



Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: 2021-0291 **Version:** 1 **Name:**
Type: Action Item **Status:** Passed
File created: 7/28/2021 **In control:** Board of Port Commissioners
On agenda: 10/12/2021 **Final action:** 10/12/2021
Title: RESOLUTIONS FOR AS-NEEDED SERVICE AGREEMENTS FOR FIVE-YEAR DURATIONS, WITH NO INCREASE TO THE MAJOR MAINTENANCE AND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM BUDGETS, AS FOLLOWS:

A) RESOLUTION SELECTING AND AUTHORIZING AGREEMENTS WITH RICK ENGINEERING COMPANY, NASLAND ENGINEERING, HARRIS & ASSOCIATES, INC., MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL, INC., NV5, INC., AND PSOMAS FOR AS-NEEDED CIVIL ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$4,000,000

B) RESOLUTION SELECTING AND AUTHORIZING AGREEMENTS WITH ARCADIS, U.S., INC., HARRIS & ASSOCIATES, INC., AECOM TECHNICAL SERVICES, AND HDR ENGINEERING, INC. FOR AS-NEEDED PROJECT MANAGEMENT/CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT SERVICES FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$2,500,000

C) RESOLUTION SELECTING AND AUTHORIZING AGREEMENTS WITH MOFFAT & NICHOL, SIMPSON GUMPERTZ & HEGER, INC., TRITON ENGINEERS, INC., AND GHD, INC. FOR AS-NEEDED MARINE STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$4,000,000

D) RESOLUTION SELECTING AND AUTHORIZING AGREEMENTS WITH BUREAU VERITAS NORTH AMERICA, INC., NV5 INC., AND INTERWEST CONSULTING GROUP FOR AS-NEEDED QUALITY CONTROL AND DESIGN REVIEW SERVICES FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$500,000

E) RESOLUTION SELECTING AND AUTHORIZING AGREEMENTS WITH DOMUSSTUDIO ARCHITECTURE, SILLMAN WRIGHT ARCHITECTS, AND ROESLING NAKAMURA TERADA ARCHITECTS, INC. FOR AS-NEEDED ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$800,000

Sponsors:

Indexes:

Code sections:

Attachments: 1. 8. 2021-0291 Attachment A, 2. 8. 2021-0291 Attachment B, 3. 8. 2021-0291 Attachment C, 4. 8. 2021-0291 Attachment D, 5. 8. 2021-0291 Attachment E, 6. 8. 2021-0291 Attachment F, 7. 8. 2021-0291 Attachment G, 8. 8. 2021-0291 Attachment H, 9. 8. 2021-0291 Attachment I, 10. 8. 2021-0291 Attachment J, 11. 8. 2021-0291 Attachment K, 12. 8. 2021-0291 Attachment L, 13. 8. 2021-0291 Attachment M, 14. 8. 2021-0291 Attachment N, 15. 8. 2021-0291 Attachment O, 16. 8. 2021-0291 Attachment P, 17. 8. 2021-0291 Attachment Q, 18. 8. 2021-0291 Attachment R, 19. 8. 2021-0291 Attachment S, 20. 8. 2021-0291 Attachment T, 21. 8. 2021-0291 Attachment U, 22. 8. 2021-0291 Attachment V, 23. 8. 2021-0291A Draft Resolution, 24. 8. 2021-0291B Draft Resolution, 25. 8. 2021-0291C Draft Resolution, 26. 8. 2021-0291D Draft Resolution, 27. 8. 2021-0291E Draft Resolution

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
10/12/2021	1	Board of Port Commissioners	adopted as amended	Pass

DATE: October 13, 2021

SUBJECT:

RESOLUTIONS FOR AS-NEEDED SERVICE AGREEMENTS FOR FIVE-YEAR DURATIONS, WITH NO INCREASE TO THE MAJOR MAINTENANCE AND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM BUDGETS, AS FOLLOWS:

A) RESOLUTION SELECTING AND AUTHORIZING AGREEMENTS WITH RICK ENGINEERING COMPANY, NASLAND ENGINEERING, HARRIS & ASSOCIATES, INC., MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL, INC., NV5, INC., AND PSOMAS FOR AS-NEEDED CIVIL ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$4,000,000

