Minutes
May 5, 2022
Consultant Selection Committee

A. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order by Consultant Selection Committee Chair Ruppert at 1:32 p.m. in the Airport Office Building, 2nd Floor Conference Room. Commissioner Lenhard, Committee Member, was present. Authority Counsel and Staff present were Mr. Rozansky, Mr. Owens, Mr. Lobb, Mr. Keith, Ms. Best, Ms. Vandersluis, and Ms. Menard.

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Ruppert led the Pledge of Allegiance.

C. AGENDA

Mr. Rozansky stated that there were no additions or deletions to the agenda; however, one of the three firms has withdrawn.

Mr. Owens stated that Gallo Herbert Architects who was scheduled to present today has advised us that they were unable to attend today's meeting. Mr. Owens said, however, they are still to be considered as part of this process in the ranking at the end of this meeting. Even though they won't be presenting, he said that Committee members received a copy of their response to the RFP and a copy of their presentation was distributed for Committee consideration. Chair Ruppert for the record stated that he reviewed their response to the RFP, and he thought they were well qualified and a worthy candidate. He said he looked through the presentation at the start of this meeting and that the Committee will consider them in the ranking relative to the other two firms.

D. DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Interviews and Rankings of Responses for the Design Services – North Road Terminal Upgrade Request for Proposals (RFP)

Introductory Comments

Chair Ruppert asked if Committee members or staff had any questions. There were none.

Interviews

1. MLM-Martin Architects, Inc.

Mr. Miguel L. Martin, Principal-in-Charge, of MLM-Martin Architects introduced himself and his Project Manager, Mr. Miguel A. Martin, as well as Mr. Robert (Bobby) Palm, Senior Civil Engineer/Project Manager for AVCON. He highlighted other subconsultant firms who would be involved in the project. Mr. Martin (Miguel L.) presented an overview of their firm, highlighted several successful projects that they have completed, and provided their understanding of the Naples Airport project.

Mr. Palm provided an overview of his firm and engineering projects that he has worked on at the Naples Airport.

Mr. Martin (Miquel A.) provided their understanding of the design process, technical considerations, and a suggested aesthetic that would be cohesive with the General Aviation Terminal. He reviewed their quality process, flexibility in their delivery, cost control program, as well as their experience at other airports. Miguel A. addressed their approach to handling current/future material supply issues.

Miguel L. reviewed phasing options and provided an example of successful phasing at Orlando International Airport. He concluded his presentation by summarizing their experience and proven track record.

A question-and-answer period followed.

2. SchenkelSchultz Architecture

Mr. Daniel Laggan, Partner-in-Charge, introduced himself, Nathalie White, Project Manager/Construction Administrator; and Somer Spencer, Aviation Project Architect/Lead Design Professional. He provided an overview of his firm, their aviation experience, program, and local expertise. Ms. White provided a review of projects that they have been involved with at the Naples Airport and their knowledge about the North Road Terminal since they completed the first phase renovation of the building and conducted a feasibility study for the building in December 2021. She provided a review of their approach to ensure delivery of a quality project, an outline of project and program goals during the discovery phase and presented local subcontractor firms that they would be working with on this project. She provided a design schedule, design phases to track cost at each stage, and a plan to deal with any supply issues along the way.

Ms. Spencer stated that they would align with the Master Plan completed in February 2021 and will take that into consideration whenever options are considered for the future development of the North Road Terminal. She noted that her firm was the architect-of-record for the project to upgrade the building for use as a temporary terminal during the GAT renovation and that they are aware of flooding issues related to the parking area that will need to be resolved. She reviewed four different options that were outlined in the feasibility study. She said that her firm would work with staff during the discovery phase to establish what our goals are for the NRT. She provided several examples of relevant work they have achieved at other FBO terminals. Ms. Spencer proposed an optional phasing and renovation strategy for the project.

Ms. White presented several expansion options to gain additional square feet. She recapped their firm's experience and expressed their interest to work with us on this project.

A question-and-answer period followed.

3. Gallo Herbert Architects

As mentioned earlier in the meeting, Mr. Owens stated that Committee members have the presentation and response from Gallo Herbert Architects. He added that the Committee will be considering their qualifications in their analysis and that Gallo Herbert Architects will be part of the Committee's ranking.

Initial Rankings

Before the Committee provided input on their initial rankings, Mr. Rozansky said that the initial discovery phase will be important because we are uncertain of what the exact scope of the project will entail. He said that it is our intention with the design firm to conduct a solicitation for interest in the facility from the aviation community. He noted the challenges with NetJets and their nighttime operations and that they expressed their desire to be a long-term tenant in the NRT. Mr. Rozansky commented that there is tremendous interest for the use of the space and as we move forward with this project, we would like to use this project as an opportunity to achieve the goal of balancing the needs of the aviation community with the community who have expressed so much concern about noise.

