concerned with that, and you’re going to -- any money that you’re going to get from FPNC, they’re going to have some similar guidelines in terms of their involvement, oversight, and approval.

This is strictly their mandated and it’s as recommended by a number of other agencies. They’re saying this is the right way to make the design selection.

MR. SEGURA:

And some of the state funding we will be seeking will be through the state capital outlay program, which is over sought by facility planning.

MR. WALT ADAMS:

Right.

MR. SEGURA:

Who is overseeing --

MR. WALT ADAMS:

They have to -- they sign the check.

MR. SEGURA:

They’re overseeing the LSU job --

MR. WALT ADAMS:

Right.
MR. SEGURA

-- as well, which is the Seymour (phonetic) job.

MR. WALT ADAMS:

As well as the Two Billion Dollar ($2,000,000,000.00) medical center in New Orleans. Same situation.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

With your experience, Walt, it says a licensed design professional and a licensed contractor not involved in the project.

MR. WALT ADAMS:

Right.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

How many hours do you think are involved in that process to try to get a licensed design professional and a licensed contractor to put in numerous hours of their time with no benefit, financial benefit? I mean we’re talking --

MR. WALT ADAMS:

They’re going to have to meet a number of times and go through some work, but it is an extensive -- it’s not for the full twenty-eight weeks. It’s at intervals. I would say that
the initial organization of the committee and
the protocols on how it wants to proceed is the
most time challenging. And then there will be
interview process on the final three or four
that you whittle it down to. And those --
that’s time consuming. That’s all day, a
couple of days, maybe three days, better part
of a week. But you know, I think the reason
they recommend that is you have community stake
holders that -- I would tell you that most of
the architects and engineers that I know and
constructors, if they’re not involved, they
would cheerfully participate if they’re not
conflicted out.

The reason they would do so is the same
reason they serve on arbitration panels and
other things, is because it’s for the community
good. I would -- to give you an idea of those
committee members at large who it could be, for
instance, and -- I think the local universities
and others have people that purchase large
amounts of design and construction on a regular
basis and are familiar with the high standards
of public procurement law. And I think --
think of it as a loaned executive for the
duration of the selection period. They may come back and ask you to serve on their behalf sometime.

But I would tell you the demographics here, you know, there’s not a huge pool of architects and engineers that are capable to do this type of work. There certainly are many here, but whether they want to step aside and not compete in for the work is something I can’t answer. I would concede that can be a challenge. If so, we’ll have to go out concentrically to other areas of the state to find somebody that’s willing to do that.

I would not suggest that you compensate them for this. You would create another layer of problems.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Mr. Chairman, I’ve got a couple of questions. And our earlier discussion, we talked about a project manager. Is -- where would that fall in if we proceed with that line of thought?

MR. WALT ADAMS:

If you were to decide we’re going to go conventional design, bid, build route, you’re
going to need somebody full time. And I’m torn between full time employees, FTEs, or bringing in a firm to do that, but you would definitely have to have a PM.

The fact that, you know, we’re talking about a CM at risk this is a sophisticated management organization where at that point my personal view is you’re being redundant paying yet another fee for a PM to do that. If you’re going to staff up internally for it, which is certainly an option, then I would have a permanent place for that individual after the project is completed because historically those folks are hired for a period of time. And as the project starts to sunset, they’re looking for another job at the key point you need full attention to your project to wrap it up, punch it out, and get it started up, but they’re gone.

So, I think if you’re going to hire internally, that’s certainly a strong option if you feel like you have enough ongoing work beyond that point to retain them. But I wouldn’t hire a PM firm and a CMAR firm to do basically -- it’s a duplication of work.
MR. SKINNER:

I would like to know Mr. Picou’s opinion, what he -- based on what he’s seen.

MR. PICOU:

In front of you -- Mr. Adams just to -- it was distributed to the Commissioners as a getting the best value of construction dollars and primer for construction delivery methods of various methods and the pros and cons. The CMAR at risk or construction manager at risk project, to be honest with you, Mr. Skinner, this is a new process for me. We looked at it about 2003 in Albuquerque and due to the questions that you have, the uncertainties, it was elected not to go with that.

CMR at risk has its pros and cons. I can work in both the competitive bid and the CMR at risk. It’s just a learning curve on the CMR at risk and it’s something we can go and challenge and take on. I think we need to define that scope before we move on and pick a delivery method.

That way, once we have that in place then we have a better opportunity and better -- and more education to pick the route that we need
MR. SKINNER:

I think that’s what Walt was saying, is we need to define the scope. We need to clearly define the scope before we can move forward. And I don’t want to say everything comes to a screeching halt, but we need to understand what the scope is of everything and how it’s going to work.

