

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS  
FOR THE MANAGEMENT AND OPERATION OF  
ON-DEMAND TAXICAB AND FOR-HIRE  
VEHICLE SERVICES  
AT  
SEATTLE-TACOMA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT  
RFP # 2016-ABD-1**

**ADDENDUM #4**

Port of Seattle  
Seattle-Tacoma International Airport  
Airport Operations  
17801 Pacific Highway South  
Seattle, WA 98158

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS  
FOR THE MANAGEMENT AND OPERATION  
OF  
ON-DEMAND TAXICAB AND FOR-HIRE VEHICLE SERVICES  
AT  
SEATTLE-TACOMA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT**

**ADDENDUM #4**

February 18, 2016

To All Prospective Proposers:

Answers to submitted questions:

1. Is there data available regarding the number of trips in which a taxi, after taking a fare from the airport to Seattle, then took customers from Seattle back to the airport?

*Please refer to Question 15 in Addendum 3 regarding deadhead data.*

2. Are the Wheelchair Accessible Vehicles required to be licensed as “wheelchair accessible”?

*Vehicles do not necessarily need to be licensed as wheelchair accessible but must meet the requirements set forth in the vehicle safety regulations published pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, and conform to:*

*<http://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/FAS/RegulatoryServices/CPU%20Rules/CPU-06-2015.pdf>*

3. If a Proposer hand-delivers a proposal to the location indicated in the RFP, what is the name of the individual to whom the proposal should be delivered?

*Hand-delivered proposals may be addressed to Deborah Harrison, Aviation Business Development.*

4. Would the Port extend the Deadline of the RFP to April 1, 2016. If no, what considerations from the Port would lead to an extension brought forth by the Port, i.e. Protest submissions or substantial alterations to the RFP based on questions posed by Proposers?

*The Port declines to extend the submission deadline of March 1.*

5. In section 4.1.3 of the draft concession agreement entitled "Relief for Exceptional Circumstances" (p7, RFP p 27), the draft specifies a 20% reduction of enplaned passengers as the trigger for a reduction of the MAG. However the MAG is estimated

based on the AVI count of taxi/FHV passengers and a percentage of taxi/FHV revenue. Isn't a reduction in this AVI count or fare revenue a more appropriate metric than a decrease in enplaned passengers? For example the TNCs could reduce taxi/FHV trips by 50% but the number of enplaned passengers could keep going up.

*The language is standard language employed by the Port in a variety of concession agreement to address catastrophic declines in Airport activity. It is not intended to address risks specific to any particular concessionaire's operations or business.*

6. Exhibit 3 – Draft Operating Agreement

6.G – Equipment of Concessionaire and Inspection – Digital Security

Digital Security Cameras must be installed and monitored in all Vehicles per City of Seattle rules (See City Rule R-6.310.320.S)

The Proposer understands that this rule has been repealed from the City of Seattle Code in 2014 and would expect that it no longer applies in the context of this RFP. Does the Port agree?

*The Port agrees. This provision will be deleted from the draft Operating Instructions.*

7. The Port highlights the operational geography in Exhibit C, and licensing requirements (Exhibit 3, Section 7A) to meet City of Seattle and King County requirements. Due to the service Geography representing the majority of NW Washington State, the legal ability for For-Hire and Taxi cabs to pick up a return trip on long distance fare-trips being invalid, does the Port recognize the need to remove these from the Deadhead calculations.

Further, can the Port furnish the proposers with the percentage of trips that end in areas where the For-Hire and Taxi's have no legal ability to pick-up, using the performance records of the previous contract. This proposer sees that area encompassing all regions/cities outside of King County.

*Please refer to RFP Part II, Section 14 (Evaluation Criteria), Item 4 – Deadhead Reduction & Trip Efficiency Plan. Proposer must describe how it will calculate and measure deadhead reduction so the Port can accurately audit and track activity.*

*Outbound trip destinations were addressed in Question 14 of Addendum 3. Approximately half of all outbound trips were to locations within Seattle city limits.*

8. Is there a “break room” space available at the Terminal for Use by the Contractor? (This would server not only as a break and meal space, but could be utilized for reporting and clock-out purposes, thereby saving non-productive labor hours and corresponding costs).

