

Item No.	8h_supp
Date of Meeting	December 15, 2020

# Airport Terminal Accessibility and Safety Enhancements Phase II

Alternative Project Delivery

# Project Scope

Purpose: Complete security improvements for the Main Terminal landside environment

- Phase I (Work is Complete)
  - Shatter proofing the Main Terminal and pedestrian sky bridge windows
- Phase II
  - Installation of bollards on both Main Terminal curbsides, at entrances to pedestrian sky bridges, and along courtesy vehicle plaza
  - Accessibility improvements on both Main Terminal curbsides

# Project History (Phase II)

- Originally bid in 2019 (major works)
  - Cancelled bids, apparent low bid 71% above engineer's estimate
- Repackaged in 2020 as two separate procurement efforts
  - 1) Bollard procurement (lowest price technically acceptable)
    - Cancelled procurement due to multiple protests
  - 2) Security and accessibility improvements (major works)
    - Apparent low bid 34% below engineer's estimate
    - Cancelled bids due to bollard procurement cancellation

# Key Challenges for Moving Forward

- Schedule
  - FAA received complaint about terminal curbside accessibility
  - Requested remedy as soon as reasonably possible
- Design
  - Structural improvements dependent upon bollard selected
  - Public procurement rules do not support sole source
- Budget
  - Structural improvements may impact project budget

# Design Challenge

- Range of Bollard manufacturers with varying size, configuration, and weight
- Each has different load transfer with vehicle impact
- Requires selection of bollard and then structural analysis and design
- Varying facility types (Departures, Arrivals, Main Garage)



# Traditional Design-Build Project Delivery

## Advantages:

- Design-Build team determines bollard and structural requirements
- Price proposal is part of selection
- A shorter schedule than Design Bid Build
- Experience with Traditional Design Build

## Disadvantages:

- Port does not control design, only requirements
- Stipends required for procurement

# Traditional Design-Build Project Delivery

## Risks:

- Project basis of design requirements not defined adequately resulting in owner errors and omissions
- Combining two design firms to prepare project basis of design requirements

## Opportunities:

- Design or constructability innovation through design-build process
- Reduced operational limitations due to reduced passenger activity

# Project Next Steps

- Prepare procurement documents and advertise (Q1 2021)
- Select Design-Build team (Q2/Q3 2021)
- Complete construction (Q4 2022)



# Bollard Procurement Lessons Learned

<b>Problem/Opportunity Description</b>	<b>Origin (Root Cause)</b>	<b>Solution</b>
Structural assessment selection criteria was partially based upon information obtained through a non-disclosure agreement	Full implications of non-disclosure agreement were not discussed between PM and CPO teams	Review basis of design information and selection criteria to make sure there is no proprietary information
The procurement type was not correct (low price technically acceptable vs. best value)	The structural assessment evaluation criteria did not support the low price technically acceptable evaluation approach	The evaluation criteria need to be discussed further between PM and CPO teams
Vendors that did not meet proposal requirements were not identified as “nonresponsive”	Response to vendors was “not technically acceptable”	Purchasing to consider as part of their internal guidance documents