MR. PICOU:

And we also need to understand that the various delivery methods and the funding sources.

MR. SKINNER:

We need to compare those. I agree. We need to compare them and the different funding sources, compare one to other on this project and not just in general. I would like to see how it compares on this particular -- specific type of project.

And then I would love to see what other airports who have successfully completed some of the different projects, successfully. Not -- I know New Orleans has used a CMAR but they haven’t completed it, so it would be nice to
see what ones have completed what they have to say about it.

MR. PICOU:

I’m not familiar with any, but I’m sure they’re out there. I just have to do some research and get back to you. I’ll get back to the commission as to ones that are -- that have successfully completed CMAR projects.

MR. SKINNER:

So, my recommendation then is that we, at subcommittees, whatever, that we get the scope defined in a broad -- not in a general sense, but in a very broad and a specific box as possible. And then from their work on the selection committee and then work on the delivery method. I think we can do all those fairly quickly.

MR. WALT ADAMS:

Concurrently or --

MR. SKINNER:

Well, you know, we -- as you said in last meeting, we need to define the scope first. I mean we have to do that before we move forward on any other -- I don’t have enough information based on what we have on what method to use.
So, I think step one, let’s get the scope defined. And it would similar to what the selection committee would be doing, right? The selection committee defines the scope and the criteria. There’s no reason why we can’t, as a commission, try to figure that out.

MR. WALT ADAMS:

My suggestion would be that working with you and the staff we can give enough direction to the design committee to review something and endorse it, if not improve upon it in terms of the project definitions.

MR. CRUSE:

Well, and here’s one thing I want to make clear. I talked about this with Steven earlier and Walt and I have discussed this, this Commission has got to transition back to the way that it was originally designed to operate. I know that it’s gotten away from that over the past couple of years for necessity, but it is — this Commission’s job is to set policy and give direction. And then the staff’s job is to carry out that policy and direction.

So, the majority of the interaction between -- that Walt needs to have and this process
moving forward in general needs to be done at
the staff level. That man right there we spent
a lot of time, put a lot of effort into hiring
the right person to come in here and run this
job. He’s the CEO of this airport. And any
CEO of any corporation would be handling this.

We do not need to micro manage this from
the commission level on making every one of
these decisions. It needs to be done at the
staff level with a direction and a guidance and
policy from the commission down. And that’s
it. I mean that’s the way that it was designed
to operate and that’s the way we need to shift
back and get to a point where that can happen.

So, I mean that’s --

MR. SKINNER:

I agree with that.

MR. CRUSE:

It’s got to. Otherwise, this whole process
will just be completely bogged down with trying
to get three, or four, or five of us who all
have paying jobs, and travel and everything
else, together to try to make a decision that
should be done at the CEO level.

MR. SEGURA:
I think we need to proceed forward. I have my opinions on which method, but if you all aren’t ready to decide that and need to have some workshops then I guess so be it, but I think the important part is to proceed forward and try to get this committee together, which may take a little time as well. And I know, Tim, your concern about our original committee structure as opposed to this committee structure, which this one isn’t bad. And I understand your concern.

In the past, Walt, you may not be aware that we -- in particular with the design -- with the engineering companies that work for us, because of the FAA issues, the way -- and we probably didn’t have our committee designed like it should have been, but there was some issues where the committee made the decision. They made a recommendation to the commission, but the commission pretty much had to pick what the committee said.

So, you know, if we can -- if in the CMAR process or these others, this structure that you’ve outlined can do that with some sort of approval by us, then I don’t see what problem
there is in making the structure of this committee much like the CMAR structure.

MR. SKINNER:

    I’ll agree to -- Like what you're saying, let the executive director come to us with a recommendation on how we should be handling it.

MR. SEGURA:

    And you want to allow the director, but mainly that committee to do what they were charged to do without, you know, as Matt says, messing with it.

MR. CRUSE:

    Well, and we need to leave this meeting with a clear path moving forward. So, from what I’m hearing, and I agree, the scope of this project needs to be more defined than what it is at this point. So, in order to move in that direction then you and Steven, and then anyone else who wants to participate -- I mean Steven, it’s going to be your job to let the other Commissioners know if you guys want to participate. And we’re going to have a meeting and it’s probably going to last four or five hours or whatever, but we’re going to sit down and we’re going to define the scope as much as
we can. And then at that point we also need to
be -- you need to continue working on the
RFP/RFQ, you know, putting together these --
the selection criteria because that is not
going to change --

MR. SEGURA:

Right.