*No space is available at the Airport terminal.*

9. Are there work stations (podiums or otherwise) available at the Terminal Curb for the Operator's personnel? If not, can the Operator provide the same?

*There are no workstations available. The selected Proposer, at its expense, may provide their own. If the selected Proposer seeks to utilize workstations, the Port will work to identify space at which they may be placed. The Port may, however, require the selected Proposer to lease this space.*

10. Are queuing stanchions used for taxi and on-demand lines of patrons? If not, can they be made available and at whose expense?

*Queuing stanchions may, with the Port's prior approval, be used. Any stanchions will need to be provided by the selected Proposer, at its expense.*

11. If Operator suggests and the Airport determines that the dispatch systems would benefit from the use of additional or replaced signage, who will control design, production and placement of the same?

*It depends on the nature of the signage. The Airport is generally responsible for and provides way-finding signs throughout the Airport. To the extent affecting these signs, the Port would control the design, production and placement. For localized signs intended to supplement the Port's way-finding, these would usually be designed, produced and placed by the operator. Any such signs, however, must meet Port of Seattle sign standards and would be subject to pre-approval.*

12. Are credit cards currently mandated in all taxis and on-demand vehicles service the Airport?

*No. Any Proposer not intended to accept credit cards should specifically address payment mechanisms as part of its customer service discussion.*

13. Is employee parking provided by the Airport? Is there a cost for same?

*Yes. Employee parking is available in the North Employee Parking Lot located at 2300 N. 146<sup>th</sup> Street. The cost is \$80/month per person.*

14. Does the Port of Seattle have a specific reference form or structure/template preferred for reference submission?

*The Port does not have a preferred structure for reference submission.*

15. Customer Service

A. Describe your personnel policies and procedures including hiring, training incentives, performance measures, and equal opportunity employment programs. Include company requirements on attire, hygiene and other employee procedures.

Does the Port of Seattle intend this section of the submittal to cover subcontractors and/or FTE or PTE employees? For example, in section 4J the Port asks the Proposer to

describe training procedures for drivers. Does the Port seek a description of all hiring, performance and training incentives encompassing all proposed relationships including all FTE, PTE and subcontractors in this section of the submission?

Further, is there a mandated Airport Customer Service Program (in Addition to Operator’s internal programs) to be taken by Operator’s employees? Does this also apply to all independent contractors and medallion owners?

*Yes. The Port seeks to understand the personnel policies for all the persons interacting with the public under the Concession. This may include employees and independent contractors, both of the Proposer and any subcontractors.*

*There is no Airport customer service program.*

16. Provide examples of how you will guarantee level of service and performance standards with vehicle adjustments for seasonal change in demand

The Port provided estimates on annual growth in the Background Section of the report. Is the Port willing to provide Proposers with the estimated Seasonal Demand fluctuations observed over the last term of the RFP to validate the Proposers estimates for vehicle adjustments?

*The table below illustrates the seasonality of on-demand outbound taxi trips over the past five years:*

	Percentage of Total On-Demand Outbound Taxicab Trips												Total
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
2011	7.0%	6.5%	8.3%	7.8%	9.0%	9.2%	9.4%	9.4%	9.1%	8.7%	8.4%	7.2%	100.0%
2012	7.7%	6.9%	8.3%	8.2%	9.0%	9.3%	9.2%	9.2%	8.9%	8.9%	7.6%	6.8%	100.0%
2013	7.8%	7.0%	8.1%	8.2%	9.0%	9.3%	9.2%	8.9%	9.1%	8.8%	7.2%	7.5%	100.0%
2014	7.3%	7.1%	8.0%	7.7%	8.6%	9.3%	9.5%	9.2%	9.3%	8.8%	7.7%	7.5%	100.0%
2015	7.1%	6.9%	8.0%	8.1%	8.8%	9.1%	9.4%	9.4%	9.1%	8.9%	8.1%	7.2%	100.0%

17. Describe in detail your plan for ensuring maximum wait times of 5 minutes for customers at the airport.

Can the Port clarify the measurement tool, responsible party for measurement and location at which the 5 minute wait time standard will be measured at?

