

PORT OF SEATTLE
MEMORANDUM

COMMISSION AGENDA
ACTION ITEM

Item No. 6c
Date of Meeting August 9, 2016

DATE: July 7, 2016
TO: Ted Fick, Chief Executive Officer
FROM: Elizabeth Leavitt, Senior Director, Environment and Sustainability
Jeffrey Brown, Director, Aviation Facilities and Capital Programs
SUBJECT: Planning Services Indefinite Delivery, Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Professional Service Agreements

Amount of This Request: \$0
Maximum Value of Contracts \$10,000,000

ACTION REQUESTED

Request Commission authorization for the Chief Executive Officer to execute up to 4 indefinite delivery, indefinite quantity (IDIQ) contracts for Airport Planning Services totaling no more than \$10,000,000 with a 5-year ordering period. No funding is associated with this authorization.

SYNOPSIS

As a follow-on to the Sustainable Airport Master Plan (SAMP), Advanced Planning efforts need to be developed that are beyond the granularity of detail described in the airport master plan. The Planning IDIQ requested will include an Advance Planning consultant to provide 1) a more detailed and dimensioned analysis of the SAMP program to validate the feasibility of individual projects and program elements; 2) Planning necessary to transition projects from a master plan to design, and; 3) refinement of the anticipated capital program with more defined phasing, project definition, schedule and cost. Also included in the scope of this procurement is allowance for on-going strategic and day to day planning work requested by staff, initiatives and projects. The service agreements resulting from this request will allow the Port to respond to a range of planning needs over the next four plus years and with the necessary Advanced Planning we will be equipped with proper foresight and direction to move swiftly into and through the anticipated capital program.

The intent is to execute up to 4 contracts. One contract will be for \$5,000,000 and is intended to be primarily for Advance Planning. Two contracts will be for \$2,250,000 and one at \$500,000. If we do not receive sufficient proposals from qualified firms, including small business firms, we will split the remaining money among qualified firms. The overall total contract value will be up to \$10,000,000.

COMMISSION AGENDA

Ted Fick, Chief Executive Officer

July 7, 2016

Page 2 of 4

All contracts will include requirements for a 12 percent small business participation attainment goal. The \$500,000 contract will be a set aside for a proposal submitted by a qualified small business firm. In this case, a small business will be the prime consultant. For the larger contracts the small businesses will be sub-consultants to the prime and part of the contract's small business attainment goal.

BACKGROUND

The SAMP, initiated in 2014, is anticipated to reach a draft preferred alternative by the end of this year. The SAMP effort is a 20-year forecast of demand and alternatives for Airport Uses and Layouts providing a high level planning detail considering distinct Planning Activity Levels. Advanced Planning is required to transition from this high level planning to defined projects and programs. This effort will validate elements of the SAMP and provide framework and basis of program/project definition to move into a capital program.

With continued accelerated growth at the Airport, the Planning Department has a significant backlog of service requests. It is anticipated that the need for planning services will continue to grow with the increased airport activity and as existing facilities become overburdened before additional capacity can be brought on-line with large scale projects envisioned in the SAMP. On-Call Planning Services will enable Planning staff to more readily respond to strategic planning needs and ensure the airport has comprehensive planning for the near term developments with correlation and transition to the longer term plans.

PROJECT SCOPE OF WORK AND SCHEDULE

The IDIQ contracts will be procured according to Port policies and procedures in accordance with Resolution No. 3605, as amended, and procurement policy CPO-1. The Port will advertise and issue a solicitation. The contracts will be written with specific not-to-exceed amounts and identify the services required. Each contract will have a contract ordering period (during which the services may be separately authorized) of five years. The actual contract duration may extend beyond five years in order to complete the work identified in the particular service directives. Service directives may be issued during the contract-ordering period and within the total original contract value. The Port will have the option of moving money between contracts if the Port determines that a contracted current firm cannot adequately complete future work requests.

Schedule

We estimate that these contracts will be executed in November 2016 and have a 5 year ordering period. Each service directive will specify the duration and schedule associated with the task or tasks involved.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Charges to these contracts will be from the Aviation Division's operating expense budget. Consequently, there is no funding request associated with this authorization.

COMMISSION AGENDA

Ted Fick, Chief Executive Officer

July 7, 2016

Page 3 of 4

BUDGET STATUS AND SOURCE OF FUNDS

There is no funding request associated with this authorization. Individual service directives will be executed to authorize the consultant to perform any specific work on the contract against approved budget authorizations and within the total contract amount.

ALTERNATIVES AND IMPLICATIONS CONSIDERED

Alternative 1 – Build up in-house staff on a limited duration basis to provide required planning services

Pros:

- (1) Over the length of the work, this option may show cost savings.

Cons:

- (1) Time to build up adequate staff with the necessary specific skill sets would take 18 to 24 months. This would delay substantially the Advanced Planning which has an overall delay to the capital program that would be following and integrated with the Advanced Planning. This would also delay our current planning backlog and future planning requests even further.
- (2) The type of work needed has an expected lifespan and will not be continuous. Adding full time in-house staff would create long term costs that would potentially be unnecessary during certain times of the work and in the longer term future and it would be difficult to attract talent on a limited duration basis.
- (3) To be cost effective, the new Port staff would need to have a broad set of specific skills which would be difficult to acquire in a manageable number of additions. Consultants have staff with these specific skills and can utilize them on an hour by hour basis as needed.

This is not the recommended alternative.

Alternative 2 – Separate Procurement for Each Task

Pros:

- (1) Separate contract procurements would allow consulting firms multiple opportunities to compete for each individual task.

Cons:

- (1) This alternative would increase overhead and administrative costs to the Port, as we would need to manage more procurement processes and contracts.
- (2) This alternative may add months to each task to complete the procurement process for each individual project and would impact the ability to meet the needs of the airport.

COMMISSION AGENDA

Ted Fick, Chief Executive Officer

July 7, 2016

Page 4 of 4

- (3) Costs to the consulting companies may increase as they would be responding to multiple procurements.

This is not the recommended alternative.

Alternative 3 – Prepare Single Procurement Process Resulting in Up To 4 Contracts

Pros:

- (1) This alternative would insure the Port has the necessary professional, technical and advisory resources available to assist with time critical planning efforts and delivery of potential future capital work.
- (2) Small business participation will be a contract requirement.
- (3) The Port is setting aside one contract valued at \$500,000 for a qualified small business.
- (4) This alternative would minimize the number of procurement processes necessary for timely completion of tasks and reduce overhead and administrative costs to the Port and consultants.

Cons:

- (1) The alternative would limit the number of opportunities available to firms to compete for more discrete packages of work.

This is the recommended alternative.

ATTACHMENTS TO THIS REQUEST

- None

PREVIOUS COMMISSION ACTIONS OR BRIEFINGS

- None