On NOVEMBER 12, 2020, 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 9:01 a.m. The meeting was posted in accordance with Florida Statutes and a quorum was present.

Committee members present: Brad Friel, Chairman

Kathleen Sharman, Vice Chair

Thomas Draper, Senior Director of Airport Operations

Brian Engle, Director of Customer Experience Deborah Silvers, Director of Risk Management

Staff/Others present: Diana Hershner, Manager of Purchasing

Gordon Clark, Manager of Access Control & Security Compliance

Janice Hughes, Senior Purchasing Agent Maury Remmers, Manager of Risk Management

Michael Karamarkovich, Manager of Security Contract Orlando Santiago, Small Business Compliance Administrator

Kate Stangle, Legal Counsel, Nelson Mullins

Larissa Bou, Manager of Board Services and Recording

Secretary

CHAIRMAN'S OPENING REMARKS

Chairman Friel announced that, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Centers for Disease (CDC) guidelines, and the Greater Orlando Aviation Authority's ongoing focus on safety regarding events and meetings, seating at Sunshine committee meetings will be limited, according to space and social distancing. All attending must wear a face mask. Chairman Friel stated that anyone wishing to speak to the item being presented today, must fill out a comment card.

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, and it 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 4:00 p.m. on November 19, 2020 (emails will be accepted during the COVID-19 pandemic).

Lastly, for individuals who conduct lobbying activities with Aviation Authority employees or Board members, registration with the Aviation Authority is required each year prior to conducting any lobbying activities. A statement of expenditures incurred in connection with those lobbying instances should also be filed prior to April 1 of each year for the preceding year. 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. Lobbyists are now required to sign-in at the Aviation Authority offices prior to any meetings with Staff or Board members. In the event a lobbyist meets with or otherwise communicates with Staff or a Board member at a location other than the Aviation Authority offices, the lobbyist shall file a Notice of Lobbying (Form 4) detailing each instance of lobbying to the Aviation Authority within 7 calendar days of such lobbying. Lobbyists will also provide a notice to the Aviation Authority when meeting with the Mayor of the City of Orlando or the Mayor of Orange County at their offices. The policy, forms, and instructions are available in the Aviation Authority's offices and the web site. Please contact the Chief Administrative Officer with questions at (407) 825-7105.

Before proceeding with business, Ms. Stangle asked the Committee 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. Hearing none, Chairman Friel asked for a roll call for Committee members to individually respond to the question posed by legal counsel. All Committee members responded "no conflict".

Chairman Friel continued by communicating that today the Committee will consider the proposals received for 06-21 Security Area Monitor (SAM) Services.

CONSIDERATION OF FIRMS FOR 06-21, SECURITY AREA MONITOR (SAM) SERVICES

- 1. Chairman Friel asked Ms. Hershner to provide a list of the firms that responded to the advertisement, followed by a brief description of the scope of service, contract term, and award criteria. Ms. Hershner stated the following 10 firms submitted proposals, which were received by September 22, 2020, in alphabetical order:
 - ACTS Airport Services, Inc.
 - American Eagle Protective Services Corporation
 - American Guard Service, Inc.
 - Global Security Associates, LLC
 - HSS, Inc.
 - Inter-Con Security Systems, Inc.
 - Prosegur Services Group, Inc.
 - Safeway Services Group
 - SecurAmerica, LLC
 - Universal Protection Services d/b/a Allied Universal Security Services, Inc.

In regards to the scope of service, this Contract award will be to provide all labor, supervision, equipment, tools, materials, supplies, uniforms, fuel, vehicles and all other items necessary or proper for, or incidental to, providing security area monitoring services including, but not limited to, access control, vehicle search services, and garage patrol services at multiple locations located throughout the Orlando International Airport (OIA) in accordance with the contract documents and pursuant to the Aviation Authority's Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) and the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 49 Part 1500 series, as amended.

The awarded Proposer will be obligated to perform these services twenty-four hours per day, seven days per week, 365 days per year or 366 days per leap year. The Aviation Authority reserves the right to increase or decrease coverage at any time during the Contract.

The term of the Contract will be for twenty-four (24) months with the initial service to commence on or about April 1, 2021, and with the Aviation Authority having three (3) additional option periods of one (1) year each.

Lastly, Ms. Hershner made reference to Attachment A (copy on file), which details the award criteria. She indicated that per the award criteria, for a Proposer to meet the minimum responsibility criteria for this Contract, the Proposer must provide verifiable evidence, as follows:

- 1. Through references or otherwise, that the Proposer is an individual, a firm, a corporation, or other entity that is currently engaged in the business of providing security area monitor services;
- 2. Through references, that the Proposer, after taking into account the activities of a related predecessor (e.g. by merger or reorganization), affiliate, or principal of Proposer, has satisfactorily provided security area monitor services for an airport or similar transportation facility during such five (5) year period; and
- 3. Through reference or otherwise, that it or a predecessor (e.g. by merger) or affiliate is satisfactorily providing, or has: satisfactorily provided within the past five (5) years, in either case for a period of not less than three (3) years, security services at multiple entrance control points for an integrated campus of one or more separate facilities (in one geographic location) pursuant to a single contract with a minimum requirement of 2,000 man hours per week in multiple shifts, 24 hours per day, 7 days per week.

Chairman Friel asked if any Committee member had questions. Hearing none, he asked staff to provide their findings in regards to the Minimum Responsibility criteria.

Ms. Hughes presented the following findings for the Minimum Responsibility criteria:

1. Through references or otherwise, that the Proposer is an individual, a firm, a corporation, or other entity that is currently engaged in the business of providing security area monitor services - All Proposer met the requirement.

- 2. Through references, that the Proposer, after taking into account the activities of a related predecessor (e.g. by merger or reorganization), affiliate, or principal of Proposer, has been actively engaged in such business during the five (5) years immediately preceding the date of Proposer's response to this Request for Proposal All Proposers met the requirements with the exception of Safeway Services Group. Safeway Services Group only confirmed 3 years of being actively engaged in business.
- 3. Through reference or otherwise, that it or a predecessor (e.g. by merger) or affiliate is satisfactorily providing, or has: satisfactorily provided within the past five (5) years, in either case for a period of not less than three (3) years, security services at multiple entrance control points for an integrated campus of one or more separate facilities (in one geographic location) pursuant to a single contract with a minimum requirement of 2,000 man hours per week in multiple shifts, 24 hours per day, 7 days per week Ms. Hughes informed that obtaining references checks was a challenge, due to many of the references listed were working remotely during the COVID-19 pandemic. Reference requests were sent out on September 25, 2020 and October 5, 2020, with follow-ups on October 12 and October 29, 2020. All Proposers met this criteria with the exception of Safeway Services Group. Services Service Group did not provide a reference that could verify that they have provided 2,000 man hours per week in multiple shifts and 24 hours per day, 7 days per week.

Before proceeding, Chairman Friel informed the Committee that they were provided evaluation forms for the Minimum Responsibility requirements. This criteria should be ranked as "Meet Requirements" or "Does Not Meet Requirements". He asked Ms. Hughes to continue with the last requirement.