*The Port is responsible for measurement of this item. It is measured by ground transportation staff for passengers at the outbound, on-demand queues.*

18. Describe in detail your customer service standards.

Does the Port of Seattle have an existing customer service manifesto or KPI model which is available to Proposers to review to ensure that the objectives of the Port are available to all parties?

*With respect to ground transportation operations, the Port does not have an overarching statement of mission, vision or strategies related to customer service..*

19. The Port provided the number of Taxi-Trips reported in the last RFP term, as well as the expected annual enplanement growth for the proposed RFP's term. Does the Port have available the conversion rate for enplanements to on-demand services? Is the conversion rate directly attributable to enplanements?

*A variety of historical enplanement-related data are available at <http://www.portseattle.org/About/Publications/Statistics/Airport-Statistics/Pages/default.aspx>. Proposers are free to correlate this data with the historical taxi trips provided in RFP Section 1. Any Proposer doing so is responsible for drawing their own conclusions about the data.*

20. Does the Port have or has made available the actual deadhead reduction metrics from the previous contract incumbent? If yes, will the Port provide Proposers with this information?

*Please refer to Question 15 in Addendum 3 regarding deadhead data.*

21. Does the Port have a measurement tool which it proposes to use to measure deadhead reduction with established KPI's or measurement metrics (emissions, occupancy, miles etc.)

*Please refer to RFP Part II, Section 14 (Evaluation Criteria), Item 4 – Deadhead Reduction & Trip Efficiency Plan as well as Part III, Item 6.B. Proposer must describe how it will calculate and measure deadhead reduction so the Port can accurately audit and track activity.*

22. Does the Port factor deadhead reduction revenue into the gross revenue requests seen in Section 5B and Section 7F? Proposer believes that this revenue although linked via an ask of the RFP, does not have association to the Port as the RFP is for exclusive Pick-up on-demand services and should therefore be excluded.

*The Port is asking Proposers to provide forecasts of only outbound trips under the Concession. While Proposers must provide deadhead reduction commitments, revenue from inbound trips does not need to be included in any forecasts.*

23. What is the technology used for reporting? Consideration will be given to vendors who support a standards based reporting mechanism such as REST, JSON, XML etc. Does the Port have a preferred API system or existing reporting system capability and specification information available to Proposers? If yes, does the Port have an example of the preferred data submission characteristics and formats required for submission? For example, does the Port have a data reporting template available that will demonstrate the preferred standards based reporting requested in the RFP. If no, does the Port have an example of the preferred data submission and format characteristics required for submission? For example, does the Port have an initial detail

of the reporting characteristics for the identified preferred standards based reporting requested in the RFP.

*The Port does not have a preference for a specific standard/format. The Port will consider any standards-based solution proposed by a Proposer. Since the Port does not collect this data today, it does not have an example to provide.*

24. On or before the 20th day of each month, Concessionaire shall submit to the Port a statement of the number of Revenue trips generated from the Concession during the preceding month (the “Monthly Report”) and shall simultaneously pay to the Port the Per-Trip Fee due for that preceding month less the monthly payment of Minimum Annual Guarantee already paid by the Concessionaire for that month. In order to assist Concessionaire with the preparation of the Monthly Report, the Port will provide Concessionaire with the preparation of the Monthly report, the Port will provide Automated Vehicle Identification (AVI) system for each of Concessionaire’s Vehicles for the prior Month not later than (5) business days following the end of each month during the term. Concessionaire shall file the Monthly Report using the technology and procedures designated by the Port and shall show such reasonable detail and breakdown as may be required by the Port. If the Port instructs Concessionaire to file the Monthly Report or another report by computer, e-mail, or internet website, the Port shall not be obligated to furnish the Concessionaire with the equipment necessary to do so. The failure to timely provide the reports required by this Section shall be grounds for the imposition of liquidated damages as provided in Section 10.2.3 and the Operating Instructions.

What measures has the Port considered if the Concessionaire uses a supplementary or alternative tracking technology for Trips, which has been requested as part of the RFP, and that information differs from the AVI data as provided by the Port to the Concessionaire. For Example, if the Concessionaire has 100 outbound fare trips tracked electronically, and the Port provides by AVI record 110 trips or vise-versa. What measures will the Port consider for mediation or precedent in reporting?

