

PORT OF SEATTLE
MEMORANDUM

COMMISSION AGENDA
ACTION ITEM

Item No. 4e
Date of Meeting August 4, 2015

DATE: July 28, 2015
TO: Ted Fick, Chief Executive Officer
FROM: Cassie Fritz, Program Controls Manager, Seaport Project Management
SUBJECT: Dock and Diving Indefinite Delivery, Indefinite Quantity Professional Service Agreements

Amount of This Request: \$0

Maximum Value of Contracts \$1,500,000

ACTION REQUESTED

Request Commission authorization for the Chief Executive Officer to execute up to two professional services indefinite delivery, indefinite quantity (IDIQ) contracts for Dock and Diving Support Services totaling no more than \$1,500,000 with a three-year contract ordering period. No funding is associated with this request.

SYNOPSIS

Dock repairs, inspections, replacements, and maintenance are regular events at the Port's maritime terminals. For the next three to five years, continuous improvements, maintenance, and repairs will be necessary to sustain docks and dock areas. The Port has previously issued dock and diving service contracts that are set to expire in December 2015 and January 2016.

The service agreements resulting from this request will allow the Port to respond to a range of needs including, but not limited to, above or underwater inspections, surveys, design for dock repair or replacement, sediment monitoring, and emergency spill response. Exact scope and timing of these projects are subject to future surveys and business needs of the Port of Seattle or the Northwest Seaport Alliance. The proposed professional services IDIQ contracts would allow the Port to respond to future service needs efficiently. One contract will be awarded to the highest ranked firm for \$1,000,000. The second contract with a value of \$500,000 will be set aside for the highest ranked proposal submitted by a small business firm.

PROJECT SCOPE OF WORK AND SCHEDULE

Scope of Work

The IDIQ contracts will be procured according to Port policies and procedures in accordance with Delegation of Authority and Procurement policies. The Port will advertise and issue a

COMMISSION AGENDA

Ted Fick, Chief Executive Officer

July 28, 2015

Page 2 of 3

Request for Qualifications (RFQ) that will include a small business contract set-aside. 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 three years. The actual contract duration may extend beyond three years in order to complete work identified in particular service directives. Service directives may be issued during the contract ordering period and within the total original contract value.

Schedule

It is estimated that the contracts will be executed by the end of the year and have a three 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 projects separately authorized using standard Port procedures. Consequently, there is no funding request associated with this authorization.

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 authorizations and within the total contract amount.

ALTERNATIVES AND IMPLICATIONS CONSIDERED

Alternative 1) – Separate Procurement for Each Project

Pros:

- Separate contracts would allow consulting firms multiple opportunities to compete 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 may add several 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 company may increase as they would be responding to multiple procurements.

This is not the recommended alternative.

Alternative 2) – Prepare a Single Procurement Contract

Pros:

- Prepare a contract with up to three firms for identified needs as they arise. This alternative would insure the Port has the necessary professional and technical

COMMISSION AGENDA

Ted Fick, Chief Executive Officer

July 28, 2015

Page 3 of 3

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.
- Set aside one contract specifically for use by a qualified small business.

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