

On **JUNE 25, 2021**, the **CONCESSIONS/PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE** of the **GREATER ORLANDO AVIATION AUTHORITY** met in the Carl T. Langford Board Room at Orlando International Airport, One Jeff Fuqua Boulevard, Orlando, Florida, 32827. Chairman Friel called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m. The meeting was posted in accordance with Florida Statutes and a quorum was present.

Committee members present: Bradley Friel, Chairman
Kathleen Sharman, Vice Chair
Thomas Draper, Chief of Operations
Brian Engle, Director of Customer Experience
Deborah Silvers, Director of Risk Management

Staff/Others present: Yovannie Rodriguez, Chief Administrative Officer
George Morning, Director of Small Business Development
Frank Browne, Assistant Manager, Concessions
Tina Jackson, Concessions Contract Administrator
Gail Musselwhite, Executive Assistant
Dan Gerber, Interim General Counsel
Larissa Bou, Manager of Board Service and Recording
Secretary

Chairman Friel announced to all present that if a bidder or proposer is aggrieved by any of the proceedings of today's meeting and wishes to appeal the results of actions made by this Committee, they must file an appeal stating the item they wish to appeal and the basis for which they wish to appeal. Any decision made at these meetings will need record of the proceedings and for that purpose may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceeding is made which includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. Any appeal must be received in writing by the Chief Executive Officer, Mr. Phillip N. Brown, via email pbrown@goaa.org with copy to larissa.bou@goaa.org by Friday, July 5, 2021, by 4:00 p.m. (emails will be accepted during the pandemic COVID-19). [During the meeting, the deadline for appeals was corrected for the record. The correct deadline for appeals is July 2, 2021 by 4:00pm].

Lastly, lobbying any Aviation Authority Staff who are members of any committee responsible for ranking Proposals, Letters of Interest, Statements of Qualifications or Bids and thereafter forwarding those recommendations to the Board and/or Board Members is prohibited from the time that a Request for Proposals, Request for Letters of Interests, Request for Qualifications or Request for Bids is released to the time that the Board makes an award. For more information, Lobbying policy, forms, and instructions please visit the Aviation Authority's web site. You may also contact the Chief Administrative Officer, Ms. Yovannie Rodriguez, with questions at (407) 825-7105.

Before proceeding to business, Mr. Gerber asked Committee members to report any conflicts of interest or violations of the Aviation Authority's Code of Ethics and Business Conduct; lobbying activities policy; or the Florida Sunshine law with regard to any agenda item. None were expressed by any Committee member.

Mr. Gerber explained to the Committee and those present the order of the meeting. For each RFP, Ms. Rodriguez will first present staff's analysis; followed by public comment; and then the CPC will discuss and deliberate. He indicated that each Proposer will be given 2 minutes for public comments, and only one representative of each company will be allowed to speak. When the Committee begins its discussion and deliberations, no public comments or Proposers comments would be allowed. Additionally, Mr. Gerber indicated that even though we are under a federal mask mandate, we must record this meeting for public records purposes; therefore, he indicated that any speaker, whether a Committee member or public member, could remove their mask when speaking onto the microphone. Lastly, he directed the Committee's attention to the evaluation forms placed on the dais, and indicated that they had been provided one form for the Passenger Lounge Concession and another one for the Quick Service Food and Beverage Concession. This forms need to be returned to Ms. Bou, Recording Secretary, at the conclusion of the meeting.

MINUTES FOR THE JUNE 25, 2021, CONCESSIONS/PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE

RECOMMENDATION TO REVIEW/RANK PROPOSALS FOR THE SOUTH TERMINAL COMPLEX (STC) PASSENGER LOUNGE CONCESSION

Ms. Rodriguez started by presenting a map of the proposed location for this concession (copy on file), which is located post-security, Level 3, Unit BB and it consists of 9,301 square feet. The map also depicted the various awarded concessions located in the area.

She stated that the Term shall commence on the day the Aviation Authority opens the South Terminal C to the public and expire on the 10th anniversary of commencement. Additionally, for each Agreement Period of the Term, the successful Proposer will pay to the Aviation Authority a Concession Fee in an amount equal to the greater of: (1) a Minimum Annual Concession Fee of \$350,000 or (2) a percentage of Gross Receipts equal to the sum of the successful Proposer's proposed percentage of not less than thirteen (13%) percent. Ms. Rodriguez made a point to mention that this is proposed as a common use lounge, not a specific brand.

Ms. Rodriguez listed the criteria used for evaluation, as follows:

Evaluation Criteria Rated as Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory

Financial Capability
Reputation (References)
ACDBE Participation

Evaluation Criteria Rated According to Strength Demonstrated In Proposal

Demonstrated Experience and Qualifications
Customer Service and Marketing
Concept and Range of Prices Charged to Passengers
Concession Improvements
Financial Return to the Aviation Authority

She continued by listing the five (5) Proposals received in alphabetical order, as follows:

- AD Partnership, LLC, DBA Airport Dimensions (AD Partnership)
- Aspire Lounge - DFB, LLC (Aspire)
- Escape Lounge MCO, LLC (Escape)
- TAV America Operation Services, Inc. (TAV America)
- Trip Hospitality Orlando, LLC (Trip Hospitality)

Moving on, Ms. Rodriguez asked Vice Chair Sharman to provide staff's analysis of the financial information offered by the Proposers in their response to the Request for Proposals. Vice Chair Sharman stated that the financial analysis included areas of liquidity, profitability, and long-term solvency. Additionally, Dun and Bradstreet reports were reviewed.

The Committee was provided a memorandum containing the financial analysis. This information was also posted on the Airport's website along with the agenda (copy on file).

Ms. Rodriguez continued with staff's analysis with regard to Reputation, and indicated that all Proposers received favorable references.

Proceeding, Ms. Rodriguez stated that for the next criteria, ACDBE Participation, the Aviation Authority established a participation goal for this Concession opportunity of thirty percent (30%) of the total anticipated concession revenues. All Proposers submitted the required ACDBE participation goal of 30%; however, the Aviation Authority's legal counsel, Mr. Gerber, requested clarification from AD Partnership and TAV America regarding issues with the proposed participation.

MINUTES FOR THE JUNE 25, 2021, CONCESSIONS/PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE

Chairman Friel recognized Mr. Gerber, who presented AD Partnerships and TAV America's proposed ACDBE participation and clarifications that were attained.

Continuing, Mr. Gerber provided his legal review as it relates to TAV America's proposed ACDBE participation. TAV America also recommended changes to the Concessions Agreement provided in the RFP. If this contract were to be awarded to TAV America Mr. Gerber reminded the committee that the proposed changes would not be accepted.

Chairman Friel asked the Committee if there any questions thus far. Vice Chair Sharman asked for clarification regarding the first three criteria. Mr. Gerber explained that the first three criteria were to be evaluated as "Satisfactory" or "Unsatisfactory".

The Committee consensed to rate all Proposers "Satisfactory" in this criterion, with exception of TAV America who was "Unsatisfactory" as to its proposed ACDBE participation.

