Minutes
June 1, 2022
Consultant Selection Committee

A. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order by Consultant Selection Committee Chair Ruppert at 1:37 p.m. in the Airport Office Building, 2nd Floor Conference Room. Commissioner Messer was present and opted in to vote. Commissioner Lenhard had an excused absence.

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 there were no additions or deletions to the agenda.

D. DISCUSSION ITEMS

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

Introductory Comments

Mr. Keith stated there were three very well-qualified firms interviewing today and the Committee will have their work cut out for them.

Interviews

Chair Ruppert welcomed the DeAngelis Diamond team and reminded them the presentation should consist of a maximum of 25 minutes to allow for a question-and-answer period afterwards.

1. DeAngelis Diamond

Mr. Reggie Morgan, Chief Operating Officer and Principal, of DeAngelis Diamond introduced himself and his Project Executive, Mr. Josh Willard; as well as Lead Aviation Superintendent, Mr. Bob Ferretti.

Mr. Morgan presented an overview of their firm. He commented his firm was 5.7 miles from the Naples Airport. He presented the project organization chart, introduced the locally-based preconstruction team, and highlighted his background and experience.

Mr. Willard provided an overview of his background and experience and highlighted his work on the RSW Air Traffic Control Tower and TRACON, as well as the RSW Taxiway and Apron Expansion.

Mr. Ferretti provided a summary of his background and experience and highlighted his work on the RSW Air Traffic Control Tower and TRACON, as well as on the Raleigh Durham Airport Terminal 2 project.

Mr. Morgan provided an overview of the background and experience of Mr. Bill Szczepkowski, their Senior Superintendent, who was not present. Mr. Morgan stated Mr. Szczepkowski would be full-time on this project along with Mr. Ferretti. He noted Mr. Szczepkowski led the Taxiway A Extension and water management system improvements projects at the Naples Airport and also was involved in the RSW Part 139 Runway 6-24 Marking project.

Mr. Morgan highlighted several aviation projects they have completed in Florida. He provided their understanding of the project and presented several creative solutions about how they would do the work that would have the least impact on our customers/tenants.

In reference to DeAngelis Diamond's references to NetJets in their presentation, Mr. Rozansky stated the NAA will be going through a solicitation process for the ultimate occupancy and use of the future renovated facility. He added the discovery phase will be important at the beginning of the project.

Mr. Morgan and Mr. Willard highlighted their approach for collaboration between the NAA and the design professional and provided an overview of the development of GMP. The team reviewed their strategies to address current and future supply chain issues, material delays as well as methods to ensure delivery of a quality project on time and within budget. They demonstrated their knowledge of and experience with applicable permitting agencies and outlined their approach to minimize or avoid change orders.

Mr. Morgan concluded his presentation by summarizing their local experience and proven track record.

A question-and-answer period followed.

2. Manhattan Construction Company

Mr. Craig Bryant, Vice President of Southwest Florida Regional Office, introduced himself. In response to Chair Ruppert's question regarding Mr. Paul Dorsey's role, Mr. Bryant stated Mr. Dorsey, who was located in the Virginia area, was the Project Director/Executive-in-Charge and would address his role during their presentation. Mr. Bryant commented he began his employment with Manhattan the day the RFP response was submitted.

Procedurally, Chair Ruppert asked Manhattan to keep their presentation to 25 minutes or less to allow for a question-and-answer period afterwards.

Mr. Bryant introduced his team of Mr. Carlos Roche, Project Manager; and Mr. John Begani, Director of Preconstruction.

Mr. Roche and Mr. Begani provided a summary of their background and experience.

Mr. Roche provided an understanding of our project, a proposed logistics plan, phasing plan and floor plan. He proposed new canopies, providing temporary pedestrian walkways, and ensuring secure site access. Mr. Roche outlined their approach to collaborating between our firm and the design professional.

Mr. Begani summarized their 10-step process in the preconstruction process and the development of the GMP. He provided examples of their deliverable checklists which included schematic design, design development and construction documents. He reviewed the subcontractor bidding process utilizing Building Connected software.

Mr. Roche provided an overview of their approach to expediting supplies, material storage, quality assurance and control, communication, hurricane preparedness, safety and permitting. He reviewed their team's approach to minimizing or avoiding change orders.

Mr. Bryant recapped their firm's experience and expressed their interest to work with us on this project.

A question-and-answer period followed.

In reference to Manhattan's references to NetJets in their presentation, Mr. Rozansky stated that NetJets is in the North Road Terminal temporarily and the Authority will be going through a solicitation process for the ultimate use of the facility. He added the discovery phase will be important at the beginning of the project.