B) RESOLUTION SELECTING AND AUTHORIZING AGREEMENTS WITH ARCADIS, U.S., INC., HARRIS & ASSOCIATES, INC., AECOM TECHNICAL SERVICES, AND HDR ENGINEERING, INC. FOR AS-NEEDED PROJECT MANAGEMENT/CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT SERVICES FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$2,500,000

C) RESOLUTION SELECTING AND AUTHORIZING AGREEMENTS WITH MOFFAT & NICHOL, SIMPSON GUMPERTZ & HEGER, INC., TRITON ENGINEERS, INC., AND GHD, INC. FOR AS-NEEDED MARINE STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$4,000,000

D) RESOLUTION SELECTING AND AUTHORIZING AGREEMENTS WITH BUREAU VERITAS NORTH AMERICA, INC., NV5 INC., AND INTERWEST CONSULTING GROUP FOR AS-NEEDED QUALITY CONTROL AND DESIGN REVIEW SERVICES FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$500,000

E) RESOLUTION SELECTING AND AUTHORIZING AGREEMENTS WITH DOMUSSTUDIO ARCHITECTURE, SILLMAN WRIGHT ARCHITECTS, AND ROESLING NAKAMURA TERADA ARCHITECTS, INC. FOR AS-NEEDED ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$800,000

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This action will authorize as-needed agreements for professional services to provide advanced technical skills and to supplement in-house resources. These services are necessary to support the implementation of the Capital Improvement Program, Major Maintenance, and Other Capital Projects. Typical engineering projects span over a year from initiation to design, and ultimately to construction. Multi-year agreements are essential for maintaining work continuity through that lifecycle and meeting project deadlines. This action does not increase the Capital Improvement or Major Maintenance Program budgets.

Each agreement covers a five-year period. The agreements are for the following aggregate amounts.

Category	Maximum Contract Amount
Civil Engineering	\$4,000,000

Project Management/Construction Management	\$2,500,000
Marine Structural Engineering Services	\$4,000,000
Quality Control and Design Review Services	\$500,000
Architectural Services	\$800,000

All recommended firms received a letter stating the Port District's commitment to inclusion, diversity, and equity (Attachment A). The letter requested firms provide information (if any) on their current programs and/or commitments related to these values. The District also requested information addressing how each firm will measure success of these values with respect to any programs and/or commitments the firm employs. Further, the revised agreements contain a new section requiring each firm to submit a written report describing their actions and results of its commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion within sixty (60) days prior to each anniversary date. All recommended firms supplied the requested information (Attachment B) and agreed on the agreement language revisions (Attachments C-W).

Pursuant to BPC Policy No. 110, the District issued four (4) Requests for Qualifications (RFQ) for engineering and related services on January 28, March 26, and March 30, 2021. The District received sixty-seven (67) responsive proposals and selected thirty-one (31) firms for interviews. Based on the firms' written proposals, formal interviews, and a robust decision analysis process using the criteria stated in the RFQ, the firms determined to be the highest qualified for the services solicited are recommended as follows:

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt the following resolutions for as-needed service agreements for five-year durations, with no increase to the Major Maintenance and Capital Improvement Program budgets, as follows:

- A. Resolution selecting and authorizing agreements with Rick Engineering Company, Nasland Engineering, Harris & Associates, Inc., Michael Baker International, Inc., NV5, Inc., and Psomas for as-needed civil engineering services for an amount not to exceed \$4,000,000.
- B. Resolution selecting and authorizing agreements with Arcadis, U.S., Inc., Harris & Associates, Inc., Aecom Technical Services, and HDR Engineering, Inc. for as-needed project management/construction management services for an amount not to exceed \$2,500,000.
- C. Resolution selecting and authorizing agreements with Moffat & Nichol, Simpson Gumpertz & Heger, Inc., Triton Engineers, Inc. and GHD, Inc. for as-needed marine structural engineering services for an amount not to exceed \$4,000,000.
- D. Resolution selecting and authorizing agreements with Bureau Veritas North America, Inc., NV5, Inc., and Interwest Consulting Group for as-needed quality control and design review services for an aggregate amount not to exceed \$500,000.
- E. Resolution selecting and authorizing agreements with Domusstudio Architecture, Sillman Wright Architects, and Roesling Nakamura Terada Architects, Inc. for as-needed architectural services for an aggregate amount not to exceed \$800,000.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no fiscal impact caused by approval of this action. Funds for the first year of expenditure, if needed, are included in the applicable project budget within the FY 2019-2023 Capital Improvement Program (CIP), the FY 2022 annual CIP budget, the FY 2022 annual Major Maintenance budget, or

