**Minutes**
**August 4, 2022**
**Consultant Selection Committee**

## A. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order by Consultant Selection Committee Chair Ruppert at 1:33 p.m. in the Airport Office Building, 2nd Floor Conference Room. Commissioner and Committee member Lenhard was present.

Authority Counsel and Staff present were Ms. Cooper, Mr. Lobb, Mr. Owens, Mr. Keith, Ms. Best, Ms. Vandersluis and Ms. Menard. Mr. Brown participated virtually.

## B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Ruppert led the Pledge of Allegiance.

## C. AGENDA

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

## D. DISCUSSION ITEMS

### 1. Interviews and Ranking of Responses for Qualifications and Proposals for Architectural Design Services

Chair Ruppert explained that the Request for Proposal (RFP) directions requested that all firms submit a cover letter. He said that two of the four firms followed those instructions, and the other two firms took a different format approach. He said he wasn't sure how important this was but wanted to point it out for future submission requests. Chair Ruppert commented on a second formatting item and asked that future RFP's include pagination in every proposal since we limit the number of pages to be submitted. Ms. Best said that she added this requirement this morning.

Introductory Comments

Mr. Keith stated that four firms would be presenting today. He provided an overview of the RFP process that was advertised on May 2nd for RFP No. 22-5510 – Architectural Design and Construction Services for Airport Development Projects, which resulted in six proposals received. He said that the intent of this RFP was to secure the services of at least two architectural firms to provide on-call services. He said that although the response in Addendum 1 stated one firm would be selected, staff later determined that up to two firms would be selected. He requested the Committee interview the four shortlisted firms and make a rank-order recommendation to the full Board for their meeting on August 18th.

Chair Ruppert asked if the firms should be ranked in order 1, 2, 3 and 4 or if the top 2 should firms be selected. Mr. Owens recommended the Committee to rank all four firms in order of preference. For the record, Mr. Owens stated that this Committee makes the recommendation of the ranking and then the rankings are presented to the full Board for final approval.

Interviews

Chair Ruppert welcomed the MLM-Martin Architects team and reminded them the presentation should consist of a maximum of 15 minutes to allow for a question-and-answer period afterwards.

a. MLM-Martin Architects, Inc.

Mr. Miguel L. Martin, President and Principal in Charge introduced himself and his Project Architect/Project Manager, Miguel A. Martin and thanked the Committee for selecting MLM-Martin Architects to present today. Mr. Martin (L.) stated that their firm's first airport project was at Orlando International in 1994 and have consistently worked at airports since that time.

Mr. Martin (A.) reviewed their record of successful performance within the State of Florida which included over 185 aviation projects completed. He provided an overview of the five principles they apply to their projects to ensure a successful outcome and their understanding of the Naples Airport. He addressed items for consideration during the design, bidding, negotiation and construction phases. He presented on how they would manage, staff, schedule and control costs from design through completion of our projects.

Mr. Martin (A.) concluded his presentation by summarizing the benefits that MLM-Martin can bring to the Naples Airport. He addressed the experience and longevity of their 11 employees and noted that the benefit of a small firm is that there would be no learning curve for the employees assigned to our project and the NAA would know who they were working with from project to project.

A question-and-answer period followed.

b. Michael Baker International

Chair Ruppert welcomed the Michael Baker International team and reminded them the presentation should consist of a maximum of 15 minutes to allow for a question-and-answer period afterwards.

Mr. Mark Kistler, Principal-in-Charge/Aviation Practice Lead; Mr. Nathan Parish, Project Manager with the Airport Consulting Group in Tampa; and Mr. Steve Iovanna, Deputy Project Manager/Lead Architect working out of the Fort Myers office introduced themselves.

Mr. Kistler thanked the Committee for the opportunity to present. He provided an overview of their firm, local presence and team.

Mr. Parish presented their understanding of the design, bidding, negotiation and construction management processes.

Mr. Iovanna expanded on the conceptual design and quality control process. He said their subconsultant, Elite Permits, would be helping the team with the permitting process and they have local experience. He highlighted the importance of cost estimating throughout the entire process.

