Minutes
October 30, 2023
Consultant Selection Committee

A. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order by Consultant Selection Committee Chair Ruppert at 9:05 a.m., in the Airport Office Building, 2nd Floor Conference Room. Chair Ruppert announced that today's meeting would be a hybrid meeting whereby participants would attend in person and via Zoom.

Authority Counsel and Staff present were Mr. Rozansky, Mr. Owens, Mr. Lobb, Ms. Best, Mr. Burch, Mr. Warriner, Ms. Wiggins, and Ms. Menard.

1. Determine Committee Quorum

Chair Ruppert stated that two Commissioners were present in person and that there was a quorum. He asked Ms. Menard to take a roll call of the in-person attendees. Chair Ruppert was present, and Commissioner Cuddihy was present and opted in to participate and vote in the meeting.

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Ruppert led the Pledge of Allegiance.

C. AGENDA

Mr. Rozansky stated there were no additions or deletions to the agenda.

D. DISCUSSION ITEMS (Public comments accepted for each item; 5-minute limit)

1. **Interview Response to Request for Qualifications and Proposals (RFP) #23-5537, Full-Service Airspace Procedure Design Firm (Public comments accepted for each item)**

There were no public comments.

Introductory Comments

Chair Ruppert said there were three firms interviewing today, and ample time would be allowed for each presentation, followed by a question-and-answer period and discussion. He stated that he had a hard stop at 12:30 p.m. He requested staff to bring in the first firm to interview.

Commissioner Burns joined the meeting via Zoom.

Chair Ruppert asked Mr. Owens to introduce the procedure to potentially allow a Commissioner to participate virtually. Mr. Owens stated that an in-person quorum was present and that the two in-person Commissioners may now determine if extraordinary circumstances existed to allow the additional CSC members attending via video teleconference to participate and vote in this meeting.

Chair Ruppert moved approval for Commissioner Burns to participate and vote via Zoom. Commissioner Cuddihy seconded the motion, which was approved by a unanimous vote of 2-0.

Mr. Owens affirmed that Commissioner Burns had been approved to participate and vote in this meeting. There were now three members participating and voting in this meeting.

Interviews

Chair Ruppert welcomed Hughes Aerospace and reminded the representative that the presentation should last a maximum of 15 minutes to allow for a question-and-answer period afterward.

a. Hughes Aerospace

Mr. Chris Baur, President & CEO, introduced himself and the Hughes Aerospace technical team. Mr. Baur provided background of the firm's experience and presented an overview of the firm's history. He noted that Hughes Aerospace has exceptionally high customer satisfaction, being the largest full-service non-FAA Public Service Provider in the United States, with the most published public instrument flight procedures outside of the FAA. He reviewed the firm's vision for the project and highlighted the team's experience.

Mr. Baur reviewed his understanding of the project scope of services and expected deliverables. He said that when Hughes Aerospace mobilizes, the first thing they do is obtain data to reveal and identify obstacles. He noted that the NAA database was last updated five years ago. While his team was researching the NAA in preparation to submit their RFP, some outdated obstacles were identified. His team contacted the FAA Obstacle Data Team to inform them of the outdated obstacles that had since been dismantled and were penalizing the airport. Those outdated obstacles and duplicate obstacles have since been removed. Mr. Baur spoke about several aspects that his firm would incorporate into the project to develop airspace procedures that are FAA-compliant and submission-ready. He also summarized the benefits that he believed Hughes Aerospace would bring to the NAA. He shared some of the work his team has performed at other airports with similar needs, including several in Florida.

Mr. Baur highlighted the fact that Hughes Aerospace is the only entity outside of the FAA that can approve its own Part 97 procedures and explained how this would benefit the NAA. He said the Hughes Aerospace team design their own charts and submit them to FAA for publication.

A question-and-answer period followed regarding the challenges with the proposed golf course departure route (Goodlette-Frank) and the challenges of the Down the Bay departure. Mr. Baur shared their perspective on increasing the 2,000 foot hold and potentially moving it geographically, answered questions regarding the timeline to get procedures approved, illustrated his experience with the airlines and air traffic control, and shared the estimated 24-month timeline for deliverables. Additional discussion during this period examined the process and approval for expedient publication of procedures, review of an FAA letter declaring Hughes is certified Part 97, and the implementation of the Boeing Field procedures. The Hughes Aerospace cost estimate was presented as +/-$500,000.

Chair Ruppert stated that the first presentation took one hour and 15 minutes. He requested that the next two presentations be completed by 12 p.m. to ensure enough time for discussion and a vote before concluding by 12:30 p.m.

