

**MINUTES OF  
SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA FLOOD PROTECTION AUTHORITY-EAST  
OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING  
HELD ON AUGUST 18, 2022**

**PRESENT:** Clay A. Cosse, Chair  
Thomas G. Fierke, Committee Member  
Herbert I. Miller, Committee Member

---

The Operations Committee of the Southeast Louisiana Flood Protection Authority-East (Authority or FPA) met on August 18, 2022, in the New Orleans Lakefront Airport Terminal Building, Second Floor Conference Room, 6001 Stars and Stripes Boulevard, New Orleans, LA. Mr. Cosse called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

**Opening Comments:** None.

**Adoption of Agenda:** The Committee approved the agenda as presented.

**Approval of Minutes:** The Committee approved the minutes of the Operations Committee meeting held on June 16, 2022. Mr. Fierke abstained from the vote on the approval of the minutes.

**Public Comments:** None.

**New Business:**

**A. Discussion of the proposed award of a contract to Cycle Construction Co., LLC, in the amount of \$774,747.00 for the Base Bid and Bid Alternate No. 1 for the Lakeshore Drive Drainage Improvements Project and recommendation.**

Chris Humphreys, Director of Engineering, advised that six bids were received for the Lakeshore Drive Drainage Improvements Project, which is located near Shelter 1. The lowest bid was submitted by Cycle Construction Co., LLC (Cycle) in the amount of \$774,747. The bid was responsive and below the Engineer's estimate of \$890,000. He recommended that the Board approve the award of the contract to Cycle.

Mr. Cosse inquired about two issues (at the levee crown and at the base) at the location of the drainage project. Mr. Humphreys advised that the Drainage Project would resolve the issue at the levee base. Area drains are not functioning properly and the project will add drainage to prevent ponding water. The sinkhole, which was backfilled in June 2021, is located about 100 feet from the edge of the drainage project. The backfilled sinkhole is being monitored and monthly surveys were done until June 2022 when the survey stakes were inadvertently remove. Staff is visually observing the area at this time. Mr. Cosse expressed concern that the drainage project would only fix part of the problem at this location. Mr. Humphreys explained that the sinkhole was not

completely vertical and appeared to be moving towards the west. The drainage project is to the east. There is sufficient distance between the sinkhole and the drainage issue to indicate that there is no relationship. In a survey of all the area drains, none were found to be clogged with enough material to indicate that it was from the sinkhole. The drainage to be added by the project will be fairly shallow. The geometry does not indicate a connection between the drainage issue and the sinkhole.

Mr. Humphreys advised that the second lowest bid was submitted by Kort's Construction in the amount of \$1,004,052. Mr. Fierke asked was there any concern about the discrepancy between the two lowest bids. Mr. Humphreys replied, no; the bid by Cycle is a good bid and Cycle had constructed a number of projects for the FPA.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend that the Board approve the award of the Lakeshore Drive Drainage Improvements Contract to Cycle.

**B. Discussion of the proposed issuance a Task Order to HNTB with a not-to-exceed amount of \$131,681.75 for Resident Inspection Services for the Lakeshore Drive Drainage Improvements Project and recommendation.**

Mr. Humphreys advised that HNTB submitted a proposal to provide Resident Inspection Services for the Lakeshore Drive Drainage Improvement Project. Fifty hours of resident inspection will be provided per week for the duration of the construction. The construction period is 104 days. MMSM, the project engineer, was tasked to provide construction administration for the project. MMSM is a subcontractor for Tetra-Tech, which has an ID-IQ Contract with the FPA.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend that the Board approve the proposed task order for Resident Inspection Services with HNTB.

**C. Discussion of the proposed selection of firms for the purpose of entering into Indefinite Delivery-Indefinite Quantity (ID-IQ) Contracts with said firms to provide Civil Engineering Services on an as needed basis and recommendation.**

Mr. Miller advised that he was a member of the selection team and that ten firms were selected due to the expansion of the Civil Engineering category to include several disciplines that were previously independent categories. Mr. Humphreys explained that the Environmental, Drainage, Water Maintenance and Resident Inspection categories, which are basically Civil Engineering functions, would no longer be used; therefore, he requested that the list for Civil Engineering Services be expanded to ten firms.