Chairman Friel recognized Ms. Rodriguez, who continued with staff's analysis with regard to Proposers' Demonstrated Experience and Qualifications. Ms. Rodriguez provided a summary of the analysis for each Proposer and indicated that a more thorough report was included as part of the agenda packet (copy on file).

Additionally, under this criterion, Proposers were asked to disclose any pending litigations or criminal investigations. Ms. Rodriguez communicated that two Proposers disclosed one lawsuit each.

Chairman Friel asked if any of the Committee members had questions with regard to staff's findings for Experience and Qualifications. Vice Chair Sharman asked if legal staff conducted any further research, in addition to the litigations disclosed by Proposers. Mr. Gerber responded in the affirmative and communicated that legal staff did a full analysis of each Proposer for both the Passenger Lounge Concession's RFP and for Quick Service Food and Beverage Concession's RFP. He indicated that with the exception of one of the Proposers for the Quick Service Food and Beverage Concession, nothing material was identified.

Moving on, Ms. Rodriguez shared a summary of the analysis as it relates to Customer Service and Marketing.

Chairman Friel asked if any Committee member had questions or comments. There being no answer to his inquiry, he asked Ms. Rodriguez to continue with the next criterion.

Ms. Rodriguez reiterated that an in-depth staff's analysis of each criteria was provided with the agenda (copy on file). She continued by sharing a summary of the "Concept and Range of Prices Charged to Passengers" criterion.

Chairman Friel asked if the Committee had any questions with regard to this criterion. Hearing none, he asked Ms. Rodriguez to continue with the presentation.

Ms. Rodriguez then presented the next criterion, "Proposed Improvement Investment", and reminded the Committee that the proposed space consists of 9,301 square feet. The RFP required a \$500 per square foot minimum investment. The following is the proposed investments by each proposer:

<u>Proposer</u>	<u>Improvement Investment</u>
AD Partnership	\$10,231,100
Aspire	\$ 9,301,000
Escape	\$ 6,510,700
TAV America	\$ 4,650,500
Trip Hospitality	\$10,850,000

MINUTES FOR THE JUNE 25, 2021, CONCESSIONS/PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE

Chairman Friel asked fellow Committee members if they had any questions regarding the information provided for this criterion. Hearing none, he asked Ms. Rodriguez to continue with the next criterion.

Ms. Rodriguez moved on to present the Proposed Financial Return. She explained that the proposed percentage of gross receipts would be ranked after consideration of the reasonableness of the information presented, and the assumptions supporting the budget and pro forma documents submitted by Proposers.

Chairman Friel asked Ms. Rodriguez to present the previous slide, which showed the Proposed Improvement Investment, and asked if Schenkel Schultz provide any feedback pertaining to the improvements. Ms. Rodriguez indicated that the agenda included an analysis from Schenkel Shultz, which revealed that all proposed improvements were satisfactory.

Continuing with the Proposed Financial Return, Ms. Rodriguez showed a slide (copy on file) that contained the following information:

<u>Proposer</u>	<u>% of Gross Receipts</u>
AD Partnership	27%
Aspire	27%
Escape	37.5%
TAV America	26%
Trip Hospitality	24%

Ms. Rodriguez reiterated that rather than just looking directly at the proposed percentage returns, the Committee should analyze the reasonableness of the documentation provided in the budgets and pro formas, and then they would be able to rank the percentage of gross receipts proposed. She reminded the Committee that each Proposer has its own price point and strategies.

Discussion ensued regarding the calculation of this criterion, for which Vice Chair Sharman volunteered to calculate.

In response to Chairman Friel's question regarding TAV America's offering of certain experiences and amenities available only for those who pay for the "Premium Area", Ms. Rodriguez explained that the Aviation Authority is interested in a common use lounge; therefore, this is something that the Committee could consider at the time of evaluation.

Mr. Gerber announced that staff's presentation had concluded.

Moving on to the public comments, Chairman Friel recognized Mr. Stuart Vella, with Plaza Premium Group and representing Trip Hospitality, who provided a brief overview of the proposal's highpoints and thanked the Committee for the opportunity of being considered.

Chairman Friel asked if anyone else in the audience would like to speak. Hearing none, the Committee continued with discussion of the proposals and deliberations.

The Committee continue with the discussion and evaluation of the first three criteria Financial Capability, Reputation, and ACDBE Participation, which are to be rated as "Satisfactory" or "Unsatisfactory".

Chairman Friel opened the discussion by providing his thoughts about to the Proposers' submittal of "Financial Capability". He indicated that, in his opinion, all the Proposers were "Satisfactory" in this criterion. The Committee consensed with this rating.

MINUTES FOR THE JUNE 25, 2021, CONCESSIONS/PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE

For "Reputation", Chairman Friel stated that based on all responses to the request for references being favorable, he believes that all Proposer's were "Satisfactory" in this criterion. Ms. Draper expressed his concurrence, as they all received good responses. The Committee consensed on a "Satisfactory" rating.

As for "ACDBE Participation", Chairman Friel made reference to the information provided by Ms. Rodriguez and Mr. Gerber, and expressed his concerns with regard to AD Partnership's method of achieving its participation goal and TAV America's ability to meet the proposed 46% participation or even the 30% required participation goal. Because both Proposers were responsive, Chairman Friel questioned whether they should be rated "Unsatisfactory" in this criterion. Vice Chair Sharman asked counsel if by rating a Proposer "Unsatisfactory" it would be automatically disqualified to continue. Mr. Gerber clarified that rating any Proposer "Unsatisfactory" would not rule them out; however, it is a differentiator to take under consideration. Mr. Draper and Ms. Silver discussed whether both Proposers should be rated "Unsatisfactory" in this criterion. The Committee consensed with a rating of "Satisfactory" for AD Partnership, Aspire, Escape, and Trip Hospitality and a rating of "Unsatisfactory" for TAV America as it relates to ACDBE participation requirements.

Continuing with the evaluation criteria rated according to strength demonstrated in the proposals, Chairman Friel explained to the Committee that these criteria will be evaluated as follows:

- Outstanding (O)
- Very Good (VG)
- Adequate (A)
- Less than Adequate (LA)
- Unacceptable (U)

Chairman Friel noted that with regard to "Demonstrated Experience and Qualifications", all Proposers demonstrated their ability to perform the services requested. This was demonstrated by their years of experience and the number of lounges and locations managed by the Proposers, both nationally and globally. He questioned if AD Partnership and Aspire's litigations would have an impact of their rating for this criterion. Mr. Gerber indicated that the material litigation and investigation information is for the Committee to balance the Proposers' financial strength and capability to be able to continue to operate. He continued by stating that these are companies with big operations, for which litigations are likely to occur.

Mr. Draper recommended that all Proposers be rated "Very Good" in this criterion. Vice Chair Sharman indicated that all proposals were great; however, if looking for a delineator, Escape has experience in airports that are similar to MCO.