Chair Ruppert requested Commissioner Lenhard's input on the three firms. Commissioner Lenhard commented that it was disappointing that Gallo Herbert was unable to present today because they seemed well qualified in his review of their response and presentation. He noted that the other two firms were well qualified as well but honestly, was very impressed with MLM-Martin Architects. He said that MLM gave an excellent presentation even though they may not be local and that their projects have been mostly commercial airline related. Commissioner Lenhard stated that staff seems to have a very comfortable feeling with SchenkelShultz and has developed a good relationship with them, but he was concerned about the experience we had with them during the GAT renovation. He was curious about how much was their fault, how much was on our end, and any circumstances related to supply chain issues or COVID related issues.

Mr. Rozansky stated that it was a bit of all of those things. He explained that the project was bid twice, with value engineering in the second bid since the initial bids were $1 million over budget. He said that SchenkelShultz adjusted the best they could under those circumstances to try and meet our schedule. Mr. Rozansky noted difficulties experienced in the construction phase by their project manager's lack of sense of urgency and the lead architect left the firm. Mr. Rozansky stated that the team presenting today stepped in more than halfway through the project and did an excellent job in a challenging situation. He also said that Ms. Spencer was the creative inspiration behind the GAT project. There were supply chain issues and Mr. Rozansky noted as an example how the unavailability of the ceiling system materials had a ripple down effect, putting other schedules behind.

Commissioner Lenhard commented that MLM brought up the concerns of installing floodgates in the existing structure whereas SchenkelShultz did not mention it. Mr. Keith stated that structurally, he didn't believe any exterior walls would need to be replaced.

Chair Ruppert said that he too was impressed with the in-person presentation of MLM more than their written presentation. He said he liked Miguel A. as a project manager because he seemed more tenacious, proactive and managed enough issues to be seasoned and experienced. He commented about SchenkelShultz's experience with us and that they did the feasibility study and initial NRT renovation.

Commissioner Lenhard commented that overall, the MLM presentation was very direct, technical, and addressed issues. He felt that SchenkelShultz was more of a sales presentation. He said that although staff may have more of a comfort level with SchenkelShultz, it is sometimes not bad to have a change.

Chair Ruppert expressed concern about the comfort level with SchenkelShultz. Relating to MLM, he said that they need to have an opportunity to work with us so that we have capacity beyond one firm. Chair Ruppert said that in his background, he used dual sourcing, having two critical suppliers. He asked staff to comment relative to the presentations.

Staff Feedback

Mr. Rozansky agreed that staff was more comfortable with SchenkelShultz. He added, however, that the aesthetic presentation of an architect is important. He said that the SchenkelShultz team has the technical expertise behind them that will help answer the questions about remodeling an existing building vs. a new building. He said in the MLM presentation, there was no local flavor and no architectural aspect to the handwritten sketch provided. He said that he doesn't know MLM very well but had confidence in both firms. He said that the aesthetic was clear in the SchenkelShultz presentation, and he felt that was a differentiator in selecting an architect.

Chair Ruppert expressed concern from a project management standpoint. Mr. Keith stated that the project will be driven by our Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) that will be selected at a Consultant Selection Committee in early June.

Mr. Lobb agreed that MLM did not focus on the architectural design, and they also lacked local experience as well as no experience with permitting through the City of Naples.

Mr. Rozansky clarified that the Consultant Selection Committee would be ranking the firms for the entire project from design through construction and that our CMAR is going to make sure a full evaluation on the building is conducted and will guide the selected design/build firm through selections and timelines.

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 May 19, 2022 as follows: 1) SchenkelShultz Architecture.; 2) MLM-Martin Architects, Inc.; 3) Gallo Herbert Architects. Commissioner Lenhard seconded. The motion passed 2-0 unanimously.

E. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

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

FINAL AGENDA

Airport Office Building, 200 Aviation Drive North, 2nd Floor, Naples

Thursday, May 5, 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 the Design Services-North Road Terminal Upgrade Request for Proposals (RFP)**

    a. MLM-Martin Architects, Inc.
    b. Schenkel Schultz Architecture
    c. Gallo Herbert Architects (Not presenting in person but will be considered)

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.

F. CORRESPONDENCE/COMMISSIONER COMMENTS & REQUESTS/ MEETINGS

There were no additional comments or requests/meetings.

G. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 3:42 p.m.

Christopher A. Rozansky
Secretary