Mr. Parish reviewed their approach to the bidding, negotiation and construction phases to control cost as well as to manage the schedule and documentation/drawings.

Mr. Kistler provided an overview of their previous experience with aviation projects, including some that contained sustainability elements, and shared quotes from some of their clients about their work. In closing, he outlined the expertise they can offer to NAA if their firm was selected.

A question-and-answer period followed.

c. SchenkelShultz Architecture

Chair Ruppert welcomed the SchenkelShultz team and reminded them the presentation should consist of a maximum of 15 minutes to allow for a question-and-answer period afterwards.

Mr. Daniel Laggan, Partner; Ms. Somer Spencer, Lead Design Professional/Aviation Architect; and Ms. Nathalie White, Project Manager/Construction Administrator introduced themselves.

Mr. Laggan provided an overview of their firm and highlighted their local presence and Gulf Coast aviation expertise.

Ms. White said that she would be our sole point of contact and has been in Southwest Florida for the last eight years. She provided an overview of their staff resources and her team's experience. She highlighted their approach to projects.

Ms. Spencer outlined their five-point methodology to manage projects effectively. She gave a case study of similar project experience at Signature Flight Support at Reagan National Airport in terms of design excellence.

Mr. Laggan explained their bidding and negotiation processes and provided an example of a similar interior renovation that they worked on.

Ms. White addressed how they would approach and manage the construction phase and highlighted the work they've previously done at the Naples Airport. She noted the added value of SchenkelShultz because of their previous experience, having already completed projects at the Naples Airport and their strong relationships with local subcontractors. She recapped by thanking the Committee for the opportunity to present today.

A question-and-answer period followed.

d. EXP U.S. Services, Inc.

Chair Ruppert welcomed the EXP U.S. Services team and reminded them the presentation should consist of a maximum of 15 minutes to allow for a question-and-answer period afterwards.

Mr. David Castaneda, Project Manager introduced himself; Ms. Beatriz de Paulis, Architectural Design Manager; and Mr. Marcos Souza, Construction Manager. He provided an overview of his firm and the

services they offer and stated that they have more than 10 offices in Florida. He highlighted the subconsultant firms they would work with to hit the ground running from day one. He provided their approach to design and management.

Ms. De Paulis addressed their firm's concept design process where the project is developed into a schematic and construction document in order to move to the construction phase.

Mr. Souza presented their approach to the bidding, negotiation and construction management phases. He noted that they have an office in Fort Myers and in Broward County with plenty of available resources to see our projects to a successful outcome.

Mr. Castaneda recapped his firm's experience, local presence, and available resources.

A question-and-answer period followed.

Initial Rankings

Chair Ruppert said he would like Committee discussion about the four firms before providing the rankings. He added that a critical issue raised at the Consultant Selection Committee meeting held in May was our need to supplement and invigorate, SchenkelShultz. He said that he would consider SchenkelShultz one of the stronger presenters today and liked how they responded to the proposal. For the second firm, he was torn between selecting a large firm with lots of resources but not necessarily locally based vs. a firm that is not local/regional but who probably has more focus.

He requested Commissioner Lenhard to provide his initial feedback.

Commissioner Lenhard expressed similar thoughts shared by Chair Ruppert. He said that all four firms were well qualified. He was impressed with the way MLM came across with their knowledge level. Chair Lenhard said that he ran a small family-owned business for many years and competed against the big companies, but they differentiated themselves by focusing on their customers and giving them their undivided attention. He said MLM seems to be hard-working and dedicated. Their goal is to expand their footprint in Florida, and this is an opportunity to do that. He commented that SchenkelShultz does a great job and believes they need to be here. For the second firm, he was leaning towards MLM. He added that one of the current concerns was their physical location but noted Michael Baker International's architect of record is located in Fort Myers and is relatively new with little experience in this marketplace.