3. Suffolk Construction

Mr. Sam Sleiman, Aviation Sector Lead; Mr. Rod Nobrega, Vice President/Construction Manager; and Mr. Tom Swaim, Preconstruction Manager for Aviation of Suffolk Construction introduced themselves.

Procedurally, Chair Ruppert asked Suffolk Construction to limit their presentation to 25 minutes or less in order to allow for a question-and-answer period afterwards.

Mr. Sleiman expressed his excitement about our project. He provided an overview of his and his team's background and aviation experience. He presented an organization chart of the entire team that would be working on our project and provided an overview of his firm's aviation experience and experience in the Southwest Florida market.

Mr. Nobrega provided their understanding of the airport and approach to our project. He noted our Strategic Plan aligns with their Strategic Plan. He presented two options for keeping the existing terminal building and proposed the possibility of repurposing the existing canopy. He proposed a third option to demo the existing terminal and build a new structure.

Mr. Sleiman presented a matrix that outlined several areas for consideration when selecting one of the three options. He displayed a table for each option showing cost estimates. Mr. Sleiman noted the first 60 days of the discovery phase would be the most important part of the project. He outlined several tasks that would be important to get this project started. He noted their rapport and strong relationship they have built with the SchenkelShultz Architecture team. Mr. Sleiman provided their approach in collaborating with the design team.

Mr. Swaim described their collaborative process to get to the best price and GMP development. He noted price escalation and supply issues in this area and how they would manage any issues so they would not impact our project. He presented their methodology to maintain the project budget and get the best price. He offered a direct material purchase option for our organization and noted they would take on the responsibility of making sure the equipment is ordered, installed, and warrantied properly. He explained their trade partner procurement process and their quality control process to minimize change orders.

Mr. Nobrega presented their safety program and support available following the completion of the project. He highlighted their permitting expertise in the Southwest Florida market.

Mr. Sleiman concluded his presentation by reiterating their collaborative approach, best-in-class project experience, expert guidance through the discovery phase, an uninterrupted airport operations and seamless passenger journey, as well as their strong local presence and buying power.

A question-and-answer period followed.

Mr. Rozansky stated the discovery phase will be important because we are not exactly certain who will be in the space. He noted NetJets is temporarily occupying the space, and the NAA will be going through a solicitation process in the future.

Initial Rankings

Chair Ruppert said he would like Committee discussion about the three applicants before providing the rankings. He requested Commissioner Messer provide her initial feedback.

Commissioner Messer commented all three firms gave very good presentations and their in-person presentations were even better than their written presentations. She liked that each one of them presented several options for the project. She noted DeAngelis Diamond had no experience with car rental facilities, but she liked the extensive homework they did on the proposed options. She thought their supply chain analysis was good and even though they did not have extensive references to cost control mechanisms in their written presentation, she thought they had addressed it in their interview today. She said they didn't have any references in their written presentation about their current workload which is why she asked them about it during the question-and-answer period.

Regarding Manhattan Construction, Commissioner Messer stated she thought their analysis was good regarding how the project dovetailed relative to the timing of the other projects they are working on. She noted they have worked on a car rental facility; their Safe 8 Program was beneficial; and they had a storage area for supplies. She said they addressed cost of materials, escalation of materials, the scheduling process, the team that would be on the project, and permitting in their written and in-person presentations.

Regarding Suffolk, she said they seemed to be the most enthusiastic about the project and the project was very important to them, more so than the other two firms expressed. When reading their proposal, she noted they are doing some formidable work in Naples and Collier County right now, and she

expressed concern they wouldn't be able to take on our project. She said Suffolk addressed this and seemed to be able to do it. She noted they discussed cost of materials and escalation. She commented they matched their values to our Strategic Plan and didn't see the other two firms mention that. She was uncertain if their separate Aviation Center of Excellence would be in issue, but she was okay with Mr. Sleiman's answer that he would be here when he said he would be. She liked their 20-20-20 safety strategy, thought they were professional and liked that they were down the street from SchenkelShultz Architecture for coordination purposes, even though the other two firms were nearby as well.

Chair Ruppert commented DeAngelis Diamond's work on the RSW tower was excellent, especially after he personally toured it and saw what was involved in the project. He said they had a good understanding of the project and a good written presentation. He added they covered quite a few points and liked their safety program, quality control program, the Choose Advantage program and direct material purchase program. Chair Ruppert said they did a very good job overall.

Regarding Manhattan, Chair Ruppert said their familiarity with the City of Naples and the Design Review Board was an asset; they did a very good job in their written presentation and in person with good information on the recent cost trends. He liked that they were awarded for safety in 2017 and 2021 and they went into detail about FEMA aspects in Options 1 and 2. He commented they did a good job in identifying what the issues would be and emphasized their good working relationship with SchenkelShultz Architecture.