Mr. Engle observed that three Proposers (Aspire, TAV America, and Trip Hospitality) mentioned being awarded by SKYTRAX, which is a substantial award. Chairman Friel asked if this delineator gives these Proposers an advantage with regard to Experience and Qualifications. Mr. Engle responded that looking at the overall information provided as it relates to years of experience and locations, he would not rate any of the Proposers as "Outstanding", but he would place them in high tier "Very Good"; therefore, he agreed with Mr. Draper's initial recommendation of a "Very Good" rate for all Proposers.

The Committee consensed on the following rating for "Demonstrated Experience and Qualifications":

Proposer	Ranking
AD Partnership	VG
Aspire	VG
Escape	VG

MINUTES FOR THE JUNE 25, 2021, CONCESSIONS/PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE

TAV America	VG
Trip Hospitality	VG

Moving on, the Committee discussed the Proposers' responses for "Customer Service and Marketing". Chairman Friel began the discussion by stating that all of the Proposers appear to have good customer service training programs. He indicated that some Proposers stood out more than others. AD Partnership stood out because of its customer service training plan; Aspire, because of its "Be Remembered" approach; Escape, because of its practice of resolving issues locally; and Trip Hospitality's stood out because of its customer service and marketing program, which includes a social media approach.

Mr. Engle stated that he concurred with Chairman Friel's analysis and added that, in his opinion, AD Partnership and Aspire stood out from the other Proposers. Especially Aspire, which was the only Proposer that mentioned that they would incorporate the Aviation Authority's Customer Experience training to their program. He proposed a rating of "Very Good" for AD Partnership; "Outstanding" for Aspire; and "Adequate" for Escape, TAV America, and Trip Hospitality.

Discussion ensued with regard to the marketing plans provided by the Proposers. Chairman Friel opined that AD Partnership had a great marketing plan through its partnership with Chase, which facilitates access to a customer audience of over 80 million; Aspire demonstrated strong relationships as it relates to marketing; Trip Hospitality presented a strong approach to social media; and TAV America focused on creating a data driven marketing strategy.

Mr. Draper disagreed with the previously proposed rating for Escape, TAV America, and Trip Hospitality, and suggested a rating of "Very Good" for all three. He concurred with AD Partnership's rating of "Very Good" and Aspire's rating of "Outstanding". After a brief discussion regarding Mr. Draper's proposed ratings, the Committee consented to the following rating for "Customer Service and Marketing":

Proposer	Ranking
AD Partnership	VG
Aspire	O
Escape	VG
TAV America	VG
Trip Hospitality	VG

Chairman Friel then initiated discussion with regard to the next criterion, "Concept and Range of Prices Charged to Passengers". He provided his opinion of the responses starting with AD Partnership, who proposed first class amenities, local flavor and custom menu, family oriented atmosphere, and sourcing other local companies to be part of its plan. As for Aspire, Chairman Friel highlighted its amenities and discounts offered. He indicated that Escape offered good amenities, local flavor menu, and a one-hour pass for guests. Vice Chair Sharman expressed her approval of Escape's one-hour pass. Continuing, Chairman Friel indicated that TAV America offered different experiences (Premium and VIP), which he questioned if it fulfills the common use provision. However, he liked the pop-up kitchen and contactless transaction concepts. As for Trip Hospitality, Chairman Friel opined that the concept is inclusive of families and business travelers; they highlighted local food and beverages, and local art; and proposed good amenities. He commented that pricing was comparable across the board, with the exception of TAV America. Lastly, he stated that he liked AD Partnership and Trip Hospitality's proposed concepts the most.

Mr. Engle expressed his concerns with TAV America's proposed "premium area" and asked how would they designate the type of experience provided to the customers. He concurred with Chairman Friel's view with regard to AD Partnership and Trip Hospitality's proposed

MINUTES FOR THE JUNE 25, 2021, CONCESSIONS/PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE

concepts being a bit better than the other Proposers. Vice Chair Sharman reiterated her approval of Escape’s one-hour pass and stated that all proposed concepts were good.

Mr. Draper commented that all concepts were good. He expressed his approval of TAV America’s VIP/Premium program, as this would allow customers an option of a quieter, better, and more personal experience.

Ms. Silvers agreed with Mr. Draper’s comments and indicated that what stood out for her, are the different ranges in prices. She question how attractive a one-hour pass would be in a common use lounge arena; however, none of the other Proposers presented that option. She expressed the same sentiment with regard to the VIP/Premium concept. She concluded by stating that all Proposers did a great job.

After further discussion regarding the differences between the proposed concepts, the Committee consensed on the following rating:

Proposer	Ranking
AD Partnership	VG
Aspire	VG
Escape	VG
TAV America	VG
Trip Hospitality	VG

Chairman Friel read the requirements for the following criterion, “Concession Improvements” and provided his initial thoughts. As for AD Partnership, the space was organized and the material board was appealing. Aspire proposed a soothing and calming concept. Escape themed their concept after the Orlando market, which reflected Central Florida; however, the way it was conveyed seemed like 5 different concepts, not a unified concept. TAV America proposed the lowest improvement investment. Trip Hospitality proposed a really good concept, especially the kids’ area, which stood out.

Mr. Engel followed by providing his thoughts about proposed esthetics and use of space. He started by stating that AD Partnership and Trip Hospitality did an exceptional job. However, Trip Hospitality’s proposed murals, greenery and delineated space stood out. It was his opinion that all concepts were very good with the exception of TAV America and Escape who, in his opinion, rated lower. He proposed a rating of “Outstanding” for AD Partnership and Trip Hospitality; “Very Good” for Aspire; and “Adequate” for Escape and TAV America. Chairman Friel and Ms. Silvers concurred with Mr. Engle’s comments.

The Committee consensed on the following rating for “Concession Improvements”:

Proposer	Ranking
AD Partnership	O
Aspire	VG
Escape	A
TAV America	A
Trip Hospitality	O

Moving on with the last criterion, “Financial Return to the Aviation Authority”, Chairman Friel stated that ranking for this criterion is based upon a review of the proposed Percentage of Gross Receipts after consideration of the reasonableness of the information presented, and the assumptions supporting the budget and pro forma submitted by Proposers. He reviewed the proposed percentages of each Proposer. Mr. Gerber reiterated that the first step is for the Committee to look at the reasonableness of the information presented in the pro forma and assumptions supporting the budget.

MINUTES FOR THE JUNE 25, 2021, CONCESSIONS/PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE

Chairman Friel recognized Vice Chair Sharman who commented that the calculations of the percentages multiplied by the total sales for Year 1, result in the following financial return to the Aviation Authority:

- AD Partnership - \$1.2 million
- Aspire - \$1.5 million
- Escape - \$1 million
- TAV America - \$973K
- Trip Hospitality - \$2 million

With respect to the reasonableness of the proposals, she also observed the following proposed Cost per Enplanement (CPE) calculations:

- AD Partnership - \$1.29 CPE
- Aspire - \$1.67 CPE
- Escape - \$0.78 CPE
- TAV America - \$1.7 CPE
- Trip Hospitality - \$2.45 CPE

Vice Chair Sharman encouraged the Committee to also look at the Proposers' projected sales to determine reasonableness. Mr. Gerber indicated that there was an addendum to the RFP with regard to "merchandise sales", issued pursuant to Proposers' questions. The addendum indicated that the successful Proposer could sell merchandise subject to approval by the Aviation Authority. As for information provided with regard to assumptions supporting the budget, Mr. Gerber asked the Committee to take under consideration the fact that these are five leading, sophisticated, and experienced Proposers that know the market well.