Ms. Hughes indicated that the last requirement was small business participation, as follows:

4. The Proposer must meet a small business participation requirement of 11% for Minority and Women Business Enterprise (MWBE) and participating requirement of 11% for Local Developing Business (LDB) as established by the Aviation Authority - All Proposer met the requirement with the exception of Safeway Service Group. The Small Business Development Department provided a memorandum which stated that "Safeway Services Group proposed to self-perform the LDB goal which is contrary to the Instructions to Proposers, § 26.3: "All Proposers, including a Proposer which is an LDB, shall comply with the LDB requirements outlined in this section by having LDBs other than the Proposer...." We recommend that Safeway Services Group be deemed non-responsive to the Aviation Authority's RFP 06-21, Security Area Monitor (SAM) Services".

Chairman Friel asked the Committee and legal counsel if they had any thoughts or comments with regards to Safeway Service Group self-preforming as LDB, and the Small Business Development Department's recommendation to deem them non-responsive. Legal counsel agreed that, based on the small business requirements set forth in the Request for Proposals (RFP), not complying with this requirement can deemed the Proposer non-responsive. Additionally, Ms. Stangle noted that there were other requirements that Safeway Service Group did not meet.

Upon motion by Vice Chair Sharman, second by Mr. Draper, motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, to deem Safeway Service Group non-responsive as it pertains to small business participation requirements.

Mr. Draper asked if, based on the minimum requirements just discussed, firms without airport experience should be considered differently. On the same subject, Vice Chair Sharman asked if the requirement is to have experience in an airport and/or similar regulated transportation environment. Following a brief discussion, Ms. Stangle clarified that for the evaluation of the Minimum Responsibility criteria, experience both in an airport or similar transportation environment are acceptable to meet the criteria. However, this can be used as a discriminator when evaluating the Experience and Qualifications during staff's review of the proposal, when Committee will be asked to rank each Proposer in five other areas.

Chairman Friel asked Mr. Draper to list the Proposers he identified as having no airport experience. Mr. Draper indicated that American Eagle Protection Services, Inter-Con Security Systems, Inc. and Safeway Services Group did not list airport experience. Ms. Stangle reiterated that based on the requirement, as stated on the RFP documents, experience in an airport or a similar regulated transportation facility is acceptable. Brief discussion ensued regarding examples of similar transportation facilities.

Chairman Friel affirmed that with this explanation there is no need for an amendment to the previous motion.

Before continuing with staff review of the proposals, Chairman Friel indicated that the Committee was provided a separate evaluation form for this part of the evaluation. He proposed the use of the following scale for ranking each category, as follows: Outstanding, Very Good, Adequate, Less Than Adequate, and Unacceptable.

Executive Summary

Chairman Friel asked Ms. Hughes to provide staff's review of the Executive Summary. Ms. Hughes provided the following information:

ACTS Airport Services, Inc. (ACTS) - ACTS has been in business for 19 years. It is a subsidiary of ACTS-Aviation Security. They were acquired by ICTS Europe in 2017. ACTS was formed after 9/11/2001, to provide aviation security solutions to airline customers. They provide services at 31 airports. The firm has \$40 million in revenue. ACTS had 1,000 employees, but due to COVID-19 pandemic its staff has reduced to 600 employees. ACTS' programs for Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky International Airport and Minneapolis-Saint Paul International Airport include employee screening using x-ray machines, walk-through metal detectors (WTMDs), and handheld metal detectors, vehicle and personnel inspections at Airfield Operations Area (AOA) gates, exit lane staffing, access control, and issuance of escort badges. They proposed to use a T3 three wheel vehicle. Lastly, they had no letters of warning as it relates to CFR Title 49 Part 1500 Series, civil penalties, or evidence of penalties incurred within the past five years.

Allied Universal Security Services (Allied) - Allied has been in business for 60 years. The parent companies of Allied Barton Security Services was founded in 1958, and Universal Protection Services was founded in 1965. The companies merged in August of 2016 to form Allied Universal Security Services. The Proposer has 275 federal, state, and local clients; 750 government facilities; and up to 200 locations under a single contract. They provide services to 41 airports, 7 which are Cat X. Allied has \$7.4 billion in revenue and have approximately 230,000 employees. Some of its airport experience include John F. Kennedy International Airport, LaGuardia Airport, Rochester International Airport, Newark Liberty International Airport, Jacksonville International Airport, Ft. Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport, Miami International Airport; Dallas Love Field and San Antonio International Airport, among others. Allied listed Trikke as its proposed electric stand-up three wheel vehicle. The Proposer listed two (2) warnings at Cat X airports.

American Eagle Protective Services (AEPS) - The Proposer has been in business for 18 years and it is a privately-owned corporation with no parent or subsidiary companies. AEPS began as an approved member of the Small Business Association's (SBA) and they graduated from the program in 2014. They currently manage multi-million dollar contracts throughout the U.S. providing over 1.4 million hours of productive security guard services. AEPS currently operates and manages multiple security operations contracts throughout the continental United States, Hawaii, and the U.S. territory of Guam. There has been no change in ownership during that time. The Proposer did not list any airports. They have \$45.3 million in revenue and have approximately 1,000 employees. Since 2012, AEPS has been providing armed Contract Security Officer (CSO) services to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Western Service Area (WSA), which comprises the states of Arkansas, Washington, California, Nevada, Arizona, Utah, Colorado, Hawaii, and the US territory of Guam. Its proposed electric stand-up three wheel vehicle is a Segway SE-3. They did not list any letter of warning; however, they did not list airport experience.

American Guard Service, Inc. (AGS) - AGS has been in business for 23 years. Its services include armed and unarmed guard security, mobile patrols, surveillance solutions, crossing guards, and more. AGS has had successful contracts with federal and local municipalities, airports, maritime facilities, K-12 and higher education clients. Since 2001, they expanded airport coverage with clients such as Miami International Airport, Los Angeles International Airport, Los Angeles World Airports, and Contra Costa County Airport Division. Under experience, they listed the three aforementioned airport. They have \$98.6 million in revenue and have approximately 8,000 employees. Its proposed electric stand-up three wheel vehicle is a Trikke.

Lastly, they had no letters of warning as it relates to CFR Title 49 Part 1500 Series, civil penalties, or evidence of penalties incurred within the past five years.

Global Security Associates, Inc. (Global) - Global has been in business for 18 years. It is led by its three funders, CEO and President William McGuire, Executive Vice President and Head of Operations Victor Anderes, and Executive Vice President and CFO Lenny Bonventre. On January 2019, Global was acquired by Securitas Security Service USA, Inc. Global integrated into the Securitas family of companies as the US Aviation Division. Securitas Aviation is present at 268 airports in the U.S., Europe, South America and Asia, with a workforce of about 27,000 aviation security staff. Securitas Aviation Group U.S. has over 35 years of experience and serves 31 airports, with approximately 3,500 aviation security guards, consultants, and electronic security Global is working closely with technology sister company (Securitas Electronic Systems) to integrate leading edge technologies into airport security operations to better support client with their security needs. Global serves 13 airports, has a \$4 billion revenue, and 1,500 employees. They listed John F. Kennedy International Airport, Washington Dulles International Airport, Newark Liberty International Airport, Minneapolis-Saint Paul International Airport, and Honolulu International Airport as their Cat X experience, and San Diego as large hub experience. They proposed a T3 2020 Revolution Series as its electric stand-up three wheel vehicle. Global listed two letters of warning and incurred a single \$3,250 civil penalty, which was classified as a minor issue.