the FY 2022 Other Capital and Equipment Outlay budget. Funds required for future fiscal years will be budgeted in the appropriate fiscal year and subject to Board approval upon adoption of each fiscal year's budget.

COMPASS STRATEGIC GOALS:

The authorization of these as-needed agreements will facilitate the execution of the District's public works projects to support maritime facilities, real estate development, environmental stewardship, public access and parks.

This agenda item supports the following Strategic Goal(s).

- A thriving and modern maritime seaport.
- A vibrant waterfront destination where residents and visitors converge.
- A Port with a healthy and sustainable bay and its environment.
- A Port that is a safe place to visit, work and play.

DISCUSSION:

The RFQs for As-Needed Civil Engineering services and Project Management/Construction Management services were issued on January 28, 2021. During the advertisement period, 1,615 vendors were notified, and 166 vendors registered as prospective respondents for the opportunity. A combined information exchange meeting for these RFQs, with 110 attendees, was held on February 9, 2021.

The RFQ for As-Needed Marine Structural Engineering was issued on January 28, 2021. During the advertisement period, 1,409 vendors were notified, and 53 vendors registered as prospective respondents for the opportunity. A combined information exchange meeting for this RFQ and the two above, with 110 attendees, was held on February 9, 2021.

The RFQ for As-Needed Quality Control and Design Review Services was issued on March 30, 2021. During the advertisement period, 1,127 vendors were notified, and 71 vendors registered as prospective respondents for the opportunity. A combined information exchange meeting for this RFQ and the one below, with 71 attendees, was held on April 8, 2021.

The RFQ for As-Needed Architectural Design Services was issued on March 26, 2021. During the advertisement period, 1,214 vendors were notified, and 120 vendors registered as prospective respondents for the opportunity. A combined information exchange meeting for this RFQ and the one above, with 71 attendees, was held on April 8, 2021.

Respondents to the RFQs were required to submit separate proposals for each category under which they sought to be considered for selection. Each agreement is for a five-year period. The agreement value for each was determined based on previous as-needed agreements and the expectation of future workloads. The following is a discussion of the selection process and staff recommendations for each category:

Civil Engineering

On March 3, 2021, the District received responsive Civil Engineering proposals from twenty-five (25)

firms. The firms are listed alphabetically in the following table:

Rank	Firm	Office Location
1	AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	San Diego, CA
2	Arcadis U.S., Inc.	San Diego, CA
3	Blue Lake Civil	La Mesa, CA
4	Burns & McDonnell Engineering Co., Inc.	La Jolla, CA
5	Chen Ryan Associates, Inc.	San Diego, CA
6	CivilPros	San Diego, CA
7	Coffman Engineers, Inc.	San Diego, CA
8	Cordoba Corporation	San Diego, CA
9	Dokken Engineering	San Diego, CA
10	Hale Engineering	San Diego, CA
11	Harris & Associates, Inc.	San Diego, CA
12	HDR Engineering, Inc.	San Diego, CA
13	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	San Diego, CA
14	KPFF Consulting Engineers	Long Beach, CA
15	Latitude 33 Planning and Engineering	San Diego, CA
16	Michael Baker International, Inc.	San Diego, CA
17	Nasland Engineering	San Diego, CA
18	NV5, Inc.	San Diego, CA
19	Parsons Corporation	San Diego, CA
20	Psomas	San Diego, CA
21	Quality Infrastructure Corporation	La Mesa, CA
22	Reid Middleton, Inc.	San Diego, CA
23	Richard Brady & Associates, Inc.	San Diego, CA
24	Rick Engineering Company	San Diego, CA
25	Wood Rogers, Inc.	San Diego, CA