Chairman Friel asked staff if they had any data on how other existing lounges perform in MCO and how they perform with respect to CPE. Mr. Frank Browne, Concessions, responded that staff did not perform this analysis of CPE for the current locations.

Brief discussion ensued regarding the proposed percentages.

Chairman Friel asked the Committee if they had any other questions or comments. Mr. Draper inquired if the ask is to evaluate who has the best financial return for the Aviation Authority. Mr. Gerber responded in the affirmative.

Vice Chair Sharman suggested a rating of "Adequate" for AD Partnership, Escape, and TAV America; "Very Good" for Aspire; and "Outstanding" for Trip Hospitality. Chairman Friel added that Trip Hospitality proposed return is not outside of the realm of possibility, even though there are higher than the other Proposers. Vice Chair Sharman also pointed out that Trip Hospitality proposed to sell merchandise, which could explain the difference in amounts.

Discussion ensued with regard to how the financial return to the Aviation Authority is calculated. The amounts for Year 1 were read by Chairman Friel once again for the record.

Ms. Silvers observed that AD Partnership and Aspire proposed the same percentage and because the difference between the Proposers is based on their estimates and calculations, she questioned if this is a reason not to differentiate between them. Vice Chair Sharman acknowledged Ms. Silver's point and opined that Escape should be rated higher, since they proposed a higher percentage. She indicated that this demonstrates Escape's potential to have a greater financial return; therefore, she suggested a rating of "Outstanding" for Escape.

MINUTES FOR THE JUNE 25, 2021, CONCESSIONS/PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE

The Committee paused discussion while Vice Chair Sharman performed calculations based on estimated amounts provided by Proposers for year 2023, which resulted in the following amounts:

- AD Partnership - \$1.5 million
- Aspire - \$2 million
- Escape - \$1.3 million
- TAV America - \$1.9 million
- Trip Hospitality - \$2.7 million

Discussion ensued regarding proposed financial returns. Based on the discussion the Committee consensed on the following rating for "Financial Return to the Aviation Authority":

Proposer	Ranking
AD Partnership	VG
Aspire	VG
Escape	VG
TAV America	A
Trip Hospitality	O

The Committee tallied the ratings for the Demonstrated Experience and Qualifications; Customer Service and Marketing; Concepts and Range of Prices Charges to Passengers, Concession Improvements; and Financial Return to the Aviation Authority, as follows:

Proposer	Outstanding	Very Good	Adequate	Less than Adequate	Unacceptable
AD Partnership	1	4	0	0	0
Aspire	1	4	0	0	0
Escape	0	4	1	0	0
*TAV America	0	3	2	0	0
Trip Hospitality	2	3	0	0	0

** TAV America had a rating of "Unsatisfactory" as it pertains to ACDBE Participation.*

Mr. Draper noted that there was a tie between AD Partnership and Aspire, he suggested that the Capital Investment be used as a tie breaker between the two Proposers. Vice Chair Sharman suggested the Committee base the tiebreak on the Financial Return to the Aviation Authority. The Committee consensed with Vice Chair Sharman suggestion.

Upon motion by Mr. Draper, second by Ms. Silvers, vote carried and to approve the ranking for the Request for Proposals for Passenger Lounge Concession as follows:

- First: Trip Hospitality Orlando, LLC
- Second: AD Partnership, LLC dba Airport Dimensions
- Third: Aspire Lounge - DFB, LLC
- Fourth: Escape Lounge MCO, LLC
- Fifth: TAV America Operation Services, Inc.

MINUTES FOR THE JUNE 25, 2021, CONCESSIONS/PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE

[Before the Committee moved to the next item on the agenda, Mr. Garber corrected the deadline for appeals for the record. He indicated that the deadline is July 2, 2021 by 4:00pm. An email with the correct date will be sent out to Proposers for both Passenger Lounge Concession and Quick Service Food and Beverage Concession]

The Chairman called a brief recess before moving on to the next item.

RECOMMENDATION TO REVIEW/RANK PROPOSALS FOR THE SOUTH TERMINAL COMPLEX (STC) QUICK SERVICE FOOD & BEVERAGE CONCESSION

Chairman Friel informed the committee that it was time to consider the proposal for Quick Service Food and Beverage Concession for which a total of eight proposals was received.

Ms. Rodriguez started by presenting the location of the proposed Quick Service Unit V in the South Terminal C. She informed the committee that the proposed term of the successful proposer is ten years and for each agreement period of the term, the successful proposer will pay the Aviation Authority a concession fee in the amount equal to the greater of a minimum annual concession fee of \$165,000 or a percentage of gross receipts equal to the sum of the successful proposer's proposed percentage for food and beverage sales and 5% of gross receipts for sales to airport employees. The successful proposer is required to be complimentary and not duplicative of the previously awarded concepts in the South Terminal Complex.

Vice Chair Sharman requested a high level review of the previously awarded concession concepts in the South Terminal C.

Ms. Rodriguez presented the Committee with a map of the awarded concepts in the South Terminal C and gave a quick synopsis of the concepts.

Upon completion of the review of the previously awarded concepts, Ms. Rodriguez listed the criteria used for evaluation as follows:

Evaluation Criteria Rated as Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory

- Financial Capability
- Reputation (References)
- ACDBE Participation

Evaluation Criteria Rated According to Strength Demonstrated In Proposal

- Demonstrated Experience and Qualifications
- Customer Service and Marketing
- Concept, Quality Variety and Price of menu items proposed
- Concession Improvements
- Financial Return to the Aviation Authority

Chairman Friel noted that 8 proposals were received and referred the committee to the PowerPoint slide showing an alphabetical listing of the proposers.

Chairman Friel continued with a request for the review of the financial capabilities of the various proposers.

MINUTES FOR THE JUNE 25, 2021, CONCESSIONS/PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE

Vice Chair Sharman stated that Finance Department reviewed the financial information provided by the eight proposers. For the Quick Service Food and Beverage, staff looked at things like liquidity, profitability, long term solvency. Staff also looked at the Dun & Bradstreet reports on these proposers. Orlando F&B and Pizza Pizza were deemed satisfactory across the board by the team. McDonald's, The Chicken Guy and JDDA Concession Management, in your memo there are, there's some items of note concerning payment history that you can take into consideration. And of course the proposed deposits are all up there on the screen. With respect to Tijuana Flats, the financials provided had some negative working capital but there was other credit facilities that were available to them so we're you know okay with them with the hundred percent deposit. With respect to Legacy, their payment history was unavailable and then with respect to Izziban, they really didn't provide enough financial information for staff to do a comprehensive analysis so should they be moved forward in the process, we're probably going to have to reach out to them to get a little bit more information.