HSS, Inc. (HSS) - HSS is the Aviation Authority's current provider of these services. HSS has not been bought or purchased any companies in the past 5 years. They participate and support ASIS, IAHSS, AAAE, and ACI-NA. HSS has expanded its services beyond security guard services, to include security systems integration, medical equipment management, emergency management training & consulting, and workplace deescalation training. They serve six airports, have \$200 million in revenue and 4,000 employees. They listed Cat X experience as follows: Salt Lake City International Airport, Denver International Airport, Orlando International Airport, Portland International Airport, Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport, and Milwaukee General Mitchell International Airport. HSS proposed a T3 as its electric stand-up three wheel vehicle. They listed letters of warning received, as follows: Orlando International Airport (4); Denver International Airport (33); Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport (4); Portland International Airport (2); and Dulles International Airport (5).

Inter-Con Security Systems, Inc. (Inter-Con) - Inter-Con has been in business for 47 years. Its first client was NASA. In 1986, Inter-Con was selected by the U.S. Department of State to design and operate a Local Guard Force (LGF) to secure the U.S. Embassy and Consulates. They have over 35,000 employees providing services throughout North America, South America, Europe, and Africa. Inter-Con is developing new solutions that utilize drones, robots, as well as advanced vehicle and personnel telematics to augment Security Officer deployments. Inter-Con is investing in new software that eliminates scheduling errors. They did not list any airports. The Proposer has \$256 million in revenue. Under "Experience" they listed Port of Galveston, which is a contract that requires a complex level of coordination between managerial, administrative, logistical, and regulatory support efforts to successfully carry out its mission on a daily basis. Inter-Con's officers average 1,300 hours of service on a weekly basis and currently operates in accordance with the U.S. Coast Guard-approved and enforced Security Facility Plan, mandated under the Maritime Transportation Security Act. Its proposed electric stand-up three wheel vehicle is a Trikke Defender. They did not list any letter of warning; however, they did not list airport experience.

Prosegur Services Group, Inc. (PSG) - PSG has been in business for 44 years. The company was overseas until 2018. That same year they merged with CSC/Aviation Safeguards and three other security industry companies to create Prosegur Security USA. In the United States, Command Security Corporation, dba. Aviation Safeguards has been providing services to airports and airlines for over 35 years. PSG serves 5+ airports. They have a worldwide revenue of \$5 billion, 6,300 employees in the U.S., and 160,000 employees worldwide. PSG listed LaGuardia Airport, John F. Kennedy International Airport, Pittsburg International Airport, Philadelphia International Airport, Baltimore-Washington International, and Los Angeles International Airport as their airport experience. Its proposed electric stand-up three wheel vehicle is a Segway SE-3 Patroller. Lastly, they had no letters of warning as it relates to CFR

Title 49 Part 1500 Series, civil penalties, or evidence of penalties incurred within the past five years.

SecurAmerica, LLC (SecurAmerica) - SecureAmerica has been in business for 15 years. The company was founded by Frank Argenbright, Jr. They formed Argenbright Holdings in November 2017, and made strategic acquisitions of strong regional companies in custodial, security and aviation services. Its headquarters are in Atlanta. SecurAmerica employs 8,500 security professionals in over 50 primary and secondary markets across the country. Florida operations are headquartered in Orlando (adjacent to the Orlando International Airport). They conduct security screening at 17 U.S. airports nationally, including Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport, Detroit Metropolitan Wayne County Airport, San Francisco International Airport, Salt Lake City International Airport, Seattle-Tacoma International Airport, John F. Kennedy International Airport, LaGuardia Airport, Newark Liberty International Airport, Boston Logan International Airport, Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport, Daniel K. Inouye International Airport, Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky International Airport, and Minneapolis-Saint Paul International Airport. They mainly provide security guard services for Delta Airlines. SecurAmerica will continue to grow organically and seek out strategically appropriate acquisition targets to expand national service reach. The Proposer seeks to develop its aviation services platform into a global service offering, while growing its domestic contract security and facilities services. They have \$250 million in revenue. Its proposed electric stand-up three wheel vehicle is a T3 Motion Patroller. Lastly, they had no letters of warning as it relates to CFR Title 49 Part 1500 Series, civil penalties, or evidence of penalties incurred within the past five years.

Chairman Friel asked the Committee if they had any questions or if they would like to discuss any of the firms further before ranking this criterion. He reiterated that the following is the scale that the Committee will utilize for ranking each criteria, as follows: Outstanding, Very Good, Adequate, Less Than Adequate, and Unacceptable.

Vice Chair Sharman asked staff if SecurAmerica provides service to Delta Airlines at the Orlando International Airport. Ms. Hughes responded that there was no indication of services being provided at this airport. As a follow-up question, Ms. Silver asked what does "providing security guard services for Delta Airlines" mean. Ms. Hughes deferred the question to Mr. Michael Karamarkovich, Manager of Security Contract, who explained that, based on SecurAmerica's proposal, the understanding is that they contract with Delta Airlines to provide service at airports. In response to Ms. Silvers question regarding the specific type of services provided by SecurAmerica, Mr. Karamarkovich replied that, based on its proposal, SecurAmerica provide security services for Delta Airlines' headquarter. Following discussion, and in response to Ms. Silver's question regarding services included in the contract with Delta, Mr. Draper read the following from SecurAmerica's proposal: "Maintain the security of the Sterile and Aircraft Operations Area (AOA) at seventeen (17) airports nationally... Oversee Delta's identification processing office (IDP), ensuring TSA compliance with the issuance of employee identification badges... Responsible for all security matters related to Delta World Headquarters, controlling all access onto the Delta main campus and satellite locations... 6,035 man-hours per week in multiple shifts, 24 hours per day, 7 days per week..."

Mr. Engle asked, in regards to Allied's letters of warning received at two Cat X airports, was there any more information provided as to the reasons for the warnings. Mr. Karamarkovich responded that no further information was provided. Mr. Engle followed-up by expressing his concerns with the amount of letter of warnings received by HSS in various airports, and asked if these are consistent findings. Mr. Karamarkovich responded that staff reached out to Denver International Airport to request more information; however, they did not respond to this request. Mr. Karamarkovich made a point to mention that the RFP did not require Proposers to provide details about the letters of warning, it only required the Proposer to "list any letters of warnings, civil penalties, or other evidence of penalties incurred by the Proposer within the past five (5) years".

Ms. Silvers noted that per AGS' proposal, it provides service to three airports; however, none of the references where from any of those airports. She asked if this is because their contracts are not directly with the airports. Ms. Hughes responded that they listed 3 airports as part of their experience providing security services, but provided Carnival Cruise Line, DHL Supply, Kroger/Ralphs, 99 Cents Store Only, and Norwegian Cruise Line as its references.