Mr. Humphreys reviewed the selection process. Selection teams typically consist of five members: one Commissioner selected by the President and four staff members. Each team member reviewed the 23 Statements of Qualifications (SOQ) submitted for Civil Engineering Services. The Request for Qualifications (RFQ) listed the evaluation criteria. The 23 firms met the minimum qualifications, which included prerequisites

relative to licenses and principals' experience, and were evaluated for professional qualifications, specialized experience, capacity, location and past experience. The same evaluation criteria was used for all three categories (Civil Engineering, Geotechnical and Surveying). After each team member scored each firm, a ranking was given to each firm with one point being the highest and 23 the lowest. The rankings were compiled (the firm with the lowest number at the top) for the list to be submitted for Board approval.

Mr. Fierke advised that he had asked which firms had past experience and which were new to the list, and for a copy of the score sheets. He explained that he had past involvement in selection processes as a member of the Lakefront Management Authority Board and that some grades were found to be defective. The FPA's response was that he could not be given the requested information until he was sworn in, which would not happen until the Board meeting. He asked that a copy of the grading materials be provided to him at the Board meeting prior to its proceeding with the items.

Mr. Humphreys explained that the selection team consisted of four professional engineers and one experienced construction manager and that the grading process was followed; therefore, he was confident that everything would be found in order. Mr. Fierke explained that he wanted to see the grading sheets because over his 40 years' experience he had seen a couple of incidents. For example, one grader gave a firm a zero because he could not find the small business plan, warping the entire grading system, and none of the other graders questioned the discrepancy in the scores, which led to litigation. Mr. Humphreys stated that he had a hard copy of the summary.

Mr. Miller advised that Mr. Fierke would see that different people on the selection teams rated different criteria in different ways. For example, in his particular case, when ranking firms for past experience, due to his years of experience, unless there was a specific reason (such as a suit filed), he gave firms full credit. However, staff has experience with the firms that worked on their projects; therefore, some firms may have been rated a little higher than other firms. Team members looked at the professional qualifications of the firms and individuals a little differently. Therefore, there would be variances between grades. He was confident that the team did a good job in the overall rankings and that most of the selected firms were the top ten firms on everyone's list. He added that he did not see a problem with providing the requested information to Mr. Fierke between the Committee meetings.

Mr. Fierke asked did any firms previously contracted by the FPA not make the cut. He added that the elimination of some previous categories may have caused some firms not to respond. Mr. Humphreys explained that the number of selected firms for Civil Engineering Services increased from eight in prior years to ten this year because all of the firms are able to provide all of the services. There are firms that previously had ID-IQ Contracts in the eliminated categories that are not on the list of the top ten firms for Civil Engineering Services. Mr. Miller commented that a firm may have a subcontract with a firm that previously had an ID-IQ contract with the FPA. He clarified that the firms that are listed are the primes and that almost all of the firms have subcontracts. Mr.

Humphreys advised that two firms that had ID-IQ Contracts in the past did not make the cut because they did not have one of the top ten scores.

Mr. Fierke expressed concern about the potential need to draw upon his past experience. Mr. Humphreys advised that all of the firms were very talented and that there is a good pool of Civil Engineering Consultants in the area. Mr. Fierke asked would the FPA lose institutional knowledge or have a records retention issue. Mr. Humphreys replied that the FPA would be fine with the selected firms and its internal resources. Mr. Fierke asked were there firms on the list that had never done work for the FPA. Mr. Humphreys responded, possibly; he did not recall. He added that all of the top ten firms had performed the type of work required by the FPA for other entities.

A motion to recommend that the Board approve the selection of firms to provide Civil Engineering Services was adopted with Mr. Cosse and Mr. Miller voting yea and Mr. Fierke voting nay.

**D. Discussion of the selection of firms for the purpose of entering into ID-IQ Contracts with said firms to provide Surveying Services on an as needed basis and recommendation.**

Mr. Humphreys explained that the same process was used for the selection of firms to provide Surveying Services. The review team consisted of President Randy Noel and four staff members. Twelve SOQs were submitted. The team recommended four firms to provide Surveying Services.

A motion to recommend that the Board approve the selection of firms to provide Surveying Services was adopted with Mr. Cosse and Mr. Miller voting yea and Mr. Fierke voting nay.

**E. Discussion of the selection of firms for the purpose of entering into ID-IQ Contracts with said firms to provide Geotechnical Engineering Services on an as needed basis and recommendation.**

Mr. Humphreys advised that five SOQs were received for providing Geotechnical Services and that the same process was used for the selection. The selection team included Commissioner Jason Latiolais. Three firms were recommended to provide Geotechnical Services.

A motion to recommend that the Board approve the selection of firms to provide Geotechnical Services was adopted with Mr. Cosse and Mr. Miller voting yea and Mr. Fierke voting nay.

There was no further business; therefore, the meeting was adjourned at 10:25 a.m.