The Port specifically references an AVI system as the method in which it will track Revenue Trips as well as vehicle access at Sea-Tac airport, yet also requests in Section 2 Qualifications item 5 that the proposer must provide detailed electronic reports detailing information that an AVI system is not capable of providing. Further reference to electronic systems are made in Section 8.vi (1,2,3) whereby the Port will provide consideration to alternative electronic reporting in real-time or near real-time. The Port makes further reference in Exhibit 2 – 6.7 Technology requirements to an API system. What considerations has the Port made on accommodations for multiple electronic reporting mechanisms and the reconciliation or seniority that will be required between each of these bodies if the Proposer does in fact provide real-time or near-realtime reporting?

*Section 1.18 of the draft Concession Agreement addresses this issue. The Port intends to take account of both the AVI data and “Concessionaire’s documented, auditable records” in determining the number of Revenue Trips. The Port considers the AVI system reliable within known tolerances. Effort will always be made to reconcile any data*

*provided by the selected Proposer with the Port's AVI data. Nonetheless, in determining the number of Revenue Trips, the Port would generally intend to utilize the most accurate and reliable data available.*

25. Concessionaire shall be entitled to a credit (the "Rent Credit") against the Minimum Annual Guaranty and Per-Trip Fee due to the Port for the amount of base rent together with leasehold excise tax payable on such amount actually paid to the Port each year under that separate lease agreement between the Port and Concessionaire for certain exclusive space as provided in Section 2.3. Concessionaire may apply the Rent Credit against any amount of Minimum Annual Guaranty and/or Per-Trip Fee owed by Concessionaire to the Port. In the event that Concessionaire applies the Rent Credit against an amount of Minimum Annual Guaranty, the Rent Credit shall automatically operate as a credit against the Per-Trip Fee otherwise covered by payment of the Minimum Annual Guaranty. (In other words, the Rent Credit Shall be treated, under Section 4.2.2 of this Agreement, as a "payment of Minimum Annual Guarantee already paid by the Concessionaire" when determining the amount of Per-Trip Fee payable by Concessionaire.)

The Port requests as part of the RFP evaluation in Section 5B-Revenue to Port and Section 7F-Financial Stability, both detailed annual proformas and revenue to be provided to the Port. Can the Port provide the estimated credit to the Proposers or an allowance with which the Port will consider the submission to ensure parity between submissions, as this is an area of evaluation and scoring in the RFP.

*This question reflects a misunderstanding of Section 4.3 of the draft Concession Agreement. The Port will separately lease to the selected Proposer space at the holding lot, as provided in Section 2.3 of the draft Concession Agreement. There will be rent obligation associated with the lease. Section 4.3 provides that any rent paid under the lease will operate as a credit against the amounts due under the Concession Agreement. As a result, Proposers may effectively disregard the rental obligation in preparing their proposals because the rental obligation will not affect the total amount paid by the Proposer.*

26. Concessionaire agrees that it will affix Automatic Vehicle Identification (AVI) tags to its vehicles in a manner and location approved by the Port and to pay the Sum of \$100.00 per tag for any loss or damage that may occur to the tag(s). Additional requirements may be set forth in the Operating Instructions.

The Port makes numerous mentions of other technology solutions to track in real-time or near-realtime and API management programs. If the Port institutes a new tracking mechanism seen as superior to an AVI system, and therefore makes VI redundant to the operations at Sea-Tac, will the Port refund the Concessionaire the total costs or straight line term depreciated costs associated of affixing AVI tags to each vehicle.

The concessionaire is in a position whereby it will have to bear the cost of implementing technologies to meet the demands of the contract as well as adapt to during the life of the contract (potentially 5 years) and sees a refund or credit for technologies made redundant by the Port as fair and equitable.



*This question reflects a misunderstanding of Section 6.9.2 of the draft Concession Agreement. The selected Proposer does not need to pay for each AVI tag installed in its Vehicles. The selected Proposer only needs to pay for the AVI tags that it loses or damages.*

27. How can we guarantee monies to the Port based on an estimate of trips when we have no idea what percentage of the total trips Uber is going to take?