MR. CRUSE:

-- regardless of what we chose. The
selection criteria is going to be the selection
criteria. So, we should have that nailed down
pretty soon, you know. And then that way at
least we’ll get to a point where we have the
scope nailed down; you guys can hash out the
advantages and disadvantages of each of these
methods with the participation of any of the
Commission. And we need to get to a point
where we can actually make a decision and move
this thing forward.

MR. SEGURA:

I agree.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

I agree with the Chairman also. I look at
one project and I hate for this to end up like
that cargo facility. We got concrete sitting
out there that they tried to build three or four years ago and we still sitting there with a slab of concrete. This is going to end up just like that if we let it -- if we keep doing like we’ve been doing. I think we need to put Mr. Picou in charge; let him make recommendations; look at the recommendations; we vote on them and we go from there.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Mr. Chairman, I had intended statements here to make, but I kept my mouth shut because most of them have been cured. But I do want to go back -- I think the workshop concept, whatever, when y’all come to a decision might be a good idea. I think we got to make it available to as many commissioners as possible. And I would challenge my fellow commissioners if you can’t attend let the executive director know that you can’t attend because that creates a lot of more work for them to try to find out if we can make it or not.

I think it’s something that’s imperative. And I want to say something about what the Chairman said, directing everything through the Executive Director. And that was one of my
comments. I’ve seen some emails going around and it looks like you got different dogs hunting different animals.

And I think that the Director should be the man calling the shots if we need to talk to Bobbi Hess, he makes that shot. If we need to talk to Picard Group, he calls that shot. If we need to call Reese and Adam, we need to have one voice. And I’ve learned that in the presentation for the sales tax. When we first started, when we had more than one voice. And I can tell you that was not working at all. And when we got our act together, we ended up in a very good situation.

So, I would challenge everybody let’s go through the Executive Director. If he has any concerns, he’ll get with the Chairman or whoever and go forward. I do not want the commissioners to think we can’t funnel him any information. I think it’s our duty to do so. But I would like for everything to go through him and then he can put everything in perspective and give us a good report.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

If we have a workshop, does that have to be
advertised?

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:

If you have a quorum. If you have four or more commissioners, yes.

MR. ROBICHAUX:

You would just need to know in advance so we could advertise in the proper amount of time.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. Any other questions or comments for Walt for anybody?

(No response.)

All right. Thank you, Walt.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Thank you.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. Scheduled business.

MR. PICOU:

Okay.

F. On the next item is Runway 11-West-End Construction-Authorization to Bid.

Basically, we authorized to accept bids for Runway 11, West-End EMAS system. We’re not looking for any -- we’re looking for funding from FAA and LA DOTD with no intended match
from us. So that’s a -- that ones going.

G. Taxiway Mike-Elliott Construction-Change
Order #3. It’s inside of there.
Okay. And so G is Taxiway Mike, Elliott
Construction, Change Order #3.

H. H is 100 John Glenn Drive Parking Lot-DS&A-
Substantial Completion.

I. I, 224 Tower Drive (ARFF) Interior Upgrades
Contract (Flooring and Painting)-MBSB
Group-Approval.

J. 118 -- J is 118 Shepard Drive Exterior
Upgrades Contract (Metal Panels)-MBSB
Group-Approval.

K. K, Preventative Maintenance Contract
(Generators)-Award of Contract.

L. L is Purchase of Personnel Lift-Approval.

M. M is Purchase of Amplifier-Approval, in the
maintenance shop.

N. And N is purchase of the same type of
amplifier in the terminal, approval.

O. And O is purchase of a radio for my
vehicle.

Any questions on those items?

MR. CRUSE:

Does anybody have anything they want to
pull, individually?

MR. HEBERT:

I just have a quick question on H. If you could tell me what’s the time frame for actually using the parking lot now that we’ve accepted substantial completion?

MR. PICOU:

Mr. Hebert, what we’re doing is we’re -- this is -- I want to make sure I have the right project.

MR. CRUSE:

The rental car lot.

MR. PICOU:

Right. We are looking at somewhere in the June time frame, June 1st, first of June, to actually transition. We’re also going to be putting out an RFP for rental car, to get additional rental cars looking at that type of information. So that will marry up at the same time, June 1st time frame we’re looking at possibly being in that new lot for the rental cars.

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. Any other questions?

MR. GUILBEAU:
Mr. Chairman, I move that we accept items F through O.

MR. CRUSE:

We have a motion by Mr. Guilbeau.

MR. SKINNER:

Second.

MR. CRUSE:

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. PICOU:

P. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, inside of your packet you have monthly reports by Bobbi Hess, P.