Chairman Friel asked if there were any questions from the Committee at this point. There were none.

Ms. Rodriguez continued with staff's analysis with regard to reputation. She stated that all the proposers provided references. When staff reached out to each of the supplied reference for each of the proposers, staff was able to connect with at least one reference for each proposer. All proposers received favorable reference with the exception of The Chicken Guy which although provided 4 references in its proposal, staff was only able to connect with one and that entity provided a negative reference.

Ms. Rodriguez continued on to the ACDBE participation analysis, explaining that the proposal required a 30 percent requirement to meet with either the participation or with the good faith efforts. All of the proposers addressed this concept in their documentation. The Chicken Guy proposed a 30 percent participation and a request to clarify its joint venture was done by legal counsel and there is some follow-up information there. Izziban is a hundred percent participation as well as JDDA, Legacy, McDonald's, Orlando Food and Beverage Partners and Pizza Pizza all proposing 100 percent. Tijuana Flats proposed zero percent ACDBE participation and had some documentation and explanation as to an attempt for some good faith efforts. Again, legal counsel and the Small Business Development Department did the analysis and has some additional information.

Chairman Friel asked legal counsel to please provide the additional information.

Mr. Gerber explained that The Chicken Guy proposed a joint venture with J Project Solutions. There are as you know regulations and federal guidance regarding ACDBE's. 49 CFR 23.55(d) states when an ACDBE performs as a participant in a joint venture, count a portion of the gross receipts equal to the distinct clearly defined portion of the work of the concession that the ACDBE performs with its own forces for its ACDBE roles. The key term here is distinct clearly defined. FAA guidance defines distinct as separate and distinguishable. In its proposal, the joint venture proposed 15 elements of how the venture would operate. JPS has varying fractions of responsibility allocation for 9 of the 15 elements. Five of the elements are assigned only to the majority partner. In only one element, airport customer service and training JPS has a distinct role but that is defined by the joint venture as only three percent of the venture's total work. Further, a request for clarification from The Chicken Guy was sent and we asked directly please provide clarification of the distinct clearly defined portion of the work performed by the ACDBE. Explain how the work will be, how the work performed will be distinct and clearly defined. Furthermore, federal law is mentioned many times in the request for proposal. This specific section that I'm referencing. The request resulted in a repetition of the proposal language. It is more likely than not that this operation would not meet FAA standards. There are other insufficiencies too. The venture does not place sufficient capitalization requirements on JPS to meet federal guidance. There are questions about the ownership and management of the ACDBE's portion of the business.

MINUTES FOR THE JUNE 25, 2021, CONCESSIONS/PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE

Clarification was sought but was insufficient except for on partial issues. But the lack of distinct and clearly defined portions of work meeting the goal makes it unlikely that the venture can meet the 30 percent goal. Tijuana Flats failed to propose an ACDBE solution and failed to demonstrate good faith efforts to meet its goals.

Chairman Friel asked if there were any questions from anyone as to the report from legal counsel. There were none.

Ms. Rodriguez continued on to the evaluation criteria ranked according to strength demonstrated in the proposal. Ms. Rodriguez presented the staff analysis as to experience and qualifications. Staff also did an analysis as to litigation. No litigation issues were found for The Chicken Guy, Izziban, JDDA or Legacy. The McDonald's proposal failed to directly answer the past litigation question. It does not disqualify this proposer. No other legal issues though were identified.

Mr. Gerber asked if there were any other questions on the legal issues.

Chairman Friel asked about Pizza Pizza? Mr. Gerber explained that Pizza Pizza had two landlord tenant disputes for one of its locations. These were landlord tenant disputes with a specific landlord for breach of contract. A disclosure was not required. Both cases were resolved according to the court records. They appear to be immaterial however of course you can take that into your consideration.

Chairman Friel asked if there were any questions for legal.

Vice-Chair Sharman asked if the answer from McDonald's was acceptable from a legal perspective. Mr. Gerber answered that there was some disappointment that they did not answer this question directly. They did answer it. On balance though, the overall financial strength of McDonald's and the risk of meeting their financial obligations to the Aviation Authority because of these lawsuits, I did not find this to be a disqualifying factor.

Mr. Draper asked about some language in the RFP that states, the proposer or an affiliate must have a minimum of three years' experience in the direct managing of operation of a food and beverage business generating at least \$1M in annual gross receipts. Did staff check to see if they each have one place that met that qualification? Mr. Draper continued, for example the Orlando Food and Beverage Partners, they have the years of experience but they say they operate restaurants in airports and their generated sales for 2019 was \$3.8M so how many restaurants made up that \$3.8M or is that not a factor? Frank Browne from Concessions responded that the requirement is a combined sales of a million dollars so that would mean they would make that qualification of \$3.8M.

Chairman Friel asked if there were any other questions before we move on. There were none.

Ms. Rodriguez next explained the customer service and marketing criteria portions of the staff analysis.

Chairman Friel asked if there were any questions on the customer service and marketing proposals.

Next, Ms. Rodriguez continued by presenting staff analysis regarding the various concepts and associated menus.

Vice Chair Sharman requested the specific prices for the concepts. Ms. Rodriguez provided a summary of each proposers' menu process. Mr. Engle asked about price comparisons for the three Chick-fil-A offerings. Ms. Rodriguez responded they were pretty consistent,

MINUTES FOR THE JUNE 25, 2021, CONCESSIONS/PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE

although there were slight differences. Ms. Rodriguez indicated she would print and hand out a chart with the various prices for use during evaluation and deliberation.

Chairman Friel stated that JDDA and Legacy seem very similar and are quite identical in a lot of areas. Orlando F&B Partners seems to be slightly less when looking at the categories. Chairman Friel asked if there were any questions from the Committee. There were none.

Mr. Gerber stated that due diligence was done on the fact that we have three Chick-fil-A brand proposers to ensure that all three were authorized by Chick-fil-A to propose and we did confirm that.

Ms. Rodriguez continued on to the next category which was the proposed investment for the improvements. She stated that the proposed space consists of 1209 square feet. The requirement was to propose \$500 a square foot for non-commissary space and \$100 for commissary space. It was up to the proposer on how they wanted to divide the space. Ms. Rodriguez presented a PowerPoint slide listing each Proposer and the proposed investment.

Chairman Friel asked if a minimum investment amount. But they could do different ratios? Ms. Rodriguez stated that was correct. There was an analysis done by the Aviation Authority's consultant as to the improvements. There were some small notations and they are contained on your SchenkelSchultz charts that are green. There were a couple of proposals that the renderings were not included, Pizza Pizza and Tijuana Flats. The que for the concession point of sale extends beyond the lease line for the Izziban and JDDA spaces. Tijuana Flats also appeared to extended beyond the lease line slightly. Chairman Friel asked if there were any questions. Chairman Friel asked, regardless of which proposal was successful, were they all required to stay within their leaseholds. Ms. Rodriguez stated that was correct, any proposed plans would go through the Design Review Committee.

