PORT OF SEATTLE MEMORANDUM

COMMISSION AGENDA ACTION ITEM

Item No.6eDate of MeetingJuly 9, 2013

DATE: July 1, 2013

TO: Tay Yoshitani, Chief Executive Officer

FROM: James R. Schone, Director, Aviation Business Development

George England, Program Leader, Aviation Project Management

SUBJECT: Doug Fox Parking Lot Services Upgrades Project (CIP #C800451)

Amount of This Request: \$3,322,000 **Source of Funds:** Airport Development Fund

Est. State and Local Taxes: \$283,000 Est. Jobs Created: 32

Est. Total Project Cost: \$5,118,000

ACTION REQUESTED:

Request Commission authorization for the Chief Executive Officer to: (1) advertise, award, and execute a major public works contract for the construction of the Doug Fox Parking Lot Service Upgrades Project in the amount of \$3,322,000 for construction, construction management, project management, and other soft costs; and (2) execute a Developer Extension Agreement with the Valley View Sewer District to connect to a sewer pipeline within the S. 170th Street right-of-way. This amount is in addition to \$1,796,000 previously authorized for a total project cost of \$5,118,000.

SYNOPSIS:

The Doug Fox Parking Lot is located ¼ mile from the Airport and has served as an off-site parking lot for the Airport for over 20 years. The lot competes with several private off-site lots, but needs substantial upgrades to better attract customers and increase its revenue-generating capability. This request is for infrastructure upgrades, demolition of the existing building, and construction of a new building at the lot. There is a separate related request for execution of a lease and concession agreement with ATZ Inc. (ATZ) to operate the lot. The agreement with ATZ calls for the Port to construct storm drainage, lot resurfacing, lighting, building, and signage upgrades to improve the customer experience and revenue-generating capability of the lot. Construction of the upgrades in this request will meet the provisions of the agreement with ATZ. The total project budget is estimated to be \$5,118,000, and new annual revenue resulting from the upgrades is estimated to be in the range of \$1-\$2 million annually.

The project also includes construction of a sanitary sewer pipeline that will connect with an existing Valley View Sewer District pipeline in the S. 170th Street right-of-way. The project site

Tay Yoshitani, Chief Executive Officer July 1, 2013 Page 2 of 7

is currently served by a sewer holding tank that must be pumped periodically. In order to connect the site to the sewer district, approximately 190 linear feet of new pipeline will be constructed within the right-of-way. The construction value of these improvements is approximately \$20,000. As a condition of connection, the sewer district requires the Port to enter into a Developer Extension Agreement and dedicate the portion of the new pipeline within the right-of-way to the district upon completion of the project. The district will then have ownership and maintenance responsibility for the dedicated pipeline. Staff will return to Commission at a later date with a resolution to surplus and transfer ownership of the new pipeline to the Valley View Sewer District.

This project was included in the 2013 - 2017 capital budget and plan of finance.

BACKGROUND:

On February 14, 2012, the Commission approved \$1,028,000 under CIP #C800451 for the design and construction of a new storm drainage system at the Doug Fox Parking Lot and to complete the drainage improvements by September 30, 2012. The Commission was also informed that additional improvements to the lot were being evaluated, including lot resurfacing, lighting, a new building, and signage. The result of that evaluation was that staff proposed to move forward with the additional improvements, and that these additional improvements be combined with the original storm drainage work to obtain significant design and construction efficiencies.

Subsequently, on May 22, 2012, Commission authorized the consolidation of the additional improvements with the original storm drainage improvement, and authorized \$768,000 for the design of the additional improvements. All project work was consolidated into CIP #C800451 with a total budget of \$6,123,000. That action constituted a Project Change per Resolution No. 3605, as amended by Resolution No. 3628, section 4.2.3.3, and thus required Commission authorization. Based on cost estimating work performed during the design phase, the project budget is now being reduced by \$1,005,000 from \$6,123,000 to \$5,118,000.

The environmental review effort for this project was completed with the issuance of a final Determination of Non-Significance on May 8, 2013.

Additional background information related to the operation of the Doug Fox Parking Lot and the agreement with ATZ is provided in the separate Commission agenda memo regarding the lease agreement.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION:

With the proposed new lease with ATZ and construction of the upgrades proposed in this request, the Airport has the opportunity to increase parking revenues generated from an improved facility. The facility represents an important element of the Port's Airport parking business with annual Port revenues regularly surpassing \$2 million.