Mr. Draper made reference to AGS' proposal and confirmed that the company was contracted by DHL Supply to provide Shipping and Receiving Guard(s) and GSC Ground Security Coordinator at Los Angeles International Airport. They also provide on-call security service at the Miami International Airport.

Chairman Friel asked if there were any further questions or comments. Hearing none, he asked the Committee to discuss ranking for this criterion. Vice Chair Sharman started the conversation by focusing primarily on the letters of warning reported by each Proposer. Following a brief discussion regarding how to evaluate this section, Vice Chair Sharman proceeded to provide her suggested ranking as Outstanding for ACTS; Very Good for Allied; Adequate for AEPS, due to its lack of airport experience; Outstanding for AGS; Less than Adequate for Global, because they had 2 letters of warning and incurred a civil penalty; Less than Adequate for HSS, due to the of letters of warnings listed; Adequate for Inter-Con, due to its lack of airport experience; Very Good for PSG; and Very Good for SecurAmerica. Vice Chair Sharman indicated that she is not firm on this ranking, but provided a starting point to open discussion among Committee members.

Mr. Engle made a point to mention that it is important to also look at the amount of airports each firm serves and the scope of service they provide. Chairman Friel concurred with Mr. Engle's point. For example, Allied provides services in 41 airports, seven which are Cat X; however, they only have two letters of warning, over a 5-year period. Both Chairman Friel and Vice Chair Sharman agreed with Mr. Engle's observation.

Ms. Silvers made the observation that the proposed ranking for ACTS and AGS is Outstanding for both; however, ACTS has more direct contracted airport experience than AGS. Mr. Draper expressed he had concerns with ACTS, since they stated in their proposal that they serve 31 airports, but due to COVID-19 they reduced their employees to 600. In response to Mr. Draper's question regarding current staffing for this contract, Mr. Karamarkovich responded that currently there are approximately 150 employees for this contract. Mr. Draper suggested ACTS' ranking be changed to Very Good, and Allied ranking to remain Outstanding, based on the previous discussion. The Committee agreed with his suggestion.

Mr. Draper continued by suggesting a ranking of Very Good for AGS, because the services provided at Miami International Airport are listed as on-call services. In regards to Global, Mr. Engle commented that the amount of years in business and airport experience should offset the two letters of warning, and at minimum should be ranked Very Good in this category. Chairman Friel agreed with this ranking. Vice Chair Sharman stated that depending on the severity of the civil penalty, she would be able to make a definite ranking. Mr. Draper made reference to Global's proposal and read that the violation was due to "Non-return of an employee airport SIDA badge". He also indicated that both letters of warning and the civil penalty took place in 2018. Mr. Draper suggested a ranking of Very Good for Global. The Committee agreed.

Chairman Friel indicated that, with regards to HSS, he ranked them as Adequate. He continued by stating that they have airport experience and experience at Orlando International Airport, but he expressed his concerns about the amount of letters of warnings listed by HSS. Ms. Silvers added that HSS provided a graph with the number of letters of warning, civil penalties, or other evidence of penalties within the past 5 years, without further details of the violations. The Committee consensed to rank HSS as Adequate.

Moving on to Inter-Con, Chairman Friel expressed his concerns regarding its lack of airport experience. He suggested a ranking of Adequate or Less than Adequate. Mr. Draper, Mr. Engle and Vice Chair Sharman concurred with ranking Inter-Con as Adequate for this criterion.

Chairman Friel suggested a ranking of Very Good for PSG, based on their worldwide experience, years in business, number of airports they serve, and number of employees. Ms. Silvers asked for verification of Allied's ranking. Chairman Friel indicated that Allied had been ranked Outstanding for this criterion. Ms. Silvers observed that based on Chairman's Friel point about PSG's strengths, they should be ranked Outstanding as well. The Committee agreed with Ms. Silvers suggestion.

In regards to SecurAmerica, all Committee members concurred to rank the Proposer Very Good for this criterion.

Chairman Friel tallied the rankings for this category, as follows:

The scale for ranking for this criterion is as follows: Outstanding (0), Very Good (VG), Adequate (A), Less Than Adequate (LA) and Unacceptable (U).

Proposer	Ranking		
ACTS	VG		
Allied	0		
AEPS	A		
AGS	VG		
Global	VG		
HSS	А		
Inter-Con	А		
PSG	0		
SecurAmerica	VG		

The Committee consensed with the ranking.

Experience and Qualifications for On-Site Manager

Chairman Friel asked Ms. Hughes to present staff findings for Experience and Qualifications for On-Site Manager.

Before providing staff findings, Ms. Hughes clarified that the RFP required the Proposers to provide a State of Florida Security Manager (MB) license; however, the COVID-19 pandemic presented some difficulties for licenses to be obtained. Therefore, through an addendum, Proposers were allowed to provide proof of their applications. Once the proposals were received, Ms. Hughes was able to verify the information on the website.

ACTS Airport Services, Inc. (ACTS) - Ms. Hughes indicated that ACTS' proposed On-Site Manager is Mr. LaMont Starch. Mr. Starch's license was issued as of 11/10/2020. He has 28 years of Law Enforcement Security experience and 10 years with the Metropolitan Airport Commission's Police Department at Minneapolis St. Paul International Airport. Since 2014, Mr. Starch has served as the Security Operations Manager for the Walt Disney Company, managing the security team. He has an Associate's Degree in Police Science from Western Wisconsin Technical College, and a Bachelor's Degree in Security Management from Bellevue University.

Allied Universal Security Services (Allied) - Allied proposed Mr. Ronald D. Pellechia as their On-Site Manager. On October 14, 2020, Ms. Hughes was able to confirmed Mr. Pellechia's MB license. He has been an Allied Universal Manager for 5 years; Client Area Manager from 2015-2017; Account Manager 2017-2018; and Client Manager 2018-Present. Mr. Pellechia has experience with city transit accounts such as New York City Police Department. He is certified by the American Association of Airport Executives (AAAE) as an Airport Certified Employee (ACE) - Airport Security, and an Airport Security Coordinator (ASC). Mr. Pellechia has taken many courses which include Criminal Investigation, Homicide Investigation, Sex Crimes and Child Abuse Investigations, Insurance Fraud, Photo Image Systems, Internet Crimes, Cellular Telephone Fraud, Detecting Pickpockets, Specialized Protective Security Training, and DSX Access Control.

American Eagle Protective Services (AEPS)- AEPS' proposed On-Site Manager is Mr. Jerrold Johnson. A copy of the license was provided, but when verified on the website, the license expired on December 23, 2019. Staff rechecked various time and as of November 10, 2020, it still showed as expired. Additionally, his application has been denied twice. From 2019-Present, Mr. Johnson has been the Director of Public Safety in the City of Raleigh North Carolina. From 2014-2016 he worked as the Director of Security Operations for Walt Disney World Resorts in Orlando, Florida. From 1999-2011 he worked as a National Police Advisor/Military Command Human Resource Manager/Unit Victim Advocate, Military Command at Fort Benning, GA. Mr. Johnson has a Bachelor's Degree in Criminal Justice from Lincoln University.