Chairman Friel asked if someone was outside their leasehold, their pro forma is based upon them using that leasehold and then using the non-leasehold area for the point of sale for their queuing, can they still meet their pro forma goal if now they're forced to push back into their leasehold which makes their kitchen smaller. Should that be a consideration when reviewing their proposals?

Mr. Gerber indicated it was not a disqualifying factor based on the consultant's review. A consultant would have failed with that circumstance if it was uncorrectable. They will have to go through DRC so all the proposers should know that the final design will be subject to DRC approval which is specified in the RFP.

Ms. Rodriguez moved on to next category, financial return to the Aviation Authority. She stated that the proposed percentage of gross receipts will be ranked after consideration of the reasonableness of the information presented and the assumption supporting the budget and pro forma submitted by each one of their proposers. She presented a list of the proposals. She noted that one of the proposers did propose a percentage on alcohol sales and alcohol sales are not permitted at this location. This concluded Ms. Rodriguez's presentation.

Chairman Friel asked if there were any speakers for the item? The Recording Secretary indicated there were speakers.

Mr. Gerber stated there were speakers and that presentations were limited to two minutes. Only one speaker per proposer and once the public comment period is over and once deliberations begin, there will be no further speakers allowed. Mr. Gerber recognized the first speaker, Mr. Hughes.

MINUTES FOR THE JUNE 25, 2021, CONCESSIONS/PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE

Mr. Howard Hughes introduced himself and thanked the committee for the opportunity to speak. He continued that "I am the Director of Operations for Mr. Jim Gilchrist representing Gilchrist Enterprises. I've been with Jim for 20 plus years about the same time Jim became, started doing business out here at the airport. We really want to take this opportunity to kind of address the issue, the concern that the Committee would certainly have about the duplication of menus or duplication of brands and we really feel very strongly that the McDonald's brand and the Shake Shacks are two different target audiences and then we actually do compliment what the existing line of the venues, particularly the fact that at this airport in our current two locations, the two \$14M we do up here, about half of that takes place during breakfast. This airport geographically sees a huge amount of people coming out of the airport during mornings. That fifty percent of sales condensed into a 5 or 6 hour period means you really have to be able to produce large quantities to meet the public. Our location over here at Airside 2 it's not unusual to see a \$15,000 to \$17,000 morning at the McDonald's out here on a Saturday. It's just insane how busy it is early in the morning and we've been doing this for years so in that way we really feel we've got great confidence with the existing line up because there's just not that much on your awarded contracts that really specialize in breakfast. Additionally, when we moved into the burger business side what we call the regular menu side, we do way more than just burgers. The majority of our burgers are kid's business. McDonald's is kids we all know that. Our offerings of regular menu, they just, they're really not quite the same as Shake Shack. When you leave your house if you're heading to Shake Shack when you decide that they're too busy, you're probably not going to decide to go to McDonald's instead. Just two different type of trading areas and we're not really compared with them. Additionally, if we can get past that portion of the process, we know that there's three Chick-fil-A's on the docket as well and just down the road here, right in the main building you see a McDonald's, ours and then Chick-fil-A that face each other every day. If you haven't consulted the sales reports, you should because we've been doing business across from them for many many years. 2019 we came in at that location just under \$7M. They haven't quite hit four yet. Why? Why do consumers, why do our passengers choose us to the tune of us doing 70 percent more business than they do year after year when we're looking at each other right across the hallway. So we all know that percentage rent is largely based upon overall sales."

Mr. Gerber recognized the next speaker was Mr. Hall.

Mr. Hall introduced himself and continued: "Good afternoon my name is Kern Halls and I'm a local veteran owned ACDBE company. I partner with Orlando Food and Beverage Partners. This is also a veteran owned company as well as the modern day team that is a female ACDBE lead as well. I stood here just about two years ago and we weren't successful at the bid that we did at that time but I learned so much throughout that process. So much that I started partnering with the City of Orlando through My Brother's Keeper to start mentoring kids to understand, virtually through the pandemic we taught cooking classes and also we taught them an entrepreneurship. And the most thing now that I tell the students on a daily basis it's just about persistence and perseverance. One of the things that we always want do is that through this time is that we also became a vendor at the Amway Center you know partnering with the City of Orlando, making sure that we brand to some concessions in that venue so we got to ten year contract with them. Then also we got a phone call out of the blue from the pandemic from Orange County Public Schools. We fed students through the pandemic. A lot of students were learning virtually and we were able to feed a thousand students a day to make sure parents came in and picked up their meals and took it home to them. So we are really big on local and making sure we're supporting everybody that we can here. Since the last time we spoke to you as well, my son graduated from UCF and now he's going to be doing, going to school at University of Florida for his pharmacy program right here in Lake Nona. My wife's a Knight. My son was a Knight and now of course he's going to be a Gator. But as we continue to make sure that we do these, we want to make sure that we are attuning our students and everybody that we're persistent in everything that we do. So one of the things that I wanted to take away is that for this opportunity for here for this QSR opportunities that I would love for you all and

MINUTES FOR THE JUNE 25, 2021, CONCESSIONS/PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE

myself to go back to the students at MBK, My Brother's Keeper and tell them that you know the hard work and perseverance paid off. Thank you for your time."

Mr. Gerber recognized the next speaker as Jason Yu.

Mr. Yu thanked the Chairman and Committee and senior Airport members. He continued that "I'm the owner of the JDDA Concession Management. We propose Chick-fil-A here. I guess hopefully we're number one Chick-fil-A in U.S. I just want to assure and guarantee my construction proposal and the cost but I want to guarantee once awarding the JDDA would guarantee \$1000 per square foot but we're going to spend money. That's it so eat more chicken. Thanks."

Mr. Gerber asked if there were any other speakers. Being none he indicated that deliberations would begin.

Chairman Friel thanked everyone for their comments. He indicated the committee would start evaluations of the financial capabilities, reputation and then the ACDBE participation, ratings would be either satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Chairman Friel indicating that under financial capabilities, he had everyone satisfactory.

Vice Chair Sharman asked legal counsel, with respect to the proposer that didn't quite give enough information, can ask for more? Mr. Gerber indicated that it was within her discretion. This is a one hundred percent small business. They did explain why they had difficulty in one of their years of financial statement presentation. It's within your discretion to say satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

All committee members consented to ranking all proposers satisfactory under financial capabilities.

Chairman Friel moved on next to the evaluation for reputation. The Chicken Guy under reputation provided for only one reference to us and it was unfavorable. So I want to read the reputation and this is out of the RFP: "Reputation will be considered based upon the information provided by the proposers' references or as otherwise determined by the Aviation Authority. A poor reference or multiple non-responsive references may result in an unsatisfactory rating." So based upon the guidance that was given as to the Committee, I think in my mind there was one unfavorable and that was the only one that were unsatisfactory. I don't know what the Committee thinks about that in that regard. But I can keep going if you want a moment to pause on that. Izziban I had as satisfactory. Actually I had everyone else as satisfactory. That was my only one, only one that stood out based upon their one unfavorable rating.