Chair Ruppert called for a short recess.

b. Diverse Vector Aviation Consulting (DVAC)

Chair Ruppert welcomed the Diverse Vector Aviation Consulting (DVAC) team and reminded the representatives that their presentation should last a maximum of 15 minutes to allow for a question-and-answer period afterward.

Mr. Kevin Karpe, Founder and CEO of DVAC, introduced himself and Mr. Douglas Marek, CEO of PBNNAS, LLC, a subconsultant. Mr. Karpe shared the firm's extensive project experience, its qualifications and work history in the United States, worldwide, and with the NAA. He provided an overview of how DVAC would approach the project, stating that the Safety Management Systems (SMS) would be part of the procedure design from the beginning and would include recommendations from all stakeholders. He indicated an understanding of how critical community engagement is to the NAA and how his firm would provide for regular updates and presentations as defined in the Scope of Work.

Mr. Karpe stated that DVAC has supported the NAA as a subconsultant to Environmental Science Associates (ESA) for two years as part of the recently completed Part 150 Noise Study. Involvement in that project allowed DVAC professionals to develop relationships with the NAA, FAA, Naples Tower, and the RSW Tower/TRACON, and they are intimately familiar with the aviation goals of the City of Naples and the NAA.

Mr. Marek presented the cost analysis, breaking down each section of the project and detailed the project's timeline to completion. He noted that DVAC and its partners are well-versed in working with FAA throughout this process. He explained the possible impacts on the RSW approach airspace and their approach to affecting change early on vs. at the back end.

A question-and-answer period followed regarding the high cost estimate for the project compared to the other two firms interviewing today, their complete implementation package, the work DVAC/PBNNAS has already done to date with the FAA related to the Naples Airport, the estimated timeline of 12 months and their capacity to take on this project.

Mr. Rozansky noted that another submitter had suggested that the feasibility study prepared by DVAC regarding the Down the Bay and Goodlette Road corridor was not feasible and did not meet FAA criteria. Mr. Marek said other firms are building in TARGETS (FAA software), but he elaborated on how Mr. White changes the track type and the waypoint type, which allows the path of the aircraft to change, making the system perform differently.

c. VMC, LLC

Chair Ruppert welcomed the VMC, LLC team and reminded the representatives that their presentation should last a maximum of 15 minutes to allow for a question-and-answer period afterward.

Ms. Angie Merrifield, President of VMC LLC, introduced herself and Mr. Robert Varani, Vice President and Project Lead. She also introduced Mr. Mack Alexander, Infina, Ltd., who would be conducting the FAA coordination for the project.

Ms. Merrifield spoke about her firm's approach to developing airspace procedures, the firm's project experience and critical factors, estimated cost, and the project timeline. She stated that VMC is a full-service company with a large team that brings many unique perspectives. She also said that VMC possesses a solid understanding of the unique airspace issues in the region.

Mr. Varani shared his background and experience. He said each project is unique and requires different skill sets. Mr. Varani acknowledged that Instrument Flight Procedures are very complex, especially from the airport's perspective. A significant amount of coordination is required for a successful outcome. He discussed the elements of his team's full-service approach, highlighting subcontractors and the

perspective they bring to the table. He presented a project organizational chart that indicated everyone on the project team. In addition, Mr. Varani discussed the tasks, goals and deliverables.

Mr. Alexander shared his experience and how it is relative to the scope of services for this project. He discussed the approach to developing airspace and the coordination required. He noted this was about managing change and understanding the importance of positive professional relationships.

Mr. Varani presented insight tasks identified in the RFQ. He discussed considerations and how his firm would approach various project elements. He talked about the project experience and key factors, stating that his team would look at and evaluate alternatives to determine what is best for the airport's success. The project cost was noted, but Mr. Varani said the costs may be refined. In the proposal, different costs were provided for multiple projects, each project containing varied elements.

A question-and-answer period followed regarding the number and type of current and past projects, feasibility of getting each procedure in the RFQ completed, estimated cost of $1.35 million, timeline for completion, FAA's three priority levels of advancing the procedure development schedule, and their team's capacity to complete this project.

Mr. Rozansky asked Mr. Varani to expand on his mention of challenges with the Down the Bay departure. Mr. Varani said there were design and performance issues with the procedures noted in the RFQ as well as potential issues moving noise from one area to another. He explained the requirements for developing an Instrument Flight Procedure and the climb gradient of 500 feet per nautical mile. He added that the ground track may not be where you want it to be. If you put in a charted visual departure to fly the bay visually, that would be feasible.

Initial Rankings

Chair Ruppert asked if there were any public comments. Ms. Menard said there were none.

Chair Ruppert said that all three presentations were very good. He requested Commissioner Burns to share his input about each firm.