Tay Yoshitani, Chief Executive Officer July 1, 2013 Page 3 of 7

Project Statement:

Design and construct improvements, including new storm drainage, lot resurfacing, lighting, signage, new sanitary sewer pipeline, and a new building at the facility by late 2014.

Project Objectives:

The Port's objective is to increase revenues generated from the facility. An enhanced customer experience will result from new storm drainage, pavement, lighting, signage and a new building, allowing the facility to offer a more competitive parking product in the Airport parking market.

PROJECT SCOPE OF WORK AND SCHEDULE:

Scope of Work:

- New stormwater drainage system
- Lot resurfacing
- Lighting system upgrade
- New and improved signage
- Construction of a new sanitary sewer pipeline
- Demolition of existing building
- New building (including supporting infrastructure), cashier booths, and canopy over entrance/exit lanes

Schedule:

Design and Contractor Acquisition Phase: May 2012 – September 2013

Construction Phase: October 2013 - September 2014

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Budget/Authorization Summary:

	Capital	Expense (RMM)	Total
Original Budget	\$1,665,000	\$0	\$1,665,000
Previous scope and budget changes	\$4,408,000	\$50,000	\$4,458,000
Current budget	\$6,073,000	\$50,000	\$6,123,000
Current budget reduction	(\$1,005,000)	\$0	(\$1,005,000)
Revised budget	\$5,068,000	\$50,000	\$5,118,000
Previous Authorization	\$1,796,000	\$0	\$1,796,000
Current request for authorization	\$3,272,000	\$50,000	\$3,322,000
Total Authorizations, including this request	\$5,068,000	\$50,000	\$5,118,000
Remaining budget to be authorized	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$5,068,000	\$50,000	\$5,118,000

Tay Yoshitani, Chief Executive Officer July 1, 2013 Page 4 of 7

Project Cost Breakdown:

	This Request	Total Project
Construction	\$2,696,000	\$3,309,000
Sales Tax On Construction	\$225,000	\$283,000
Design and Other Soft Costs	\$87,000	\$955,000
Construction Mgt. and Related Costs	\$314,000	\$571,000
Total	\$3,322,000	\$5,118,000

Budget Status and Source of Funds:

This project, CIP #C800451, was included in the 2013 – 2017 capital budget and plan of finance with a budget of \$6,073,000. The budget decrease will be transferred to the non-aeronautical allowance CIP (#C800405), a business plan prospective project, resulting in no net change to the Aviation capital budget. The funding source for this project will be the Airport Development Fund.

Financial Analysis and Summary:

As part of the February 14, 2012, request for design and construction funding for the stormwater drainage repair work, the associated financial analysis assumed that by upgrading the drainage system, the current revenues generated at the facility would be maintained. However, no new, incremental revenues were anticipated as part of that analysis.

The financial analysis associated with the additional design funds requested on May 22, 2012, assumed new, incremental revenues associated with the construction of the additional project elements based on staff's expectation that with new, enhanced pavement, lighting, signage and a new building, revenues would be enhanced.

The financial analysis and justification associated with this request again includes only the new, incremental revenue generated from the facility with implementation of all the project elements, including the cost of the previously approved drainage work. This was done to create a conservative financial analysis showing all costs associated with the project, both previously approved by Commission and those related to this request, as well as new revenues anticipated from an enhanced surface parking facility. In addition, since the May 22, 2012, communication to Commission, staff has been able to better refine the parking activity assumptions throughout the lease term and extensions associated with the facility improvements. The updated assumptions included significant input and review from ATZ as well as review by Leigh Fisher Associates, a parking consulting firm currently under contract with the Port of Seattle.