Regarding Suffolk, Chair Ruppert was impressed they had a lot of Naples projects, but he felt that could be an issue. He was satisfied with their answer in their ability to handle our project. He said all three firms showed interest in being selected, but he felt that Suffolk engaged us vigorously to assure us they would get this project completed. Chair Ruppert added Mr. Sleiman is very dedicated to getting any issues resolved within Suffolk should there be an issue here. He commented they had experience in consolidating a rental car facility at Boston's Logan Airport. Overall, he said they had a very good project understanding in writing and in person, very good discussion of potential challenges, direct purchasing program, excellent warranty approach and a real good standalone program for that. He too thought they were aligned with our values which is important, and they had a healthy discussion about FEMA implications. He stated they did a good job with cost estimates. He expressed two concerns. The first was with the Aviation Center of Excellence not being local, although he said he accepted their answer, which was sincere and truthful. The second concern was our project being dwarfed by their other projects, notably One Naples and the Naples Beach Club.

He opened the discussion for staff's input.

Staff Feedback

Regarding DeAngelis Diamond's process used in the bidding process for their subcontractors, Mr. Rozansky said they did have a slide about the use of technology, and he was impressed with how they inspect and video work in progress. He said they too use Building Connected, the same platform that Manhattan mentioned, for their bidding process. Mr. Rozansky added he does not put as much emphasis on having the Aviation Center of Excellence located at a big airport. For selecting a Construction Manager at Risk, they would be working with the design team, and for this project we are looking more at the firm's understanding of the market issues with materials, the constructability, the knowledge of

the subcontractors, and helping to build out the maximum guaranteed price. He said he appreciated Suffolk's comments regarding timing the bid process rather than going out to bid when the subcontractors are bidding on 10 other projects.

Mr. Rozansky noted DeAngelis Diamond vets their subcontractors every six months. He said we have had tremendous difficulty with some of the elements of our GA project, and a more frequent review of the subcontractors is important in an environment when things are evolving rapidly. He said all three firms were exceptional and workload is a legitimate concern.

Mr. Lobb agreed it is a challenging decision having three very qualified firms. He said there is value they can bring with the selection of materials that you just don't get from a design-build project. He expressed concern with the size of Manhattan and Suffolk being more nationally oriented. He noted the comment by Manhattan that they have a national database of subcontractors whereas the other two firms prefer local subcontractors. He cautioned that if you have out-of-town subcontractors more than two hours outside the geographical region, it can be a challenge on a renovation project.

Regarding Mr. Lobb's comments about subcontractors coming in from out of the area, Mr. Rozansky said it would be difficult to get accommodations for these people. He said we have seen a situation where the contractor didn't plan for how to accommodate their people traveling two-plus hours each way.

Mr. Keith said he thought it was interesting DeAngelis Diamond had two field people as part of their presentation. He said they had a complete, well-thought-out presentation, and it was interesting from a cost standpoint they put the rental car location down underneath the storage area. He noted DeAngelis Diamond and Suffolk went over their warranty program, but he said there was no mention of it from Manhattan.

Chair Ruppert had two additional comments. He did not like that Manhattan switched out their project executive four weeks after the proposal and did not address it even after asking them about it at the beginning of the presentation. He said this is not a minor detail; we should know up front who is on the team and who will be serving our needs.

Chair Ruppert said Suffolk did a pretty good job in addressing cost estimates for Options 1, 2 and 3. Mr. Rozansky stated he believed those numbers were referenced in our feasibility study.

Final Rankings

Procedurally, Mr. Owens explained the ranking process and requested the Committee to recommend the rankings to the full Board of Commissioners for approval at the June 16, 2022 NAA Board Meeting.

Chair Ruppert said he was struggling with the No. 1 and No. 2 rankings. He had DeAngelis Diamond and Suffolk very close for different reasons but for good reasons and Manhattan as No. 3. He liked the local team making the presentation, but he did like Suffolk's focus and their resources. He was leaning with Suffolk, DeAngelis Diamond and then Manhattan. Commissioner Messer agreed with his evaluation and said she had the same 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 June 16, 2022 as follows: 1) Suffolk Construction.; 2) DeAngelis Diamond; 3) Manhattan Construction Company. Commissioner Messer seconded. The motion passed 2-0 unanimously.

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 4:55 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
Wednesday, June 1, 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 Construction Manager at Risk Services (CMAR) - North Road Terminal Upgrade Program**

   a. DeAngelis Diamond

   b. Manhattan Construction

   c. Suffolk Construction

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.