### PORT OF SEATTLE MEMORANDUM

COMMISSION AGENDA ACTION ITEM			Item No.	4f
			Date of Meeting	February 24, 2015
DATE:	February 17, 2015			
то:	Ted Fick, Chief Exe	cutive Officer		
FROM:	Michael Ehl, Director, Airport Operations Wayne Grotheer, Director, Aviation Project Management Group			
SUBJECT:	Professional Service Contracts for Airfield Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ)			
Amount of This Request:		\$0	Source of Funds:	Not Applicable
Maximum (	Contracts Value:	\$4,000,000		

### **ACTION REQUESTED**

Request Commission authorization for the Chief Executive Officer to execute two professional services indefinite delivery, indefinite quantity (IDIQ) contracts for airfield technical support services in the amount of \$2,000,000 per contract for a total of \$4,000,000 with a contract ordering period of three years in support of upcoming airfield capital improvement projects at Seattle-Tacoma International Airport. A budget request is not associated with this authorization.

### **SYNOPSIS**

Over the next few years, the Port of Seattle will embark on several large development programs to fulfill business goals and Century Agenda Objectives. Procuring airfield technical support services IDIQ contracts will allow the Port to meet the needs of the planned projects in a timely manner.

IDIQ contracts provide the Port with the flexibility to meet business requirements as they arise by issuing individual service directives to accomplish tasks within a general, pre-defined scope of work on an as-needed basis for a fixed period of time and a maximum contract amount.

### BACKGROUND

The proposed IDIQ is for technical support services for engineering evaluations and analyses, planning, operational, design and construction support, and for permits required for specific projects. Over the next few years, a number of projects are being planned and significant changes will be coming to the Airport to fulfill business plan objectives. The Port will need the ability to obtain highly technical assistance and to have additional resources available for periods

# **COMMISSION AGENDA**

Ted Fick, Chief Executive Officer February 17, 2015 Page 2 of 3

of peak work load or when regular Port staff is not available to ensure project delivery can occur in a timely manner.

Upcoming design projects at the Airport will consist of small scale projects requiring a quick turnaround and large scale projects requiring several years of planning and design support. In order to meet the service capacity and turnaround times needed, staff recommends the Port contract with two consulting firms.

# PROJECT JUSTIFICATION AND DETAILS

Contracts for architectural and engineering services are addressed in Revised Code of Washington 39.80 that requires selection be based on the most highly qualified firm at a price that is considered fair and reasonable to the agency. Agency procedures and guidelines shall include a plan to insure that minority and women-owned firms and veteran-owned firms are afforded the maximum practicable opportunity to compete for and obtain public contracts for services.

The Port will advertise and issue a request for qualifications (RFQ) that includes small business goals, including small contractors and suppliers (SCS); participation as determined jointly with the Office of Social Responsibility (OSR). The consultant will provide a multidisciplinary team to meet the Port's needs. The program lead will support the small business and SCS goals, which provide opportunities for a variety of small businesses to participate. SCS goals and the opportunity for minority and women-owned firms and veteran-owned firms to participate can be met by the use of subconsultants or joint ventures.

The contract will have a contract ordering period (during which the design services may be separately authorized) of three years. The actual contract period may extend beyond three years in order to complete the work identified in particular service directive(s). Service directives may be issued during the contract ordering period. The Port will not issue service directives in excess of the contract value.

Representative projects could include, but are not limited to, airfield operational analysis, general aviation planning, aircraft parking and gate layout planning, airfield electrical system upgrades, wildlife data analysis, refueling and fuel management systems, stormwater and IWS system evaluation, CAD support services and safety risk assessments. It is anticipated that many of these projects and other non-identified projects will move forward for approvals based on the improvements and their timing identified to support the Sustainable Airport Master Plan. Each service directive will include the project specific scope, duration and schedule associated with the work.

# FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The total estimated cost for technical support services will not exceed \$4,000,000. Each contract will have a not-to-exceed threshold of \$2,000,000. Work is not guaranteed to the consultants and the Port is not obligated to pay the consultant until a service directive is executed. After

# **COMMISSION AGENDA**

Ted Fick, Chief Executive Officer February 17, 2015 Page 3 of 3

receiving authorization for each specific project in accordance with Resolution No. 3605, as amended, the actual scope of work will be fully defined and the Port will issue individual project-specific service directives.

# ALTERNATIVES AND IMPLICATIONS CONSIDERED

# Alternative 1) – Separate Procurement for Each Project

**Pros:** 

• Separate contracts would allow consulting firms multiple opportunities to complete for each individual project,

#### Cons:

- This alternative would increase overhead and administrative costs to the Port as we would need to manage more procurement processes and contracts.
- This alternative would add 4 to 6 months to each project schedule to complete the procurement process for each individual project and would impact the ability to meet project and customer needs.
- Costs to the consulting community may increase as they are responding to multiple procurements.

This is not the recommended alternative.

# Alternative 2) – Prepare a Single Procurement Contract

**Pros:** 

- Prepare a single contract with two firms for identified design needs as they arise. This alternative would insure the Port has the necessary professional and technical resources available to assist in time-critical evaluations and delivery of future projects, and that small business participation is part of the criteria.
- This alternative would minimize the number of procurement processes necessary for timely completion of projects and reduce overhead and administrative costs to the Port.

Cons:

• This alternative would limit the number of opportunities available to firms to compete for work.

### This is the recommended alternative.

# ATTACHMENTS TO THIS REQUEST

• None

# PREVIOUS COMMISSION ACTIONS OR BRIEFINGS

• None