Commissioner Burns stated that he was looking for a consultant with the most experience in the Naples community, as well as the technical ability to complete the job. He liked the idea of the fixed cost as presented by DVAC. He added that cost was not the most important factor for him. Generally, experience in the industry was more important to him.

Chair Ruppert asked Mr. Rozansky to share his thoughts. Mr. Rozansky said all three firms demonstrated the technical competence to do the work. He noted that varying opinions were heard about what was feasible but, separately, what was likely to be accepted by the FAA. He said DVAC had more familiarity with Naples, and they referenced their positive meeting at RSW and ability to work with them. Staff knows that there was also some pushback in that meeting, and it would be difficult to get everything we wanted to achieve. Regarding Hughes, they have recently done some work in the State of Florida and have done multiple projects that might be more comparable to Naples. Mr. Rozansky was concerned about their assertive statement that they did not believe the Down the Bay procedure was feasible. At the end of Hughes presentation when questioned about using fly-by waypoints instead, Mr. Bauer then said, it was possibly feasible.

Mr. Rozansky thought VMC presented a balanced approach and painted a realistic picture of the timeframe within which they thought the project could be done, based on recent experience. He did not see any projects they had done that were as relevant to the RFP as what had been done by the other firms. Mr. Rozansky liked the success that Hughes Aerospace had, but he also liked the credibility of Mr. Walter White of PBNNAS. If someone other than DVAC were selected, the first step would be validating or having them perform their own feasibility analysis at the front end before getting into design.

Commissioner Cuddihy thought all of the firms were terrific. She said Hughes Aerospace cost was the lowest price but the estimate did not include the feasibility analysis. Her concern was how they would address the public. She felt their language may be difficult for the general public to understand. She thought VMC did the best job putting the technical information in plain English. She did not get a feeling from Hughes about how far they will go to get the buy-in of the air traffic controllers in Naples and Fort Myers. When she looked at DVAC, their cost seemed high, but it was fixed. She said the advantage with them was their knowledge of Naples Airport and the procedures. She said VMC's timeline was quite concerning at 3 years and 8 months, even though it might be realistic. She said the gentleman from VMC who was talking about the feasibility of each of the procedures seemed very doubtful how well they could or couldn't do it.

Chair Ruppert felt that in the first and third presentations, there was a fair amount of concern expressed about the ability to implement some of the procedures from the feasibility study. So much so that he would entertain an independent analysis be done anyway. Chair Ruppert shared apprehension that although this job may be the path for a very familiar and talented consulting firm, the problem may not get solved. His second concern had to do with the timeframe given by the three firms. He was encouraged by the short timeframe given by DVAC, but believed it was based on the assumption that what they had written would be formalized and then implemented. His third concern was cost, with Hughes being under $1 million versus $1.35 million for VMC versus $2.4 million for DVAC. It was relevant to Chair Ruppert that DVAC was somewhere between double or triple the cost estimate of the other two consultant quotes. He thought that Hughes Aerospace needed to provide more clarification and validation on whether the goals requested would be accomplished and result in a reduction of the noise. He believed that Hughes could provide a relatively quick validation of which principles were implementable and may also provide other alternatives. Chair Ruppert was leaning toward the party that could validate the procedures and help determine whether that was a way to reduce noise in the community. Dealing with the only firm who will save time because they are Part 97 certified was attractive, because they can get the procedures designed, accepted and implemented. Hughes Aerospace did indicate that they have people embedded within the project management division of the FAA, which was also a plus. Chair Ruppert thought all three firms would be capable, and each one did a nice job presenting their submittals. He stated that he was favoring Hughes Aerospace. He was concerned with VMC's capacity.

Commissioner Burns liked that DVAC had experience in Naples. He also felt they could best relate to the community because of their previous experience. He said this was a flight departure procedure assignment based on the results of the Part 150 study, and he saw no reason to change consultants. He felt DVAC was farther along, including having met with Air Traffic Control in Fort Myers.

Commissioner Cuddihy addressed the comments regarding Down the Bay potentially not being feasible. She thought the difference between Hughes and VMC was significant in that one reverse-engineered a possible solution whereas the other was pretty negative about the possibility. She said DVAC spent several months developing their solution, and they had a lot more time invested in this initiative. She also noted that the NAA already had significant resources invested in DVAC.

Mr. Rozansky said that the considerable difference in cost remained a concern. He said other procedures would have to be modified, so he did not think the pricing was reliable until after the negotiation stage. He said it wasn't often that a solicitation received submittals with pricing as varied as this one. Mr. Rozansky said without getting further into the process, he did not have a lot of confidence in the fact that this job would cost less than $500,000. He pointed out that VMC, LLC mentioned their work would be complete in about eight months, and that they were referring to the three years timeframe as the time for FAA to review and approve. Mr. Rozansky said that regardless which firm is chosen, he has typically experienced an 18-24-month timeframe for the FAA to review and publish flight procedures.