CIP Category	Revenue/Capacity Growth
Project Type	Business Expansion/New Business Development
Risk adjusted Discount	8%
rate	
Key risk factors	Construction risks: the project may encounter
	unexpected delays due to unforeseen issues, such as

Tay Yoshitani, Chief Executive Officer July 1, 2013
Page 5 of 7

contaminated soils, which may increase the cost of the project and/or cause schedule delays. • Financial risks: general economic conditions will impact the parking market and if general economic declines occur in the future, incremental revenues may fall short of forecasts. • A timeframe of 15 years was included in the financial analysis, covering the initial five-year lease and two five-year extensions. There is risk associated with a potential future conversion of the property to non-parking use, and lease terms associated with future extensions. Project cost for analysis Business Unit (BU) Effect on business performance Contaminated soils, which may increase the cost of the project and/or cause schedule delays. • Financial risks: general economic conditions will impact the project and/or cause schedule delays. • Financial risks: general economic conditions will impact the project and/or cause schedule delays. • Financial risks: general economic conditions will impact the project and/or cause schedule delays. • Financial risks: general economic conditions will impact the project and/or cause schedule delays. • Financial risks: general economic conditions will impact the project and/or cause schedule delays. • Financial risks: general economic conditions will impact the project and/or cause schedule delays. • Financial risks: general economic conditions will impact the project and if general economic declines of the project and if general economic declines will and if general economic declines of forcests. • A timeframe of 15 years was included in the financial analysis, covering the initial five-year lease and two five-year extensions. • A timeframe of 15 years was included in the financial analysis, covering the initial five-year lease and two five-year extensions. • A timeframe of 15 years was included in the financial analysis, covering the initial five-year lease and two
 Financial risks: general economic conditions will impact the parking market and if general economic declines occur in the future, incremental revenues may fall short of forecasts. A timeframe of 15 years was included in the financial analysis, covering the initial five-year lease and two five-year extensions. There is risk associated with a potential future conversion of the property to non-parking use, and lease terms associated with future extensions. Project cost for analysis \$5.1 million Business Unit (BU) Landside The financial analysis assumes that with construction of the
impact the parking market and if general economic declines occur in the future, incremental revenues may fall short of forecasts. • A timeframe of 15 years was included in the financial analysis, covering the initial five-year lease and two five-year extensions. There is risk associated with a potential future conversion of the property to non-parking use, and lease terms associated with future extensions. Project cost for analysis \$5.1 million Business Unit (BU) Landside Effect on business The financial analysis assumes that with construction of the
declines occur in the future, incremental revenues may fall short of forecasts. • A timeframe of 15 years was included in the financial analysis, covering the initial five-year lease and two five-year extensions. There is risk associated with a potential future conversion of the property to non-parking use, and lease terms associated with future extensions. Project cost for analysis \$5.1 million Business Unit (BU) Landside Effect on business The financial analysis assumes that with construction of the
may fall short of forecasts. • A timeframe of 15 years was included in the financial analysis, covering the initial five-year lease and two five-year extensions. There is risk associated with a potential future conversion of the property to non-parking use, and lease terms associated with future extensions. Project cost for analysis St.1 million Business Unit (BU) Landside Effect on business The financial analysis assumes that with construction of the
• A timeframe of 15 years was included in the financial analysis, covering the initial five-year lease and two five-year extensions. There is risk associated with a potential future conversion of the property to non-parking use, and lease terms associated with future extensions. Project cost for analysis St.1 million Landside Effect on business The financial analysis assumes that with construction of the
analysis, covering the initial five-year lease and two five-year extensions. There is risk associated with a potential future conversion of the property to non-parking use, and lease terms associated with future extensions. Project cost for analysis \$5.1 million Business Unit (BU) Landside Effect on business The financial analysis assumes that with construction of the
analysis, covering the initial five-year lease and two five-year extensions. There is risk associated with a potential future conversion of the property to non-parking use, and lease terms associated with future extensions. Project cost for analysis \$5.1 million Business Unit (BU) Landside Effect on business The financial analysis assumes that with construction of the
five-year extensions. There is risk associated with a potential future conversion of the property to non-parking use, and lease terms associated with future extensions. Project cost for analysis St.1 million Business Unit (BU) Landside Effect on business The financial analysis assumes that with construction of the
parking use, and lease terms associated with future extensions. Project cost for analysis \$5.1 million Business Unit (BU) Landside Effect on business The financial analysis assumes that with construction of the
extensions. Project cost for analysis \$5.1 million Business Unit (BU) Landside Effect on business The financial analysis assumes that with construction of the
Project cost for analysis\$5.1 millionBusiness Unit (BU)LandsideEffect on businessThe financial analysis assumes that with construction of the
Business Unit (BU) Landside Effect on business The financial analysis assumes that with construction of the
Effect on business The financial analysis assumes that with construction of the
3
performance project improvements at the facility, annual revenues to the
Port will increase. Current revenues to the Port are
approximately \$2 million to \$2.5 million per year. Within
five years of implementation of the improvements, annual
revenues are anticipated to increase by close to \$1 million,
totaling \$3.5 million. Within ten years, revenues are
anticipated to increase by approximately \$2 million, bringing
the annual total to around \$4.5 million.
IRR/NPV NPV: \$4.8 million
IRR: 13%
Payback: 7 years
CPE Impact None