Mr. Draper agreed with the Chairman.

Vice Chair Sharman agreed with the Chairman.

Mr. Engle and Ms. Silvers consented with the members of the committee.

Chairman Friel moved on the ACDBE deliberation. He reminded the committee about the earlier presentation and counsel's input on that, I had written down that for The Chicken Guy more likely than not they will not meet the goal. Did I do that right?

Mr. Gerber confirmed that as proposed and clarified, yes.

Chairman Friel continued that he had them in his scoring based upon that is that they were unsatisfactory. That I had Izziban, JDDA, Legacy, McDonald's, Orlando FNB Partners, Pizza Pizza as satisfactory and then Tijuana Flats is they didn't, they were non-responsive basically on that in my view. They didn't submit anything for us to determine whether they were satisfactory or not did they?

MINUTES FOR THE JUNE 25, 2021, CONCESSIONS/PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE

Mr. Morning reminded the committee that there were two requirements in the RFP. One was to meet the 30 percent ACBB goal and the second one was to provide the supporting ACDBE documentation which they did not.

Chairman Friel asked for the committee's input, specifically, is it responsive, non-responsive or is it unsatisfactory versus satisfactory? To me it seems a bit cut and dry. Ms. Silvers added that it seemed different from The Chicken Guy. He at least provided the information so it feels non-responsive. Mr. Engle stated: "I'm good with that." And Mr. Draper repeated that Chicken Guy is unsatisfactory. Chairman Friel attempted to summarize the discussion as Chicken Guy I had as unsatisfactory and then Tijuana Flats is non-responsive. So pausing there for a minute with that in mind. With Tijuana Flats being considered non-responsive on this one piece of their proposal, do we continue forward with them and evaluate or do you not? I would think counsel, legal counsel, any thoughts?

Mr. Gerber responded that No, non-responsive.

Chairman Friel continued that as a result of the legal clarification, the committee would continue evaluating all proposers with the exception of Tijuana Flats. Chairman Friel continued with a discussion regarding the demonstration of experience and qualifications proposed by the respective remaining proposers.

Mr. Draper suggested that they be ranked all very good because everyone fully met the requirements.

Chairman Friel: I'm fine with that.

Vice Chair Sharman agreed and Mr. Engle consented.

Chairman Friel initiated a full discussion regarding customer service and marketing attributes of each proposer.

Mr. Draper agreed with Chairman Friel's analysis although stated that he that Legacy and Orlando Food and Beverage Partners were a little bit above everybody else's because of how they, they spread out their program and their whole recognition and retention program among other stated items. He also stated that Izziban may be a step behind everybody else's for various reasons.

Mr. Engle agreed with both Chairman Friel and Mr. Draper and added that Izziban just a little bit lacking. Another item to note as far marketing plans having iPad ordering and having the kiosk is a positive. Another note was that 407 Empanada was the only one that mentioned that they will participate in our MCO customer experience training so the way I look at it, I mean I would rate Orlando Food and Beverage as well as Legacy as outstanding. Chicken Guy very good. Izziban adequate. JDDA very good and McDonald's very good.

Vice Chair Sharman concurred with the previous discussions. Vice Chair Sharman stated that she definitely loved Legacy's kiosk on this category, the other category where it would have the ordering kiosk on the board, and that was great and that the fact that they have people sort of out in the line so yes those two and Orlando FNB as well.

More discussion ensued and Vice Chair Sharman requested Mr. Engle to summarize the proposed ranking on the category again.

Chairman Friel and Mr. Engle summarized the proposed rankings on the category for each proposer and all Committee Members came to a consensus.

Chairman Friel initiated a discussion on the category for Concepts and quality, variety and price on each venue. He reminded the committee that concepts were required to compliment the plan of South Terminal Concessions previously awarded.

MINUTES FOR THE JUNE 25, 2021, CONCESSIONS/PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE

Chairman Friel asked a question of the Committee with respect to the three Chick Fil A brands and the fact that they are closed on Sundays. He pointed out that if Chick-fil-A ends up rising up at the top then just bear that in mind for the Committee. All that I know and even what I've read is you know Chick-fil-A from a sales perspective does as much in six days as well as a lot of others, most others did in seven. So it's a strong brand but as we evaluate the concepts and the menu prices and the menu, we need to be mindful that that won't be there on Sundays. So with having said that unless there's any questions or comments from the Committee on that.

Mr. Draper discussed why he thought they were all very good.

Vice Chair Sharman requested the floor to make a comment and was recognized by Chairman Friel. Vice Chair Sharman continued that "I would just as I did the last time one of these came up. I think McDonald's is a really great brand and it's a comfort brand right. Everywhere in the world you know what you're getting when you go to McDonald's and you're traveling so I just want to acknowledge that I think that, I think this is the right place for me to say that." Vice Chair Sharman continued that "obviously the proposers could have proposed any concept and three out of the eight of them proposed a Chick-fil-A. So I definitely think Chick-fil-A should have some strong consideration but I do, I just want to acknowledge that I kind of think McDonald's should be there somewhere. I said that before and I still stand by that."

More discussion ensued.

Mr. Draper suggested that McDonald's is an outstanding and Orlando Food and Beverage Partners is an outstanding because they, of the Chick-fil-A brands, they have in the cost comparison, they have the lower pricing and that everyone else is a very good. Vice Chair Sharman added that she thought Legacy should be ranked very good on the basis of their concept of the mobile, the kiosk and concession improvements.

Chairman Friel clarified as to the complimentary concept requirement, that ranking McDonald's as outstanding, the committee was in effect, agreeing that they're complimentary?

Vice Chair Sharman agreed that McDonald's was complementary and not duplicative.

Chairman Friel asked again if the McDonald's proposal was complimentary.

Mr. Gerber stated that it was within the committee's discretion.

Chairman Friel requested that Mr. Engle repeat his suggested rankings.

Mr. Engle stated that he was confident in Legacy, FNB Partners for Chick-fil-A we said outstanding but there is a question about the kids meal and then to Vice Chair Sharman's point with Legacy you know with everything they're offering make them outstanding so there a differentiator in there as well.

Vice Chair Sharman confirmed Mr. Engle's statement with Legacy as outstanding and Mr. Draper repeated the proposed rankings as: Chicken Guy is very good; Izziban is very good; JDDA is very good; Legacy is outstanding; McDonald's is outstanding; Orlando FNB Partners is outstanding and Pizza Pizza is very good.

Chairman Friel moved the discussion to concession improvements. He then paused to ask legal counsel a question as Izziban's statement at the meeting that he committed to \$725,400 for their concession improvement. They made a public statement here earlier that they would increase.

Mr. Gerber clarified that the statement was in fact made by a representative of JDDA, and they could not amend their proposal verbally.