Q. Q is Adams and Reese.

R. R is The Picard Group.
S. S is the Monthly Airport Fiscal Review for March.

MR. CRUSE:

Project updates.

MR. PICOU:

On the project updates,

T. T is Taxiway Mike (Parallel Taxiway)-Update. It’s included.

U. North GA Phase II.

V. Master Plan.

W. RTR Cable Relocation.

X. John Glenn Parking Modifications.

Y. Perimeter Road.

Z. Runway 4-Right/22-Left Overlay, as we discussed earlier.

AA. Taxiway Sealcoat Project.

AB. Runway 11-29 RSA Improvements.

AC. The Noise Study.

AD. Cargo Facility-Update.

AE. Cargo Facility-UPS Relocation.

AF. ATCT Interior Upgrade.

AG. Main Terminal Interior Upgrade.

AH. LRA Sign Upgrades.

AI. Main Terminal-Office Suite Upgrades.

MR. GUILBEAU:
Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a comment on project update. I know Mr. Picou has early on talked to me about this. How would the commissioners feel that those updates are sent to us by email and that we don’t have it on the agenda? We’re cutting a lot of trees. I can -- I’m good with getting it on the email and not having it in the agenda packet.

MR. HEBERT:

That’s pretty much what we’re doing now, reviewing them.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Yeah, but it would save a lot of reproduction.

MR. CRUSE:

Yeah. Would it still be in the packet, the electronic packet?

MR. PICOU:

Yes.

MR. GUILBEAU:

No, yeah?

MR. CRUSE:

Okay. As long as it’s accessible by the public, you know, for the -- they have access
to the same documents we have.

MR. GUILBEAU:
   That's not part of the requirement.

MR. CRUSE:
   It's not?

MR. GUILBEAU:
   It was added through the years.

MR. CRUSE:
   Okay. I’m okay if it saves paper. Anybody else?

MR. GUILBEAU:
   Does that address your thoughts?

MR. PICOU:
   Yes. And for clarification, so project updates we’ll remove from this packet, but we will include them in the email electronic version; is that correct?

MR. GUILBEAU:
   Let’s do it separate, maybe at the same time, but a separate transmittal so it don’t end up in the packet.

MR. PICOU:
   Okay.

MR. SWARTZENDRUBER:
   I just have one question. Would they still
be on the agenda? The only reason I ask is if you want to discuss something not on the agenda, you would have to add it as additional business.

MR. CRUSE:

Yeah. I think that is an -- that’s an issue because the purpose for having it is so that if anybody has any questions about any of the project updates we can ask them there. And if we don’t have it on the agenda then --

MR. GUILBEAU:

I was thinking they should email back to the Director and get an answer.

MR. PICOU:

Just a sidebar on that, I know that the commissioners voting on purchasing tablets. We’re going to go ahead and get those. And I think that will help on cutting down some of this and it all being electronic version. So you will be able to scroll through it at that point. It doesn’t necessarily answer the question at hand of do we have to keep it on the agenda.

MR. GUILBEAU:

That solves the problem with cutting the
trees.

MR. PICOU:

   Right.

MR. GUILBEAU:

   Yeah. Okay.

MR. CRUSE:

   All right. I’ll accept a motion to adjourn.

MR. SKINNER:

   I’ve got just a couple more questions. Mr. Steven, anything, any update on Deputy Director search or what’s your plans?

MR. PICOU:

   On the Deputy Director --

MR. SKINNER:

   You’re definitely going to need some help with all this stuff, I mean --

MR. PICOU:

   Sure.

MR. SKINNER:

   -- any way we can step that up.

MR. PICOU:

   Right. I met with Mr. Cruse this morning and within the next forty-five days we’ll actually put an advertisement out on the
street. And then we’ll hire somebody. You’re right. My plate is very full at this point and so --

MR. SKINNER:

It would be nice to have a --

MR. PICOU:

Right.

MR. SKINNER:

-- Deputy Director on board.

MR. PICOU:

And so my goal is to actually learn the process before I brought someone in, kind of immersion into this process. Now it’s time to move on to get a Deputy Director.

MR. GUILBEAU:

Include that in the Internal Affairs committee meeting.

MR. PICOU:

Okay. Yes, sir.

MR. GUILBEAU:

I move.

MR. SKINNER:

Second.

MR. CRUSE:

A motion by Mr. Guilbeau; a second by Mr.
Skinner. Any other comments or questions from the Commission?
(No response.)
From the public?
(No response.)
All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS:
Aye.

MR. CRUSE:
All opposed?
(No response.)
Meeting is adjourned.
(Adjourned at 7:01 p.m.)
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