

CATEGORY III SELECTION SUMMARY

Solicitation Name:	Flight Corridor Safety Program 2024
Solicitation Number:	00321214
Contract Administrator:	Tae Stacy

I. SOLICITATION SUMMARY

Brief Description of Scope of Work:	The Flight Corridor Safety Program (FCSP) is an ongoing program to manage obstructions consisting of trees and other vegetation at and around Seattle-Tacoma International Airport (Airport) and replant lower-height native vegetation on or near the removal sites. This program is necessary to meet the Aviation Division's goals of ensuring safe and secure aircraft operations.
Estimated Contract Value:	Estimated Value \$2M- Initial Commission Approval for Phase I \$500,000.
Estimated Contract Duration:	Initial year plus option to extend for 3 years.
Number of Contracts:	1

II. FIRMS, SHORTLISTING, & RATING

A. Firm Names:	Criteria A Specialized Experience & Technical Competency of Key Individuals	Criteria B Project Approach	Criteria C Diversity in Contracting	Criteria D Interview	Shortlist ed Y/N	Awarde d Y/N	Business Classificati on
1. AECOM	Marginal	Marginal	Good	N/A	N	N	NSB
2. HNTB	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding	Y	Y	NSB
3. Jacobs Engineering	Good	Good	Outstanding	Good	Y	N	NSB
4. RS&H	Good	Acceptable	Good	Acceptable	Y	N	NSB

III. SELECTION PROCESS

A. Proposal Evaluation

All 4 proposals were reviewed and scored by the selection team. Based on the received ratings for each criterion, Three (3) submitters were shortlisted.

Factors that contributed to ratings included, but were not limited to:

	Criterion A (Specialized Experience and Technical Competency of Key Individuals/Firm)	Criterion B (Project Approach)	Criterion C (Diversity in Contracting Inclusion Plan)
AECOM	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Organizational Diagram was written very clearly, and easy to navigate. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The list of projects was lacking details, especially related to the environmental permitting, review, and surveys. 	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Key projects listed were relevant to the scope of work. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Lack of the detail regarding the obstruction data collection. b. Overall, the project approach was too general and not tailored to the scope of work. 	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Firm is above the WMBE aspirational goal. (22% commitment) b. Firm hosts and attends business diversity events and maintains the database containing WMBE firms. c. Firm engaged in mentoring in areas of

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. The key personnel and firm's project experience were very confusing as it was difficult to tie together the key personnel and their projects worked on. c. Overall, the proposal was generic and lacked detail. d. The position and title for the Port project were misleading compared to actual responsibilities. e. The community outreach lacked an explanation of how it was tailored to the scope of work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. Firm's approach was missing key elements of the project such as easement and subordination. d. QA/QC was very high level and lacked detail. e. Despite the scope being very sequential, the proposal is broad and high-level. 	<p>proposal support, and small business matching.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. 10-day prompt payment to the subconsultants. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Although they mentioned the mentorship program, the response lacked in the detail. b. The dispute resolution response lacks any mediation or arbitration used to ensure the disputes are resolved fairly.
HNTB	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Key personnel on the proposal had very relevant experience with examples provided. b. Key personnel's experience regarding mitigation projects related to the airport was extensive. c. Project experience included local projects and other airports that were very relevant to the scope of work. d. Under the Organizational Diagram, there is appropriate information in each discipline. e. Proposal format was easy to read and understand. 	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Identification of the challenge, and mitigation was well explained. c. Provided GIS approach including web-first approach. d. Firm spends time on community consideration in project approach and touch points with multiple steps. e. Online open house approach was unique and considerate of the public. f. Diagram and Exhibits displayed in the proposal were very helpful to understand, especially with Schedule graph and Outreach dashboard. g. Current mitigation 	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Firm is above the WMBE aspirational goal. (18% commitment overall) b. Their outreach strategy includes hosting in-person and online event targeting WMBE firms. c. Firm participates in PortGen Workshop. d. The mentorship program includes help in the area of invoicing, training in file sharing, and other administrative tasks. e. Firm elaborated on how they will incorporate the WMBE firm with 1% utilization.