American Guard Service, Inc. (AGS) - AGS's proposed On-Site Manager is Mr. Doug Snow. Staff verified his license and as of October 14, 2020, he does have a valid MB license. From 1986-1990 he served as Sergeant for the United States Air Force. From 1990-2001 he worked as a Shift Supervisor and Operations Manager for Diamond Group Argonne Nat'l Lab. In 2003 he served as a Protection Specialist for Diplomatic Protection Services. From 2003-2016 he worked in various capacities for McRoberts Maritime Security. From

2016-Present he has worked as an Operations Director for American Guard Services, Inc. He studied International Security at the Community College of the Air Force.

Global Security Associates, Inc. (Global) - Global's proposed On-Site Manager is Mr. Kenneth W. Nelson. His license application was complete and staff verified that he has his MB license. Mr. Nelson has 31 years of experience in aviation and 22 years in management. His resume stated that he previously worked at the Orlando International Airport, but staff was unable to verify that information. He has worked at various Cat X and Cat I airports such as Denver International Airport, LaGuardia Airport, and Raleigh-Durham International Airport. He also worked at Baghdad International Airport and Basra International Airport. Mr. Nelson has a Bachelor of Business Administration in Aviation Management from Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, Daytona Beach. He is certified by the American Association of Airport Executives (AAAE) as an Airport Certified Employee (ACE) - Airport Security, and an Airport Security Coordinator (ASC) and a Certified Member (CM). Mr. Nelson is a member of the Florida AAAE Security Committee.

HSS, Inc. (HSS) - HSS proposed On-Site Manager is Mr. Kevin Brown, who is currently serving in that capacity at this airport. He has his MB license. Mr. Brown worked for the Orange County Corrections Department from 2005-2020 and for Disney as a Security Officer from 2004-2005. He is a registered AAAE Airport Certified Employee (ACE).

Inter-Con Security Systems, Inc. (Inter-Con) - Inter-Con's proposed On-Site Manger is Mr. Ryan Canchola. His licens was verified on October 14, 2020. His experience includes three years as Infantryman in U.S. Marine Corps Corporate; Security Manager for Power Design Inc. from 2018-2020; Special Agent/Criminal Investigator for the U.S. Department of State, Washington D.C. from 2015-2018; and Special Agent/Criminal Investigator/Protective Liaison Team Leader for the U.S. Department of State, New York Field Office from 2013-2015. He has a Bachelor's Degree in Business Administration in Aviation Management.

<u>Prosegur Services Group, Inc. (PSG)</u> - PSG's proposed On-Site Manager is Mr. Chris Kelemen. Staff verified that he has his MB license. Currently, Mr. Kelemen works at G4S as a District Manager. He worked for Securitas USA from 2005-2018, as he worked his way through various position starting as a Scheduler all the way to Vice President of National Accounts. Additionally, he worked with Allied Universal as an Assistant Account Manager from 2001-2004. Mr. Kelemen is 16 credits short of a Bachelor's of the Arts from Montclair State University.

SecurAmerica, LLC (SecurAmerica) - SecurAmerica's proposed On-Site Manager is Mr. Chris Ruiz. Ms. Hughes indicated that Mr. Ruiz does not have his MB license, but does have his D license. However, per Florida Statutes, if the company (SecurAmerica) has a Class B license, then the individual who performs the services of a manager for 2 years can perform the services. Ms. Hughes added that, if SecurAmerica is shortlisted, staff will have to look further into this matter. Mr. Ruiz has worked as a General Manager for GardaWorld in Orlando from 2014-Present, where he is responsible for over 13,000 hours of security staffing per week. In that role, he directs the hiring, training, performance and retention of over 400 employees. He worked as a Senior Instructor and Detail Leader for Gryphon Group Security Solutions from 2004-2014, providing Mobile Force Protection Training to active duty military and federal personnel. From 1993-2004 he was a sworn officer of the City of Detroit Police Department. Mr. Ruiz has a Bachelor's Degree in Business Management from Penn Foster College.

Chairman Friel asked the Committee if they had any questions or if they would like to discuss any of the firms further before ranking this criterion. To help initiate the discussion among Committee members, he suggested to rank ACTS as Very Good in this criterion. Mr. Engle and Vice Chair Sharman indicated that they had the same ranking for this Proposer. Mr. Draper made a point to mention that ACTS' proposed On-Site Manager had some law enforcement experience and other security experience; therefore, he would suggest a ranking of Outstanding. Chairman Friel added that Mr. Starch had a valid license and 20 years of experience. The Committee concurred to rank ACTS as Outstanding.

Chairman Friel continued to provide his ranking for Allied as Outstanding. He stated that not only did the proposed On-Site Manager has a valid license, but various AAAE certifications. The only concern is that Mr. Pellechia does not have airport experience. Mr. Draper stated that he had them listed as Outstanding. Mr. Engle indicated that he had them ranked as Very

Good; however, he highlighted that Mr. Pellechia had 20 years of experience with the New York City Transit Police Department. The Committee concurred to rank Allied as Outstanding for this criterion.

In regards to AEPS, Chairman Friel ranked them as Adequate, due to the lack of license and the application being denied twice. All other Committee members concurred that AEPS should be ranked as Unacceptable in this criterion, based on the aforementioned fact. Chairman Friel agreed. The Committee consensed to rank AEPS as Unnaceptable for this criterion.

Chairman Friel stated that he listed AGS as Adequate or Very Good, because even though Mr. Snow has a valid license, his experience is not as extensive as others. Mr. Draper and Ms. Silvers indicated that they had assigned a ranking of Very Good. The Committee consensed to rank AGS as very good for this criterion.

Chairman Friel proceeded to discuss his suggested ranking for Global, which was Outstanding or Very Good. He based his decision on the On-Site Manager's valid license, years of experience, certifications and education. The Committee concurred to rank Global as Outstanding.

Moving on to the next Proposer, Chairman Friel indicated that he had listed HSS ranking as Adequate or Very Good. He explained that he based his decision on the fact that Mr. Brown is currently providing the service at Orlando International Airport; however, he just started as an On-site Manager this year. Mr. Draper suggested a ranking of Very Good, because of Mr. Brown current and previous experience. The Committee consensed on ranking HSS as Very Good for this criterion.

Chairman Friel moved on to discuss Inter-Con's On-Site Manager and suggested a ranking of Adequate or Very Good, because of his type of experience. Mr. Draper suggested a ranking of Adequate, due to Mr. Canchola's experience being mostly in other areas rather than hands-on experience as manager in a facility. The Committee consensed to rank Inter-Con as Adequate for this criterion.

For PSG, Chairman Friel provided a ranking of Very Good or Adequate. All other Committee members suggested a ranking of Very Good. The Committee consensed a ranking of Very Good for this criterion.