Qualifications were reviewed by a panel of District staff. Eleven (11) of the twenty-five (25) submitting firms were selected for interviews based on their written proposals, and interviews were conducted on April 6 through 8, 2021. The evaluation panel considered the written proposals, presentations, and responses to interview questions, and the firms were subsequently ranked based on the criteria established in the RFQ. The six (6) top-ranked firms interviewed are described below, in the order in which they were ranked:

#1 Rick Engineering Company has a strong civil design experience including traffic, multiple stakeholders, and regulatory processes. The company is experienced in public works projects for all member cities as well as the Port. Their presentation clearly, concisely, and logically demonstrated a strong understanding of the Port's needs including Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC), schedules, innovative technology, drone and 3D surveying. Their key sub-consultants provide supporting services for Utility Locating & Potholing, Mechanical & Utility Design, Stormwater,

Drainage, Water Quality, Environmental/Biology, Coastal, Electrical, and Structural Engineering.

#2 Nasland Engineering has extensive relevant experience with public agencies in areas of stormwater, sea level rise, structural, geotechnical, traffic, and coastal engineering. Their presentation was clear, logical, and demonstrated a strong understanding of Port's requirements and needs including QA/QC, and outlined specific procedures and specifications used to minimize change orders. Their key sub-consultants provide supporting services for Landscape Architecture, Architecture, Traffic Engineering, Structural Engineering, Coastal Engineering / Sea Level Rise Consulting, and Geotechnical Engineering.

#3 Harris & Associates, Inc. has excellent relevant experience with Port and public agencies in design, construction, structures, water and distribution pipelines and storage, water treatment, and roadways. Their presentation demonstrated meeting the Port's needs for QA/QC, and outlined specific procedures and specifications used to minimize change orders. Their key sub consultants provide supporting services for Geotechnical and environmental Consulting, Cost Estimating, Mechanical Electrical and Plumbing Engineering, Land Surveying, Landscape Architecture, Structural, Coastal, Stormwater/Drainage Potholing and Subsurface Utility Location and drafting.

#4 Michael Baker International, Inc. has experience relevant to the RFQs scope with the Port and other public agencies. Their presentation was clear and logical and demonstrated how they can meet the Port's needs with a well-defined organizational QA/QC program. Their key sub consultants will provide supporting services for Structural Engineering, Potholing and Utility Locating, Geology/Geotechnical, Electrical Engineering, and Landscape Architecture.

#5 NV5, Inc. has extensive experience in civil engineering with public agencies in the areas of stormwater, drainage, and flood control. They have provided technical expertise for developing the Design Manual, Construction Management Procedures Manual and Survey Procedures Manual for the Port's Engineering Department. They have an expert in-house design team, and their key sub consultant provides supporting services for Coastal Engineering.

#6 Psomas has a strong public agency experience with various agencies and all the Port's member cities, including focused areas of maintenance, parks and streets. Their presentation clearly demonstrated meeting the Port's needs in QA/QC through an outlined general procedure, use of new technology and effective communication. Their key sub consultants provide supporting services for Structural, Potholing, Landscape and Architecture, Mechanical, Electrical and Plumbing Engineering, and Coastal/Geotechnical.

The selection panel found that Rick Engineering Company, Nasland Engineering, Harris & Associates, Inc., Michael Baker International, Inc., NV5, Inc., and Psomas were the highest qualified candidates based on the experience of their staff and firm, approach to the project, capability to perform, and fair and reasonable cost. Based on this analysis, staff concluded the proposed agreements will achieve the best value to the District. Furthermore, these firms successfully demonstrated their commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Staff recommends the Board adopt a resolution selecting and authorizing agreements with Rick Engineering Company, Nasland Engineering, Harris & Associates, Inc., Michael Baker International, Inc., NV5, Inc., and Psomas for As-Needed Civil Engineering Services.