	<p>f. The layout of the Key personnel section was easy to navigate and referred to the key personnel's project involved.</p> <p>g. Project Manager's environmental background and experience are relevant to the scope and well suited for this project.</p> <p>h. The firm described who is doing what work was explained in detail.</p> <p>i. Appendix-Resume had a variety of skilled people.</p> <p>j. Proposal was very comprehensive and covered all the components requested in the criteria.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>a. Organizational Diagram illustrates many high-level positions/titles that may not be required for this scope of work.</p>	<p>strategy was well written and clear.</p> <p>h. More than one technology tool was recommended.</p> <p>i. Data integration with detail was above and beyond expectations.</p> <p>j. Straight forward assessment and expression of the firm's idea were very well explained.</p> <p>k. Firm offered alternative feedback on the schedule section.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>None</p>	<p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>a. None</p>
<p>Jacobs Engineering</p>	<p>Strengths:</p> <p>a. Listed a variety of personnel in the key personnel section.</p> <p>b. Specialized experience had relevant information including additional information and detail under each key personnel.</p>	<p>Strengths:</p> <p>a. QA/QC section was well written and clear.</p> <p>b. The approach of early property work was well explained utilizing the firm's experience as examples.</p> <p>c. Risks noted as high/medium/low and additional</p>	<p>Strengths:</p> <p>a. Firm is above the WMBE aspirational goal. (31% commitment)</p> <p>b. Firm hosted outreach events that gathered more than 200 firms. Additionally, they follow-up to scheduled 1:1 meeting.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. Their relevant examples and experience are related to this scope of work. d. The proposal included good detail, familiarity with the work, and the ability to achieve the scope of work. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Proposal was difficult to follow as the display was very crowded with a busy design. b. The years of relevant experience per person were inconsistently stated throughout the proposal. c. While there are many people listed, only a few are involved in day-to-day operations is concerning. d. 	<p>challenges were laid out well.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Methodology of how the firm will handle certain elements of the scope of work was missing. b. Project approach was too general. c. Missing information under permit approval and new tree ordinance, and information was too general. d. Their experience was not clearly explained nor incorporated into the project approach. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. Jacob's subconsultant-Shrewsbury works closely with the WMBE firms by facilitating bi-weekly business development meetings. d. 10-day payment commitment and a proven track record of releasing payments. e. Each inclusion plan responses were very thorough and had great detail in all areas. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. One of the firms is listed at 1% and, their utilization under the scope is unclear.
RS&H	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Good team including the Project Manager with relevant project experience. b. Data collection was well written and included many details. c. Team with the competency of the key staff is established. d. Relevant information was provided regarding the proposed team and key personnel. e. The hyperlink used in the proposal was very useful to navigate the 	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Nice process of steps was listed. b. Early emphasis on community outreach was well explained. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Missing the strategic plan and implementation following the field verification, environmental review, and jump to Design. b. Lack of specificity in Data integrity, missing strategy, and details. c. Project approach was too simplistic and lumped altogether while 	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Firm hosts events in King County that have captured a handful of WMBE partners. b. The firm has mentored WMBE firms on invoicing. c. Firm is committed to 10-day prompt payment. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. None

- proposal making it easy to read.
- f. Firm's experience with projects such as 509, King County Airport and WA DOT, and other airports such as Tampa International airport were very relevant to the scope of work.

- d. the scope of work shows sequential steps.
- d. There were some misspelled words.

Weaknesses:

- a. Some project experience lacked detail; additional information would have been useful.
- b. Organizational Diagram design was difficult to navigate.
- c. Organizational chart was difficult to navigate.

B. Interview Evaluation and/or Discussions:

Three proposers were interviewed by the evaluation team. Each proposer was asked the same list of interview questions and received the list of questions as part of the interview. Topics included those identified in the Solicitation such as data collection and integrity, environmental approach, and community outreach.

Factors that contributed to the ratings included, but were not limited to:

Criterion D (Interviews)

HNTB

Strengths:

- a. The team collaboration of responding to questions, allocating time, and involvement of everyone was well-coordinated.
- b. The response to each question was very thorough and well explained including examples and similar scope experiences.
- c. The Firm's understanding of community outreach challenges and the complexity of the project was explained exceptionally well.
- d. The Project Manager demonstrated management and effective organization of the team throughout the interview.
- e. The response to the LiDAR question was answered very thoroughly including examples, relevant systems, and the use of systems.
- f. The Firm response to the questions regarding the data collection and integrity was described in detail in every phase of the project including the accuracy of the data, and relevant data use.

Weaknesses:

- a. The question regards to tracking progress/ schedule/tasks/budget was high-level, and missing details.

Jacobs Engineering Group

Strengths:

- a. Firm's robust idea of reversing the ways to tackle the properties was very innovative.
- b. The cost savings and cost-effective approach were explained thoroughly.

Weaknesses:

- a. Firm lacked the details in response and the responses were too high level.
- b. The team was lacking collaboration and a holistic approach in responses to the questions.

RS&H

Strengths:

- a. The response regarding the tracking progress and schedule was very thorough and explained well including relevant examples and the system use.
- b. The responses to the environmental questions were very relevant, meaningful, and similar to the scope.

Weaknesses:

- a. Overall responses to the questions were too generic and missing the details.
- b. The response to the questions were repetitive with the same information.
- c. Firm was missing the details in response to the community outreach question.
- d. The question regarding the data collection and integrity- The firm's strategy and methodology of data collection was missing.

C. Awardee Selection

HNTB effectively demonstrated outstanding expertise, knowledge, and relevant experience in performing the scope similar to this project. The Firm's detailed response including relevant experience with similar projects, an understanding of the regulatory agency requirements, FAA requirements, community outreach methodology, and environmental mitigation was exceptional. The Firm showcased its ability to manage the project with a collaborative team who are qualified to perform work similar to the Port's scope of work and provide the necessary support, systems, knowledge, and skills to the Port to accomplish the project. The Evaluation Team deemed HNTB as the best fit for this project.

D. Cost Evaluation (Personal only)

Not Applicable- Professional Services

IV. EVALUATION TEAM

Name	Title	Department
Mengqi Wu	Capital Program Leader	Aviation Project Management Group
Michelle Carioto	Capital Project Manager III	Aviation Project Management Group
Steve Rybolt	Senior Environmental Program Manager	Aviation Environmental Programs Group
Marco Milanese	Senior Program Manager Community Engagement	External Relations
Robert Kikillus	Airport Operations Development Manager	Airport Operations

V. FINAL DETERMINATION

The evaluation team has determined that HNTB is the highest ranked firm/s and recommends award to that firm.

Michelle Carioto

1/31/23

Print Name and Signature (Email signature is acceptable)

Date