Lifecycle Costs and Savings:

Responsibilities for future operations and maintenance costs of the lot facilities are set forth in the lease agreement between the Port and the lot operator.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES:

This project aligns with the Port's Century Agenda strategy of advancing the region as a leading tourism destination and business gateway. Upgrading the Doug Fox Parking Lot for Airport travelers helps meet the objective of meeting the region's air transportation needs at Sea-Tac Airport for the next 25 years and encourage the cost-effective expansion of domestic and international passenger and cargo service. In addition, a result of this project will be the ability of the Airport to increase a current non-aeronautical revenue stream.

Tay Yoshitani, Chief Executive Officer July 1, 2013 Page 6 of 7

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY:

This project will provide the opportunity to apply environmental sustainability principles associated with the new improvements, including:

- Energy efficient light fixtures;
- Upgrading the drainage system to better manage stormwater;
- Utilizing, if practicable, recycled asphalt to pave the area; and
- Coordinating with the future tenant to improve or replace the existing building using "green" design standards.

BUSINESS PLAN OBJECTIVES:

Approval of the proposed upgrades and the related lease authorization request will contribute to achievement of the Airport's business plan objective of "maximizing non-aeronautical net operating income" by generating increased non-aeronautical revenues.

TRIPLE BOTTOM LINE SUMMARY:

The project supports economic development by investing in an upgraded parking lot to serve the public's parking needs at the Airport. Environmental sustainability principles will be employed consistent with Port policy. In addition, procedures set forth in the Port's Small Contractors and Suppliers Program and other small business participation opportunities in support of the Century Agenda goals will be used when applicable in the project contracting process in coordination with the Office of Social Responsibility.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS:

- Alternative 1 Do not authorize execution of the new lease with ATZ and do not approve this construction funding request. The current lease, with holdovers, will expire September 30, 2013. Port staff would negotiate an amendment to the current lease with ATZ in order to have sufficient time to prepare a revised RFP for a new lease for operation of the facility. Without proposed repairs to the facility, continued wear and tear would eventually lead to the shutdown of the facility. The new negotiated lease would likely include significantly lower revenue to the Port due to the poor condition of the facility. This is not the recommended alternative.
- Alternative 2 Authorize execution of the new lease but only invest in critical infrastructure needs with a lower project cost, such as pavement and lighting, and do not invest in signage and a new building. This alternative would allow for improvement to critical facility systems, thus marginally enhancing the level of customer service. However, this alternative is not recommended as the facility will continue to be less competitive due to its poor visibility to customers, and lower level of customer service compared to other facilities in the Airport parking market. In addition, this alternative would only defer the required investment in the building as the current building has an estimated life of two-to-five years. Also, the new lease with ATZ would need to be

Tay Yoshitani, Chief Executive Officer July 1, 2013 Page 7 of 7

renegotiated to reflect the reduced investment in facility upgrades. This is not the recommended alternative.

• Alternative 3 – Authorize execution of a new lease with ATZ and invest in proposed improvements to the facility. This alternative will lead to a better customer experience and enhanced revenues due to an upgraded parking facility that is more competitive in the Airport parking market. **This is the recommended alternative.**

OTHER DOCUMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS REQUEST:

• Exhibit 1 – Doug Fox Lot Service Upgrades

PREVIOUS COMMISSION ACTIONS OR BRIEFINGS:

- May 22, 2012 Commission approved 1) increasing the project scope by adding lot resurfacing, lighting, building, and road signage work elements; and 2) proceeding with project design.
- February 14, 2012 Commission approved funding for design and construction in the amount of \$1,028,000 to install a new stormwater drainage system by September 30, 2012.
- March 5, 2013 Commission postponed consideration of the Doug Fox Lot Service Upgrades Project.
- June 4, 2013 Proposed Doug Fox Lease and Service Upgrades Project was presented to Commission but no final action was taken.