Project Management / Construction Management

On March 3, 2021, the District received responsive Project Management / Construction Management qualification proposals from ten (10) firms. The firms are listed alphabetically in the following table:

Firm	Office Location
Accurate Testing & Inspection, LLC.	San Diego, CA
AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	San Diego, CA
Arcadis U.S., Inc.	San Diego, CA
Blue Lake Civil	San Diego, CA
Burns & McDonnell Engineering	San Diego, CA
Creative Builds	San Diego, CA
Harris & Associates, Inc.	San Diego, CA
HDR Engineering, Inc.	San Diego, CA
Project Professionals Corporation	San Diego, CA
Psomas	San Diego, CA

Qualifications were initially reviewed by a panel of District staff. Six (6) of the ten (10) firms were selected for interviews based on their written proposals and interviews were conducted on May 6 and 7, 2021. The evaluation panel considered the written proposals, presentations, and responses to interview questions, and the firms were then ranked based on the criteria established in the RFQ. The six (6) top-ranked firms interviewed are described below, in the order in which they were ranked: #1 Arcadis U.S., Inc., a large international engineering firm proposed a small focused and highly capable team of professionals for these services. The team members, including subconsultants Alyson Consulting, Davy Architecture Inc., Loveless Linton Inc., and Ninyo & Moore, have all been part of delivering successful results on past District projects and similar projects for other public agencies. Their approach was thorough and directly tailored to the District's needs for creative solutions on scaling services up or down to match the timing and level of services needed by the Port. Arcadis' proposed costs were the most competitive of all the selected firms.

#2 Harris & Associates, Inc. proposed a strong and experienced team of members, some of whom are former District employees. Harris presented a creative, accommodating, and complete approach to providing services specifically tailored to the needs of the District. Nearly all services they currently deliver are provided to other public agencies. Their proposed in-house and subconsultant resources, including Moffatt & Nichol and Ninyo & Moore, are broad based and experienced, assuring the capability to provide the services needed by the District. Harris' proposed costs were among the most competitive of all finalists.

#3 AECOM Technical Services, Inc. proposed a strong team with significant relevant experience. Their firm has extensive experience on projects serving the District and several other similar agencies. Their approach and capability to perform were demonstrated by their vast local resources and a thorough project delivery plan. Nearly all AECOM services will be provided by their in-house staff. Proposed costs were comparable yet slightly higher than the other selected firms.

#4 HDR Engineering, Inc., a large international engineering firm, proposed a small tactical and capable team of professionals for these services. Their proposed project team has vast experience working with public agencies including the District. Their approach to this RFQ was tailored to the District's specific needs. HDR Engineering, Inc. proposed a comprehensive team of subconsultants

including Moffat & Nichol, GHD Inc., and O'Day Consultants, all of which have experience providing services to the District on various projects. Their proposed costs were higher than most of the other finalists.

#5 Burns & McDonnell, a large international engineering firm, proposed a local and capable team of professionals for these services. The firm emphasized broad and very capable experience with agencies, including the District; however, the experience emphasized in their submittal seemed limited to renewable/clean energy and environmental projects. Their proposed costs were the highest of all finalists.

#6 Blue Lake Civil is a small locally based firm that specializes in providing CM services as well as staff augmentation to local agencies. The majority of their proposed team members have extensive experience providing services and delivering projects similar to those of the District. Their approach is hands-on and being readily accessible. Their proposed costs are reasonable compared to the other finalists. However, their approach to project and capability to perform were not as robust as other firms.

The selection panel found that Arcadis U.S., Inc., Harris & Associates, Inc., AECOM Technical Services, and HDR Engineering, Inc. were the highest qualified firms based on the experience of their staff and firm, approach to the project, capability to perform, and fair and reasonable cost. Also, these firms successfully demonstrated their commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Based on this analysis, staff concluded the proposed agreements will achieve the best value to the District. Staff recommends the Board adopt a resolution selecting and authorizing an agreement with Arcadis U.S., Inc., Harris & Associates, Inc., AECOM Technical Services, and HDR Engineering, Inc. for As-Needed Project Management/ Construction Management Services.