*Each Proposer must make its own determination regarding this issue.*

28. How many trips do they believe that Uber will take of the total from the background section (page 4)?

*The Port does not know. Anecdotal data from other airports reflects that the introduction of Transportation Network Companies may result in a decrease of total, outbound taxi trips of 5-10%. However, each Proposer must make its own determination regarding any effect from the introduction of Transportation Network Companies.*

29. When the Port reported 131,482 trips in 2015 for for-hire vehicles (page 4), how did they calculate that? Was this only from the AVI? Was this corroborated from company dispatch logs?

*This is data from the Port's AVI system. It is not corroborated with any data from the for-hire vehicle operators.*

30. Who are the "appropriate regulatory bodies" (page 6) to be registered with and who needs to be registered?

*The answer depends on the identity of the Proposer. Each Proposer should ensure that it has registered with those regulatory bodies with which it is required to register under federal, state and local law based on the nature of the Proposer and its operations.*

31. Does there need to be a contract in place between the proposer and the "on demand" providers before the RFP is submitted?

*Not necessarily. Each Proposer is required to demonstrate an "ability to provide" 300 dual-licensed vehicles. While an in-place contract may evidence that, it is not required to demonstrate an ability to provide those vehicles.*

32. Nothing in the qualifications section on Page 6 addresses the value that our client brings as the direct service providers/single owners at the Airport. My clients feel that they are not being given credit for the exceptional service that they have provided for the last 5 years; we are the reason that Yellow Cab has provided excellent service and we believe that this should be taken into account.

*The Port will evaluate the proposals exclusively on the Evaluation Criteria identified in Part II, Section 14 of the RFP.*

33. What authority does the Port have to dictate to private business who we must work with in our RFP including For-Hire vehicles?

*Under RCW 14.08.120, the Port has the authority to adopt rules and grant concessions “under such terms and conditions that seem just and proper.”*

34. Does the Port realize that by putting taxis and for-hires into the same space, they will be creating problems and conflicts that the Port will be ultimately responsible for?

*Each Proposer is responsible for managing its own operations, specifically including any conflicts that may arise between any of its Drivers.*

35. If there are changes or bills passed at the legislature in Olympia that effect taxi service how will that be handled with the RFP?

*The Port cannot answer the question without knowledge of the specific bills or changes. With that said, please see Sections 2.5, 14.3 and 14.12 of the draft Concession Agreement.*

36. What type of evidence or documentation does the proposer have to provide to prove they actually have vehicles in their fleet? Can a proposer with only 100 dual licensed vehicles claim that they anticipate 300 dual licensed vehicles will sign up with them after being awarded the concession? Wouldn't this show that they don't meet the minimum qualifications on page 6 of the RFP.

*Please see the answer to Question 31 above. As noted there, each Proposer is required to demonstrate an “ability to provide” 300 dual-licensed vehicles. How that is demonstrated is up to each individual Proposer.*

If Yellow Cab wins the concession again, do they still have to wait until July 1, 2016, to add more vehicles to the airport fleet or can they do so beforehand?

*The current Concession Agreement with Puget Sound Dispatch does not expire until June 30, 2016. Any new Agreement, regardless of the selected Proposer, will not start until July 1, 2016.*

37. Do for-hire vehicles need to be dual licensed city-county or are taxicabs the only vehicles that need to be dual licensed to qualify for the 300 vehicle requirement?

*All vehicles, other than wheelchair accessible vehicles, supplied under the Concession must be dual-licensed. This includes both taxicabs and for-hire vehicles.*

38. Does Yellow Cab need a transition plan since it already is at the airport?

*All Proposers require a transition plan. The current operation is significantly different from the operation contemplated under this RFP.*

39. Should the trip information provided by the Port on page 4 of the RFP -- which shows approximately 9 taxicab fares for every one for-hire fare -- be relied upon to set the ratio between taxicabs and for-hires in the proposer's breakdown? For example, using that information, the initial ratio would be 270 cabs and 30 for-hire vehicles for the initial year in a 300 car fleet.

*Each Proposer must decide on its own whether and how to utilize this data. However, the Port notes that for-hire vehicles were not providing on-demand service like for-hire vehicles now will under the Concession.*

40. Can a proposer receive more than 300 airport permits in their initial first year of operation by providing a fleet of more than 400 vehicles?

*Please see Section 6.2 of the draft Concession Agreement.*