Final Rankings

Commissioner Burns moved to recommend the ranking of firms as follows: 1) Diverse Vector Aviation Consulting; 2) VMC, LLC; 3) Hughes Aerospace, for RFP #23-5537, the Full-Service Airspace Procedure Design Firm for Board approval at its November Regular Meeting. The motion failed due to lack of a second.

Commissioner Cuddihy moved to recommend the ranking of firms as follows: 1) Diverse Vector Aviation Consulting; 2) Hughes Aerospace; 3) VMC, LLC for RFP #23-5537, the Full-Service Airspace Procedure Design Firm for Board approval at its November Regular Meeting. Commissioner Burns seconded. The motion passed unanimously 3-0.

There were no public comments.

E. CORRESPONDENCE/COMMISSIONER COMMENTS & REQUESTS/ MEETINGS

Commissioner Cuddihy said that providing the ranking was a tough choice today.

Commissioner Burns thanked the Commissioners for allowing him to participate via Zoom today. He thought it worked very well.

F. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:36 p.m.

Christopher A. Rozansky, Secretary

CITY OF NAPLES AIRPORT AUTHORITY (NAA)
Board of Commissioners
Notice of Consultant Selection Committee Meeting

Naples AIRPORT AUTHORITY

FINAL AGENDA

Airport Office Building (AOB) Conference Room, 200 Aviation Drive N., Naples, FL
Monday, October 30, 2023
9 a.m.

Commissioner Kerry C. Dustin – Chair
Commissioner Rick Ruppert – Vice Chair, Consultant Selection Committee Chair, Audit Committee Member
Commissioner Rita Cuddihy – NCC and TAC Liaison
Commissioner Robert P. Burns – Consultant Selection Committee Member, Audit Committee Member
Commissioner Terrence W. Cavanaugh – Audit Committee Chair
Executive Director: Christopher A. Rozansky
Authority Attorney: William L. Owens, Esq. of Bond, Schoeneck & King, PLLC

Welcome. If you wish to address the Consultant Selection Committee regarding an item listed on the Agenda, please complete a Speaker Registration form and hand it to the Executive Assistant prior to consideration of that item. We ask that speakers limit comments to 5 minutes and that large groups name a spokesperson whenever possible. All written, audio-visual, and other materials distributed to Committee members or staff during this meeting will become the property of NAA and will be a public record. Thank you for your interest and participation.

NOTICE

Formal action may be taken on any item listed on the Agenda below, or added to the Agenda before or during the meeting, or discussed during the meeting without being added to the Agenda. Also, the sequence of items may be changed as the meeting progresses.

Any person who decides to appeal a decision of this Committee with respect to any matter considered at this meeting (or hearing) will need a record of the proceeding and may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be heard.

Any person with a disability requiring auxiliary aids or services in order to participate in this proceeding for meetings at the City Council Chamber may call the City Clerk's Office at 213-1015, or for meetings at the Airport Office Building, the NAA Executive Assistant's Office at 643-0733, with requests at least two business days before the meeting.

Information on Action Items and other items which has been provided in advance of this meeting may be inspected at the office of the Executive Assistant, General Aviation Terminal Building, 2nd Floor, 160 Aviation Drive North. minutes of this meeting will be prepared for Board approval, usually at the next Regular Meeting.

A. ROLL CALL

1. Determine Board of Commissioners Quorum

   a. In person attendance

   b. Action required by majority of in-person members to allow virtual attendance

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

C. AGENDA (Add, delete or re-sequence items)

D. DISCUSSION ITEM (Public comments accepted for each item; 5 minute limit)

1. Interviews Response to Request for Qualifications and Proposals (RFP) #23-5537, Full-Service Airspace Procedure Design Firm

   a. Hughes Aerospace

   b. Diverse Vector Aviation Consulting

   c. VMC, LLC

E. CORRESPONDENCE/COMMISSIONER COMMENTS & REQUESTS/MEETINGS

F. ADJOURN

Information on Discussion Items and other items which has been provided in advance of this meeting may be inspected at the office of the Executive Assistant, General Aviation Terminal Building, 2nd Floor, 160 Aviation Drive North. Minutes of this meeting will be prepared for Board approval, usually at the next Regular Meeting.

NOTE: The Consultant Selection Committee is comprised of Committee Chair Ruppert and Commissioner Burns. All NAA Commissioners are welcome to attend and can "opt in" to participate and vote.