With regards to SecurAmerica, Chairman Friel provided a ranking of Adequate to Less than Adequate, because of concerns with licensing. Mr. Draper and Mr. Engle agreed that the Proposer should be ranked as Less than Adequate due to licensing. Vice Chair Sharman stated that she would lean towards ranking SecurAmerica as Adequate. Discussion ensured regarding licensing requirements. Ms. Hughes explained that the RFP required the On-Site Manager to have the MB license to provide the services; however, under the Florida Statues if the company has a Class D license, then an individual who has a Class D license for 2 years or more, can performs the services of a manager. Mr. Karamarkovich clarified, for the record, that a Class D license is required by the State for a guard (unarmed) and MB license is required for a manager. If, for example, an individual worked for a licensed security company and has his Class D license for 2 years, and they want to make him a manager, that person does not need to have their MB license. If that individual calls out sick from work and another employee has the Class D license and has been working with the company for 2 years, that person can be tasked as a manager and be in compliance with the State. Ms. Silvers made the observation that the RFP specifically required that the On-Site Manager had the MB license. She also made the observation that Mr. Ruiz's resume indicated that he had his MB license. brief discussion, the Committee concurred to give SecurAmerica a rank of Less than Adequate.

Chairman Friel tallied the rankings for this category, as follows:

The scale for ranking for this criterion is as follows: Outstanding (0), Very Good (VG), Adequate (A), Less Than Adequate (LA) and Unacceptable (U).

Proposer	Ranking	
ACTS	0	
Allied	0	
AEPS	Ū	
AGS	VG	
Global	0	

HSS	VG
Inter-Con	А
PSG	VG
SecurAmerica	LA

The Committee consensed with the ranking.

Transition Plan

Chairman Friel asked Ms. Hughes to present staff finding for the Transition Plan.

Ms. Hughes indicated that for this criterion, Proposers were asked to describe their plan to start operations and bring about a smooth transition; describe how they will handle anticipated problems; and time period for hiring and training of employees.

ACTS Airport Services, Inc. (ACTS) - Ms. Hughes indicated that ACTS proposed to incorporate a Transition Team that will oversee all aspects of this contract; on-line collaborative tools to manage the transition process; and retention of Incumbent Workforce. ACTS expects to retain 80-90% of all incumbent security officers. (Ms. Hughes took a moment to explain that the RFP contained a requirement that first right of refusal would be to the current guards and supervisors that are in place today. All Proposers agreed to this statement). ACTS' transition is broken into 2 parts: Pre-Transition and Post-Transition. They listed activities for each on in charts on pages 40-42 of its proposal. The staffing charts provided show labor hours per post/position. ACTS had 4 FTE for a post requiring 168hrs (weekly) of staffing. When calculating 168 hours divided by 40 hours, it results in 4.2. Staffing charts show posts/positions to be staff by subcontractor(s) on Pg. 45. Its plan describes how they would handle transitional issues. ACTS' provided a time period for the transition of 45-60 days.

<u>Allied Universal Security Services (Allied)</u> - Allied will offer the right of first refusal of positions from the existing Contractor's qualified Project Manager, Assistant Project Manager and other security SAM personnel who wish to remain on the new contract (this would include the Trainer, Administrator, Assistant Manager and current On-site Manager). The Proposer did not list any anticipated problems/solutions. They proposed a 45 day transition period.

American Eagle Protective Services (AEPS) - AEPS' proposed staffing is composed of 80% Full Time employees and 20% Part-time employees (Pg. 16). They used the Normal Staffing Requirements table from the RFP to build its staffing. AEPS addressed anticipated problems on Pages 29 and 30 of its proposal and indicated a 30 day transition period.

American Guard Service, Inc. (AGS) - AGS's provided a summary table on Pg. 28. Its proposed transition plan indicates that once a notice is received the plan will activate. AGS will immediately contact qualified incumbents and offer "Right of-First-Refusal" within the first week. Details of transition plan are listed on Pg. 28 - Pg. 32. AGS did not provide details of labor hours by locations and did not list any anticipated problems/solutions with the transition plan. They proposed a 31 day transition period.

<u>Global Security Associates, Inc. (Global)</u> - Global provided a transition chart on Pg. 57 - Pg. 59; a breakdown of labor hours on Pg. 61; and a master schedule on Pg. 63, which shows an additional 1.5 FTE of breakers per shift at no additional cost to the Aviation Authority. Global proposed to rotate post assignments every 6 months. Its proposal indicated that Global will conduct a comprehensive risk management review. They proposed a 60 day transition period.

 $\frac{\text{HSS, Inc. (HSS)}}{\text{Pg. 51 - Pg. 56}}$ - HSS is the current provider. They included a transition chart on Pg. 51 - Pg. 56, and its proposed breakdown for labor hours on Pg. 47 - Pg. 49. As the incumbent, HSS did not list any anticipated problems with the transition.

<u>Inter-Con Security Systems, Inc. (Inter-Con)</u> - Inter-Con's provided a transition chart on Pg. 13 of the PDF proposal. The breakdown for labor hours is broken down by headcount percentages of Full-Time employees vs. Part-Time employees. They did not list any anticipated problems with the transition. Inter-Con proposed a 90 day transition period.

Prosegur Services Group, Inc. (PSG) - PSG's provided a transition chart on Pg. 54. They did not include a breakdown for labor hours. PSG did not list any anticipated problems with the transition. They proposed a 30 day transition period.

<u>SecurAmerica</u>, <u>LLC</u> (<u>SecurAmerica</u>) - SecurAmerica's proposed transition schedule is on Pg. 15 and labor hours schedule is listed on Pg. 24 - Pg. 26. They did not list any anticipated problems with the transition. They proposed a 30 day transition period.

Chairman Friel asked the Committee if they had any questions or comments. Mr. Draper asked Mr. Karamarkovich what is the adequate transition time period. Mr. Karamarkovich replied that, taking into account badging, interviews, uniform, etc., a 45 day transition period is adequate.

By question from Mr. Draper regarding the "right of first refusal", Ms. Hughes responded that the right of first refusal is for the Monitors and Supervisor positions only.

Chairman Friel began discussion by offering ranking suggestions. He indicated that for ACTS he suggests a ranking of Very Good, based on its transition plan and transition period time. He suggested the same ranking of Very Good for Allied, based on the same comments. Committee members concurred with the first two rankings suggested by the Chairman.

For AEPS, Chairman Friel listed them as Very Good and asked if they should be considered as Outstanding. Mr. Draper and Mr. Engle opined that the 30 day transition may be a bit too aggressive; therefore, they agreed that Very Good is the appropriate ranking for AEPS for this criterion.

Continuing with the ranking, Chairman Friel suggested Very Good for AGS, and the Committee concurred with his suggested ranking. For Global security, Chairman Friel also suggested a ranking of Very Good. Again, the Committee concurred with Global's ranking for this criterion.

For HSS, Chairman Friel suggested a ranking of Very Good or Outstanding. After a brief discussion regarding HSS being the incumbent and not having to transition, the Committee concurred that they should be ranked as Very Good. Mr. Draper made a point to highlight the exceptions taken by HSS with regards to General Conditions and Specifications. Ms. Hughes clarified that said criterion will be discussed separately.

Chairman Friel indicated that due to the proposed 90 day transition period, he ranked Inter-Con as Adequate. The Committee consensed.

Chairman Friel listed PSG ranked as Very Good. The Committee consensed.