MINUTES FOR THE JUNE 25, 2021, CONCESSIONS/PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE

Chairman Friel continued with the discussion regarding concession improvements at one point asking staff about the breakdown of front of house and back of house investments.

Ms. Rodriguez stated that obviously there's a commissary space and then there's a non-commissary space. But if you do look at the designs, there are good depictions of what they're proposing. That's really the only thing you can go on the documentation.

Ms. Silvers asked the Chairman if this were the appropriate time to consider the Schenkel Schultz evaluation.

Chairman Friel restated the consultant's analysis for the committee as Izziban and Pizza Pizza did not meet the requirements as it relates to the floor plan and the renderings and the JDDA que space was outside the leasehold.

Ms. Silvers pointed out that Pizza Pizza has a second notation regarding the renderings. Also, since it was a newer concept, 407 Empanadas, it was to review the concept and the concession improvements.

Mr. Draper continued that when looking at the drawings, he thought there was more of them that did not have the que in the leasehold.

Chairman Friel reminded the committee that any proposed queuing matters would be resolved by DRC and instead they should focus on the actual concept and then obviously the amount that they're proposing to invest. Chairman Friel continued with the discussion of the respective proposer's concepts and designs.

Mr. Draper reiterated that we asked that our consultant review and provide comment. The consultant found some areas of concern and we should take that into account and so I would start with Pizza Pizza and Izziban being adequate since they both have two areas of concern, from our general consultant on the space.

Mr. Engle stated that with the amount of improvements I mean that should obviously be in consideration. The McDonald's investment at nearly a million more so you almost have to say outstanding for that and of the three Chick-fil-A concepts both going off of the amount invested and just what I viewed, I suggest Orlando FNB Partners a little higher than I did Legacy and JDDA. Mr. Draper and Ms. Silvers agreed.

Ms. Silvers shared the images with Vice Chair Sharman and Mr. Gerber reminded both to speak into the microphone.

Vice Chair Sharman stated that she very much liked Legacy. She agreed with the fellow committee members but from appeal and "a look perspective", she thought Legacy was best. Vice-Chair Sharman continued that she agreed with everything else said.

Chairman Friel continued with The Chicken Guy as very good. Mr. Draper and Ms. Silvers agreed

Chairman Friel summarized the status of the rankings of the proposers on this element.

Vice Chair Sharman reminded the committee that the self-service component was appealing.

Chairman Friel suggested changing Legacy from very good to outstanding and the committee agreed.

Chairman Friel reiterated the proposed minimum annual guarantees and asked Vice Chair Sharman if she could help out with the pro forma.

MINUTES FOR THE JUNE 25, 2021, CONCESSIONS/PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE

Vice Chair Sharman observed that the minimum annual guarantee times those 10 years pro forma sale and then calculated the proposed revenue to the Aviation Authority should be considered and stated the results in alphabetical order.

Vice Chair Sharman continued with some discussion regarding the three Chick-fil-A's and the price comparison sheet. It looked like although Orlando FNB's prices were slightly lower, their projected sales per enplanement was significantly higher so they're counting on selling more at a lesser price. JDDA was \$1 per enplaned passenger. Legacy's was 95 cents per enplaned passenger. Orlando FNB was \$1.68 per enplaned passenger.

Chairman Friel asked Vice Chair Sharman if she had the per enplaned passengers' values for McDonald's? Vice Chair Sharman said she focused on the Chick-fil-A's because the proposed MAG's were higher, but could find that pretty quickly. She continued that Chicken Guy is \$1; Izziban is 46 cents; Pizza Pizza is 34 cents; And McDonald's 25 cents.

Vice Chair Sharman continued that the calculations were just to give a sense on how much the spread is, but revenue to the Aviation Authority, financial return to Aviation Authority which is the title of this section, Orlando FNB has the highest, followed by JDDA.

Mr. Draper suggested that JDDA and Orlando Food & Beverage Partners be ranked outstanding and the rest very good.

Chairman Friel asked Vice Chair Sharman her thoughts. Vice Chair Sharman stated that if you're really going by financial returns of the Aviation Authority as provided in the proposals, the highest seen 13, this is over 10 years. The highest being 13 and Pizza Pizza you know is 2.3 and Izziban at 3.2. So I think those are lower. Then you've got another lump of people like The Chicken Guy and McDonald's and maybe Legacy, it's sort of in the middle and then you've got the other two, JDDA and Orlando FNB. I always lump them in three categories.

Chairman Friel and Mr. Draper agreed with that.

Mr. Draper suggested JDDA and Orlando FNB as outstanding. Vice Chair Sharman agreed.

Mr. Draper continued that The Chicken Guy and Legacy and McDonald's is very good. And Pizza Pizza and Izziban are adequate. Chairman Friel asked if the committee was in consensus and after some further discussion, it was determined they were.

Chairman Friel began to tally up the individual rankings and read them aloud as: Orlando FNB Partners 1; Legacy Concession 2; McDonald's 3; JDDA 4; The Chicken Guy 5; Pizza Pizza 6; and then Izziban 7.

Ms. Silvers reminded the committee that The Chicken Guy did have the two unsatisfactory rankings. Mr. Engle stated that he had them ranked at the bottom. Vice Chair Sharman reminded the committee that The Chicken Guy was already ranked 5.

Mr. Gerber advised that just because someone is ranked fifth, you know the ranking has to hold no matter how high or how low they are. So be careful with that ranking. Do not dismiss a ranking at 5 just because you don't think they're going to get there

Chairman Friel reiterated that two members of the Committee have expressed concerns. Mr. Draper agreed that the unsatisfactory should come in there. Vice-Chair Sharman agreed. Chairman Friel revised the last three rankings as Pizza Pizza at number 5; Izziban at 6; and The Chicken Guy at 7.

The committee came to a consensus. Chairman Friel asked for a motion.

MINUTES FOR THE JUNE 25, 2021, CONCESSIONS/PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE

Ms. Silvers asked a question of legal counsel regarding the need to deem Tijuana Flats non-responsive.

Mr. Gerber instructed that yes that would be part of the motion.

Upon motion by Ms. Silvers, second by Mr. Engle, vote carried and to approve the ranking for the Request for Proposals for Quick Service Food and Beverage Concession as follows:

First:	Orlando Food & Beverage Partners
Second:	Legacy Concessions, LLC
Third:	McDonald's USA, LLC
Fourth:	JDDA Concession Management Incorporated
Fifth:	Pizza Pizza Inc. d/b/a 407 Empanada
Sixth:	Izziban Inc. d/b/a Izzi Modern Korean Kitchen
Seventh:	The Chicken Guy MCO LLC
Non-Responsive:	Tijuana Flats Restaurants LLC

Mr. Gerber clarified on the record that the appeals are due July 2. Initially at the start of the meeting someone said July 5. It's July 2 at 4 p.m. We'll send an email to all the proposers for that too if you have an appeal. Thank you.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Friel asked if there was further business to discuss before the Committee. Having no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned.


Larissa Bou
Recording Secretary


Brad Friel
Chairman