Marine Structural Engineering Services

The solicitation for as-needed services was advertised on January 28, 2021. On March 23, 2021, the District received responsive qualification proposals from seven (7) firms. The firms are listed below in the following table:

Firm	Office Location
GHD, Inc.	San Diego, CA
KPFF Consulting Engineers	San Diego, CA
Moffat & Nichol	San Diego, CA
Reid Middleton, Inc.	San Diego, CA
Simpson Gumpertz & Heger, Inc.	Long Beach, CA
Triton Engineers, Inc.	San Diego, CA
WSP USA	San Diego, CA

Qualifications were reviewed by a panel of District staff. Five (5) of the seven (7) firms were selected for interviews based on their written proposals, and interviews were conducted on May 25, 2021. The evaluation panel considered the written proposals, presentations, and responses to interview questions, and the firms were ranked based on the criteria established in the RFQ. The results are documented in the Decision Analysis Matrix prepared by the District's selection panel. The top five ranked firms interviewed are described below, in the order in which they were ranked:

#1 Moffat & Nichol demonstrated extensive local and regional marine structural engineering experience and expertise. The firm has designed numerous projects around the San Diego Bay for the Navy, the District, and other agencies throughout southern California. The firm has a large team of professionals with extensive expertise in marine structural and civil engineering combined with a staff with longevity and continuity. The firm has successfully demonstrated the ability to respond quickly to emergency repairs, complete projects on time, and perform constructability plan checks. In addition, the firm has an extensive library of project plans completed for the District.

#2 Simpson Gumpertz & Heger, Inc. has demonstrated extensive regional experience and technical expertise. The firm has been involved in a small number of projects around the San Diego Bay with most of its experience throughout various California ports. The firm has a moderately sized team of professionals with significant expertise and experience in marine structural and civil engineering. The firm has demonstrated the capacity to perform constructability reviews and shown a strong understanding of construction costs and how to complete projects on time and within budget.

#3 Triton Engineers, Inc. has successfully completed numerous projects around the San Diego Bay for the District, the Navy, local shipyards, and numerous marinas. The firm has a small team of professionals with established expertise and experience in marine structural and civil engineering services. The firm has demonstrated the capacity to perform constructability reviews. Their approach to this RFQ was thorough and directly tailored to the District's needs as they presented unique and creative solutions on scaling services up or down in accordance with the timing and level of services needed by the District. The firm has the most competitive rates of all interviewees.

#4 GHD, Inc. a large nationwide firm, demonstrated extensive local and regional experience and expertise in the field of marine structural engineering. The firm has designed numerous projects around the San Diego Bay for the Navy and throughout the West Coast. The firm is equipped with a large team of professionals having extensive expertise in marine structural engineering, civil engineering and various disciplines and lengthy experience from which the Port District may benefit from while working together.

#5 KPFF Consulting Engineers demonstrated an adequate amount of experience in marine structural engineering with a list of successfully completed projects along the West Coast. The firm has a small team of professionals with extensive expertise in marine structural and civil engineering services, including constructability reviews. However, their approach to solicitation was not comprehensive and did not focus on the District's needs or the requirements stated in the solicitation.

The selection panel found that Moffat & Nichol, Simpson Gumpertz & Heger, Inc., Triton Engineers, Inc. and GHD, Inc. were the highest qualified companies based on the experience of their staff and firm, approach to the project, capability to perform, and fair and reasonable cost. Also, these firms successfully demonstrated their commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Based on this analysis, staff concluded the proposed agreements will achieve the best value to the District. Staff recommends the Board adopt a resolution selecting and authorizing an agreement with Moffat & Nichol, Simpson Gumpertz & Heger, Inc., Triton Engineers, Inc. and GHD, Inc. for As-Needed Marine Structural Engineering Services.