Lastly, he also suggested a ranking of Very Good for SecurAmerica. The Committee consensed with the raking.

Chairman Friel tallied the rankings for this category, as follows:

The scale for ranking for this criterion is as follows: Outstanding (0), Very Good (VG), Adequate (A), Less Than Adequate (LA) and Unacceptable (U).

Proposer	Ranking		
ACTS	VG		
Allied	VG		
AEPS	VG		
AGS	VG		
Global	VG		
HSS	VG		
Inter-Con	A		
PSG	VG		
SecurAmerica	VG		

The Committee consensed with the ranking.

Proof of Insurance

Chairman Friel asked Ms. Hughes to present staff finding for Proof of Insurance.

Ms. Hughes, provided the following findings, and indicated that Mr. Remmers, with Risk Management, is present, should there be any questions:

ACTS Airport Services, Inc. (ACTS) - Complies with the insurance requirements.

Allied Universal Security Services (Allied) - Complies with the insurance requirements.

American Eagle Protective Services (AEPS) - Complies with the insurance requirements.

American Guard Service, Inc. (AGS) - Complies with the insurance requirements.

Global Security Associates, Inc. (Global) - Complies with the insurance requirements.

<u>HSS, Inc. (HSS)</u> - HSS does not comply with the insurance requirements. They deleted extensive parts of the language provided on Section 5, which is not acceptable. Additionally, they did not provide for Workers' Compensation coverage.

<u>Inter-Con Security Systems, Inc. (Inter-Con)</u> - provided proper General and Auto Liability coverage. Additionally, they did not provide for Workers' Compensation coverage.

Prosegur Services Group, Inc. (PSG) - Complies with the insurance requirements.

SecurAmerica, LLC (SecurAmerica) - Complies with the insurance requirements.

Chairman Friel and Mr. Draper asked if there was any reasoning for HSS to delete the language provided on Section 5. Ms. Hughes responded that they did not provide a reason. Mr. Draper followed up by asking if they currently have adequate insurance. Ms. Hughes responded in the affirmative.

In response to Ms. Silver's question regarding insurance requirements listed in the RFP, Ms. Hughes confirmed that the requirements are the same as on the current contract. Chairman Friel asked Ms. Stangle if deleting this language is a material issue. Ms. Stangle answered in the affirmative, since these are requirements that were set forth in the RFP. Ms. Silvers followed-up by noting that HSS proposal indicated that they wanted to decrease the General Liability from \$5 million to \$1 million.

Mr. Draper suggested a ranking of Very Good for ACTS, Allied, AEPS, AGS, Global, PSG, and SecurAmerica and a ranking of Adequate to Inter-Con. He did not provide an immediate ranking for HSS, until Mr. Remmers provided a more in depth analysis of their response.

Before moving on to Mr. Remmers' analysis regarding HSS' insurance, Ms. Silvers indicated that the Committee was provided a copy of an email communication between HSS and staff regarding an exception. Ms. Hughes explained that they took exception to Section 14, which indicated that they do not allow the Aviation Authority to make and distribute copies of the Submittal for internal purposes. HSS was made aware of State of Florida Public Records laws followed by the Aviation Authority and how their exception will hinder the CPC's ability to review and consider their proposal, unless the exception was withdrawn. On November 2, 2020, HSS provided the following statement "Thank you for the follow-up on this. I would like to assure you our exception was not intended to hinder your evaluation process or in any way remove us from consideration. Please note this email as our official withdrawal of the exception in Section 14. If there are any additional formal documents or processes we need to complete in order to continue through the evaluation process, please let me know. Thank you for reaching out to us on this item - we appreciate the ongoing partnership with GOAA." This exception was only regarding copying.

Mr. Remmers indicated that HSS did not provide any additional information in its proposal that indicated that they are willing to comply with the insurance requirements. However, there was additional language that indicated that they want to change the insurance requirements. He further stated that, as of this morning, HSS is in compliance with insurance requirements in the current contract.

In response to Ms. Silver's question regarding the Aviation Authority's requirements for Commercial General Liability and Auto Liability, Mr. Remmers responded that each is \$5 million. Ms. Silvers indicated that, looking at the language HSS deleted, they objected to a statement about our indemnification language regarding both parts having to retain its own legal counsel if they are both named as parties in a lawsuit. Additionally, HSS proposed \$1 million General Liability; \$5 million aggregate, which the Aviation Authority does not require; and they changed the Auto Liability from \$5 million to \$1 million, which is unacceptable.

Chairman Friel asked if Inter-Con provided any language or statement that indicated that they would provide Workers' Compensation coverage if awarded the contract. Mr. Remmers responded that he did not locate any language regarding Inter-Con commitment to provide said coverage.

Based on the discussion, Chairman Friel provided his suggested ranking. He suggested a ranking of Very Good for ACTS, Allied, AEPS, AGS, Global, PSG, and SecurAmerica; Less than Adequate for HSS; and Adequate for Inter-Con. The Committee was in concurrence with Chairman Friel's suggestion.

Chairman Friel tallied the rankings for this category, as follows:

The scale for ranking for this criterion is as follows: Outstanding (0), Very Good (VG), Adequate (A), Less Than Adequate (LA) and Unacceptable (U).

Proposer	Ranking		
ACTS	VG		
Allied	VG		
AEPS	VG		
AGS	VG		
Global	VG		
HSS	LA		
Inter-Con	А		
PSG	VG		
SecurAmerica	VG		

The Committee consensed with the ranking.

Proposer's Statement

Chairman Friel asked Ms. Hughes to present staff finding regarding Proposer's Statements.

Ms. Hughes provided the following findings:

ACTS Airport Services, Inc. (ACTS) - They complied with the required statement, which indicated that the proposer is willing to sign the contract, including General Conditions and Specifications. However, they indicated on Page 89 that they provide security services for airlines at the Orlando International Airport, but staff was unable to verify this information.

Allied Universal Security Services (Allied) - Allied complied with the required statement, which indicated that the proposer is willing to sign the contract, including General Conditions and Specifications.

American Eagle Protective Services (AEPS)- AEPS' complied with the required statement, which indicated that the proposer is willing to sign the contract, including General Conditions and Specifications.

<u>American Guard Service, Inc. (AGS)</u> - AGS's complied with the required statement, which indicated that the proposer is willing to sign the contract, including General Conditions and Specifications.

Global Security Associates, Inc. (Global) - Global's complied with the required statement, which indicated that the proposer is willing to sign the contract, including General Conditions and Specifications. However, they labeled every page of their proposal as "Confidential".

 $\underline{\text{HSS}}$, $\underline{\text{Inc. (HSS)}}$ - $\underline{\text{HSS}}$ did not provide the required statement, and took exceptions to the General Conditions on Page 35 of their proposal.

Inter-Con Security Systems, Inc. (Inter-Con) - Inter-Con's complied with the required statement, which indicated that the proposer is willing to sign the contract, including General Conditions and Specifications.

<u>Prosegur Services Group</u>, <u>Inc. (PSG)</u> - PSG's complied with the required statement, which indicated that the proposer is willing to sign the contract, including General Conditions and Specifications.