Chair Ruppert said his thought process was similar to Commissioner Lenhard's. He said he liked MLM's earnestness, being a boutique firm with the goal of expanding to this area. He said he did like what EXP and Michael Baker had to offer but struggled how they both would bridge local relationships in construction, permitting and dealing with the City's Building Department. He said that they had larger learning curves. Chair Ruppert stated that SchenkelShultz adequately addressed his concern about whether they would stay hungry for our business, and he liked their familiarity and experience with us. He said that MLM convinced him that they would do a good job, be responsive and do whatever they have to do to make this partnership work even though they may not be as local as we might like. Chair

Ruppert commented that EXP provided confusing answers about the use of subcontractors, who the point person was and how they assign different architects to different projects.

Chair Ruppert asked staff for their input. Committee members noted that they were open minded and that staff should feel free to share their honest feedback.

Staff Feedback

Mr. Lobb said that each of the firms are very qualified and each one offers something different. He said that some of them may lend themselves more to an architectural scope than more of a general consulting scope that we are looking for. He said that he remains concerned with MLM's location, availability and lack of Southwest Florida experience. Although Mr. Martin (A.) said that he conducts a recurring visit at his Pensacola job site every four weeks, Mr. Lobb stated that sometimes it is necessary to meet with a firm two or three times per week. Mr. Lobb expressed concern about time with the owners since they are the principals involved in their entire portfolio of projects. Mr. Lobb stated their presentation was busy, wordy, with some fonts in all caps, lower caps, yellow typeface, white typeface and a typo in the word, "hangers" vs. "hangars".

Mr. Lobb said that it was helpful that Michael Baker is based in Fort Myers, despite the architect being new to the area. He added that they have a lot of Florida and general aviation experience, ample resources and liked their discussion about the due diligence of modeling pre-existing conditions. He said they are very involved in the airport industry, have good connections and a strong bench.

Regarding EXP, Mr. Lobb said he did not understand the role of their office in Fort Myers and didn't get a great understanding of their architectural portfolio, even though he thought they were a great firm. He sees them more as an extension of our staff for general consulting services; and if they are not selected for this project, he would encourage them to submit on our general consulting services proposal when we solicit for that in the future. He liked their answer on why they would like to add Naples to their portfolio. He was concerned about their response to who the architect of record would be and with their comment about using EG Solutions as the permitting liaison.

Mr. Keith said he had similar concerns with MLM's location, the limited size of their firm and their comment about meeting every four weeks. He noted that he didn't understand the map of the airport that they displayed, and the areas highlighted did not apply to any of our current or future projects.

Regarding Michael Baker, Mr. Keith stated that they have been very active in the state and in his experience working with Mr. Kistler previously, he found him to be very responsive and accurate. He said that they have a similar clientele to that of the Naples Airport in their work at the Ocala Airport and Ocean Reef.

Regarding SchenkelShultz, Mr. Keith stated that they can bring continuity of design and their team has performed much better since Ms. White and Ms. Spencer became project manager and project architect.

Regarding EXP, Mr. Keith said that although a well qualified firm, the example project where they saved $50 million was unrelated to the type of projects that we would do here. Mr. Keith said he would rank SchenkelShultz and Michael Baker as the top two consultants for this project.

Chair Ruppert asked staff if it came down to Michael Baker and EXP, which firm would they select. Mr. Lobb said EXP is not a strong architectural firm and that they are more civil oriented and a bit more oriented towards very large airports.

Ms. Cooper commented that if EXP understood us as a client, they would have presented more examples of their work in their hospitality and entertainment lines of their business. She said that she didn't see anything in their submission that was aesthetically pleasing or that speaks to a higher echelon of clientele and this was a concern for her. Her initial thought would be to select Michael Baker, but would defer to Mr. Lobb and Mr. Keith since they would be working more closely with the selected firms.

Chair Ruppert expressed that he was truly listening with an open mind to staff's comments and agrees with their thinking; however, he was struggling whether Michael Baker was better than EXP and MLM since there would still be no local presence due to Mr. Iovanna's recent relocation from Connecticut and Mr. Parish being on three on-call projects right now all over the state with limited capacity to give us attention. Mr. Iovanna was brought to Naples to build their business. Other than the limited size of MLM's firm, they do not have any additional issues relative to Michael Baker and EXP; and MLM had a much hungrier business approach, and we would be handled to the best of their abilities. Chair Ruppert asked how Michael Baker would be better relative to a local response because they would be using a third-party permitting expediter who would not be developing a project relationship with the City's Building Department. Mr. Keith stated that their architect would be local, and their firm is large enough to provide resources to support him. Chair Ruppert asked if Michael Baker would be the better choice because they have someone in Fort Myers vs. with MLM in Orlando, we would be dealing with the founder and the founder's son.

