

PORT OF SEATTLE
MEMORANDUM

COMMISSION AGENDA
ACTION ITEM

Item No.	<u>4c</u>
Date of Meeting	<u>October 27, 2015</u>

DATE: October 20, 2015
TO: Ted Fick, Chief Executive Officer
FROM: Cassie Fritz, Seaport Project Management Program Controls Manager
SUBJECT: Infrastructure Services Indefinite Delivery, Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ)
Professional Service Agreement

Amount of This Request:	\$0	Source of Funds:	Future Individual Project Authorizations
Maximum Value of IDIQ Contracts:	\$2,000,000		

ACTION REQUESTED

Request Commission authorization for the Chief Executive Officer to advertise and execute up to three consulting services indefinite delivery, indefinite quantity (IDIQ) contracts for infrastructure-related design, construction, and other engineering support services for a not-to-exceed total of \$2,000,000 with a three-year contract ordering period. No funding is associated with this request.

SYNOPSIS

The Port of Seattle owns and maintains a large portfolio of properties of varying age and condition. Infrastructure projects are those that facilitate the efficient and safe operation of our industrial and commercial properties, preserve the value of assets, and ensure compliance with state and local codes. These service agreements will provide Maritime, Economic Development and Capital Development with subject matter expertise to support infrastructure related maintenance, repair, and upgrade projects as needed to ensure ongoing operation of Port of Seattle or Northwest Seaport Alliance facilities.

The service agreements resulting from this request will allow Port staff to respond to a range of infrastructure project needs, including, but not limited to:

- Stormwater drainage systems
- Electrical power and lighting systems, low voltage and telecom systems
- Pressurized utilities such as domestic water and fire mains and natural gas lines
- Roadways and elevated roadway structures, pavement sections, and traffic analysis
- Permitting assistance and compliance
- Landscape and public shoreline access
- Adherence to the Seattle Municipal Code (SMC)

COMMISSION AGENDA

Ted Fick, Chief Executive Officer

October 20, 2015

Page 2 of 3

Two contracts will be awarded to the highest ranked firm for \$850,000 each. A third contract with a value of \$300,000 will be set aside for the highest ranked proposal submitted by a small business firm.

REQUEST SCOPE OF WORK AND SCHEDULE

Scope of Work:

The contracts will be written with a specific not-to-exceed amount, identify the services required, and 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 March 2016 and each will 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 department budgets and projects that will be authorized separately through established procedures. Consequently, 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 project 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 four 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.

COMMISSION AGENDA

Ted Fick, Chief Executive Officer

October 20, 2015

Page 3 of 3

Alternative 2) – Prepare a Single Procurement Contract

Pros:

- Prepare a contract with up to two firms for design needs as they arise. This alternative would ensure 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.
- Set aside one contract of lower dollar value for 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