<u>SecurAmerica, LLC (SecurAmerica)</u>- SecurAmerica's complied with the required statement, which indicated that the proposer is willing to sign the contract, including General Conditions and Specifications.

Chairman Friel asked legal counsel how significant is that Global labeled its proposal as confidential. Ms. Stangle indicated that she would consider that irrelevant for the purpose of evaluating and ranking, as they signed a statement as part of their proposal acknowledging that the proposal is governed by Chapter 119 and it is a public record.

Chairman Friel suggested to rank all Proposers as Very Good, with the exception of HSS, which he ranked as Less than Adequate.

Chairman Friel tallied the rankings for this category, as follows:

The scale for ranking for this criterion is as follows: Outstanding (0), Very Good (VG), Adequate (A), Less Than Adequate (LA) and Unacceptable (U).

Proposer	Ranking	
ACTS	VG	
Allied	VG	
AEPS	VG	
AGS	VG	
Global	VG	
HSS	LA	
Inter-Con	VG	
PSG	VG	
SecurAmerica	VG	

The Committee consensed with the ranking.

Pricing

Chairman Friel asked Vice Chair Sharman to present her findings for the Pricing portion of the proposals. Vice Chair Sharman indicated that staff provided a detailed pricing spreadsheet and based on the information she split the Proposers in two groups.

Before continuing with discussion, Mr. Draper interjected and asked if this is a staff reimbursable or management fee. Ms. Hughes clarified that this is not a management fee.

Continuing with discussion, Vice Chair Sharman stated that Allied was the only Proposer whose pricing was close to the budgeted amount for this contract. Based on this, she suggested a ranking of Outstanding for Allied in this criterion. Chairman Friel agreed with Vice Chair Sharman's suggestion.

She moved on to suggest a ranking, based on pricing, of Very Good for Inter-Con, SecurAmerica, and PSG. However, Vice Chair Sharman made a point to highlight that, from a financial perspective, the ranking order of the Proposers may change based on the unit prices provided by some firms for additional staffing, especially if they have to provide service to the South Terminal.

After a brief discussion, Vice Chair Sharman indicated that based on pricing only, Allied would be ranked first; however, going back to discussing unit prices, the second, third and fourth raked are in question, depending on additional staff needed.

Ms. Silvers indicated that Inter-Con had the lowest hourly rate for the Monitors. She also noted that some of the Proposers factored in an increase on year 2 and asked staff if there was any direction of an increase in the RFP. Ms. Hughes confirmed that it is allowed for Proposers to factor in an increase.

Mr. Draper asked if the unit pricing provided by HSS reflects its current rates. Mr. Karamarkovich responded that HSS rates are not the same, because the minimum required rate increased to what is expected. As a follow up question, Mr. Draper asked what is the current rate. Mr. Karamarkovich indicated that we are currently billed \$18.86 per hour for Monitors, \$24.92 per hour for Supervisors, \$27.63 per hour for Assistant Manager/Trainer, \$38.94 per hour for On-site Manager, and \$23.57 per hour for additional staff.

Chairman Friel asked Vice Chair Sharman to provide her suggested ranking for this criterion. Vice Chair Sharman indicated that based on the pricing and rates provided, she suggest a ranking of Adequate for ACTS; Outstanding for Allied; Adequate for AEPS; Adequate for AGS; Adequate for Global; Adequate for HSS; Very Good for inter-Con, Very Good for PSG; and Very Good for SecurAmerica. Mr. Draper asked Vice Chair Sharman to repeat her suggested ranking. The Committee concurred with Vice Chair Sharman's suggested ranking.

Vice Chair Sharman asked if all categories are weighted equally. Legal counsel indicated that it is the Committee's decision to determine which criteria should weigh more than others.

Chairman Friel tallied the rankings for this category, as follows:

The scale for ranking for this criterion is as follows: Outstanding (0), Very Good (VG), Adequate (A), Less Than Adequate (LA) and Unacceptable (U).

Proposer	Ranking	
ACTS	A	
Allied	0	
AEPS	A	
AGS	A	
Global	А	
HSS	A	
Inter-Con	VG	
PSG	VG	
SecurAmerica	VG	

The Committee consensed with the ranking.

Vice Chair Sharman tallied the total ranking for all criteria, which include Executive Summary, Experience and Qualifications of the On-Site Manager, Transition Plan, Proof of Insurance, Proposer's Statement, and Pricing), as follows:

Proposer	Outstanding	Very Good	Adequate	Less than Adequate	Unacceptable
ACTS	1	4	1	-	-
Allied	3	3	-	_	-
AEPS	-	3	2	-	1
AGS	-	5	1	-	-
Global	1	4	1	-	-
HSS	-	2	2	2	-
Inter-Con	-	2	4	-	-
PSG	1	5	-	-	-
SecurAmerica	_	5	_	1	_

Chairman Friel indicated that, based on the totaled rankings, he suggests Allied to be ranked as First, followed by PSG as Second. Brief discussion ensued regarding Global's and ACTS' rankings. The Committee consensed that based on pricing and the proposed On-Site Manager, Global was ranked Third, followed by ACTS as Fourth. Mr. Draper continued to rank AGS as Fifth, followed by Inter-Con as Sixth, SecurAmerica as Seventh, AEPS as Eighth, and HSS as Ninth.

Motion to rank the firms was moved by Mr. Draper, as follows:

First: Universal Protection Services d/b/a Allied Universal Security Services, Inc.

Second: Prosegur Services Group, Inc.
Third: Global Security Associates, Inc.
Fourth: ACTS Airport Services, Inc.
Fifth: American Guard Service, Inc.
Sixth: Inter-Con Security Systems, Inc.

Seventh: SecurAmerica, LLC

Eighth: American Eagle Protective Services

Ninth: HSS, Inc.

Before asking for a second, Chairman Friel read staff's recommendation for the record: It is respectfully requested that the Concessions/Procurement Committee (1) approve to (a) shortlist and rank the Proposers, or (b) shortlist the Proposers, followed by interviews and ranking at a later meeting; (2) if the Committee moves to rank the Proposers, request the Aviation Authority Board approval of the ranking along with authorization to negotiate with the first-ranked firm in accordance with the Aviation Authority's policy, and if those negotiations are unsuccessful, negotiate with the other firms in their ranked order; and, (3) upon reaching an agreement with the successful Proposer, present the final negotiated terms to the Aviation Authority Board for consideration.

Chairman Friel asked the Committee if, based on staff's recommendations, they would like to shortlist and rank the Proposers, or interview and then rank the Proposers. Mr. Draper stated that he suggests to move on with ranking now, as the proposals provided enough information for the Committee to make the decision.

Mr. Draper amended his motion to include that the proposed ranking is presented to the Aviation Authority Board for consideration and approval at the next Board meeting. Mr. Engle seconded the amended motion. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

ADJOURNMENT

2. Chairman Friel asked if there was further business to discuss before the Committee. Having no further business to discuss, he adjourned the meeting at 11:26 a.m.

(Digitally signed on December 15, 2020)

Brad Friel Chairman

Larissa Bou Recording Secretary