Mr. Lobb responded that there was another element regarding the aesthetics of design, and he didn't believe that MLM presented that factor, whereas Michael Baker showed their aesthetics on their project at the Ocala Airport, Punta Gorda Airport and Ocean Reef.

Commissioner Lenhard understood where staff was coming from and that they will be dealing with these firms every day, but he related to Chair Ruppert's points. If there is a concern to meet with MLM twice a week, he suggested that staff could have a conversation with MLM about that. Chair Ruppert stated that Michael Baker may have a shorter learning curve, but MLM had a better team. He agreed that Michael Baker did a better job with the aesthetic part.

Commissioner Lenhard stated that the Ocala Airport project was impressive looking, but does staff know if Mr. Iovanna has those talents or would they have to bring in another architect for design.

Final Rankings

Chair Ruppert made a motion to rank the firms in order of preference to present to the full Board of Commissioners for approval on August 18, 2022, as follows: 1) SchenkelShultz Architecture; 2) MLM-Martin Architecture, Inc.; 3) Michael Baker International and 4) EXP U.S. Services, Inc.

Mr. Owens stated that proper procedure would be to second the motion. If there isn't a second to the motion, he advised the Committee could open it up for further discussion. Since there are two

Commissioners present today which qualifies as a quorum for this Committee, it possibly leads to no mutual assent. If that occurs, Mr. Owens said that this would not result in a ranking and then the Committee could discuss their individual recommendations at the August Board meeting.

There was not a second to the motion.

Chair Ruppert retracted his motion. He said that it became clear through the discussions that staff preferred Michael Baker over MLM. Chair Ruppert said he was trying to do the right thing and said he believes staff is battle-tested and would make the relationship work. If they are not satisfied, they could then go on to a firm that does work.

Chair Ruppert made a motion to rank the firms in order of preference to present to the full Board of Commissioners for approval on August 18, 2022 as follows: 1) SchenkelShultz Architecture; 2) Michael Baker International; 3) MLM-Martin Architecture, Inc.; and 4) EXP U.S. Services, Inc.

Commissioner Lenhard seconded. The motion passed 2-0 unanimously.

Chair Ruppert stated that for the benefit of the other Commissioners, there may be more discussion at the August Regular Board Meeting.

## E. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

## F. CORRESPONDENCE/COMMISSIONER COMMENTS & REQUESTS/ MEETINGS

There were no additional comments or requests/meetings.

## G. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 4:59 p.m.

Christopher A. Rozansky
Secretary

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

# FINAL AGENDA

**General Aviation Terminal, Larson Conference Room, 160 Aviation Drive N., Naples, FL**
**Thursday, August 4, 2022**
**1:30 p.m.**

**Commissioner Kerry C. Dustin – Chair**
**Commissioner Rick Ruppert – Vice Chair, Consultant Selection Committee Chair, Audit Committee Member**
**Commissioner Michael Lenhard – Audit Committee and Consultant Selection Committee Member**
**Commissioner Donna M. Messer – NCC and TAC Liaison**
**Commissioner Rita Cuddihy – 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**

**B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

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

**D. DISCUSSION ITEM**

1. **Interviews and Ranking of Responses for Qualifications and Proposals for Architectural Design Services**

   a. MLM-Martin Architects, Inc.

   b. Michael Baker International

   c. SchenkelSchultz Architecture

   d. EXP U.S. Services, Inc.

**E. PUBLIC COMMENTS (Public comments accepted for items not otherwise listed on the Agenda; 5 minute limit)**

**F. CORRESPONDENCE/COMMISSIONER COMMENTS & REQUESTS/MEETINGS**

**G. 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 Lenhard. All NAA Commissioners are welcome to attend and can "opt in" to participate and vote.