Quality Control and Design Review Services

On May 4, 2021, the District received responsive qualification proposals for Quality Control and

Design Review Services from ten (10) firms. The firms are listed in the following table:

Firm	Office Location
Bureau Veritas North America, Inc.	Santa Ana, CA
Glumac	San Diego, CA
IMEG Corp	San Diego, CA
Interwest Consulting Group	Irvine, CA
JayVee Engineering	San Diego, CA
Mour Group Engineering + Design, Inc.	San Diego, CA
NV5, Inc.	San Diego, CA
Pars Consulting Engineers, Inc.	Santa Ana, CA
True North Compliance Services, Inc.	San Diego, CA
VASISHTA Consulting International	Torrance, CA

Qualifications were reviewed by a panel of District staff. Four (4) of the ten (10) firms were selected for interviews based on their written proposals, and interviews were conducted on June 23, 2021. The evaluation panel considered the written proposals, presentations, and responses to interview questions, and the firms were ranked based on the criteria established in the RFQ. The four (4) top-ranked firms interviewed are described below, in the order in which they were ranked:

#1 Bureau Veritas North America Inc., a large international engineering firm, proposed a small focused and highly capable team of professionals for these services. The team members, including subconsultants JR Conkey & Associates, NCM Engineering Corp., and Ninyo & Moore, have all been part of delivering successful results on past District projects and on similar projects for other agencies. Their approach was thorough and directly tailored to the District's needs as they presented unique and creative solutions on scaling services up or down depending on the timing and level of services needed. Bureau Veritas' proposed costs were the third highest of all finalists.

#2 NV5, Inc. proposed a strong and experienced team of members. NV5, Inc. presented a creative, accommodating, and complete approach to providing services specifically tailored to the needs of the District and nearly all services they currently deliver are provided to other public agencies. NV5, Inc. serves on the current District as-needed quality control and design review services agreement. Their proposed in-house and subconsultant resources, including West Coast Civil, a minority business enterprise (MBE), are broad based and experienced assuring capability to provide the services needed by the District. NV5's proposed costs were slightly higher compared to all finalists.

#3 Interwest Consulting Group proposed a strong team with significant relevant experience. Their firm has extensive experience on projects serving the District and several other similar agencies. They serve on the current as-needed quality control and design review services for the District. Their approach and capability to perform were demonstrated by their vast local resources and a clear and thorough project delivery plan. Nearly all Interwest services will be provided by in-house staff. Proposed costs were the most competitive of all the finalists.

#4 True North Compliance Services, Inc., founded and incorporated in California in 2020, proposed a small tactical and capable team of professionals for building, fire, planning and engineering services. Their proposed project team has experience working with or for public agencies. Their approach to

the RFQ was the tailored to the District's specific needs specified in this RFQ. True North proposed a competitive team with experience in structural, civil plan review, fire protection and life safety, certified building officials, and inspection services. Their proposed costs were the second most competitive of the other finalists. Although the firm had a good proposal, their interview was not as strong as the other firms and the firm has been in existence for only one (1) year.

The selection panel found that Bureau Veritas North America, Inc., NV5, Inc., and Interwest Consulting Group were the highest qualified based on the experience of their staff and firm, approach to the project, capability to perform, and fair and reasonable cost. Based on this analysis, staff concluded the proposed agreements will achieve the best value to the District. Also, these firms successfully demonstrated their commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Staff recommends the Board adopt a resolution selecting and authorizing an agreement with Bureau Veritas North America, Inc., NV5, Inc., and Interwest Consulting Group for As-Needed Quality Control and Design Review Services.

Architectural Design Services

On April 28, 2021, the District received responsive qualification proposals for Architectural Design Services from twenty (20) firms. The firms are listed in the following table.

Firm	Office Location
Alcorn & Benton Architects	La Jolla, CA
Architects Mosher Drew	San Diego, CA
Bureau Veritas	Irvine, CA
Carrier Johnson	San Diego, CA
Davy Architecture, Inc	San Diego, CA
Delawie	San Diego, CA
Domusstudio Architecture	San Diego, CA
Jeff Katz Architecture	San Diego, CA
LA design Group, Inc	Diamond Bar, CA
Mour Group Engineering + Design, Inc	San Diego, CA
ObrArchitecture, Inc	San Diego, CA
PGAL, Inc	San Diego, CA
RDC	San Diego, CA
Robina Wright Architect and Associates, Inc	Fresno, CA
Roesling Nakamura Terada Architects, Inc	San Diego, CA
Safdie Rabines Architects	San Diego, CA
SGPA Planning and Architecture	San Diego, CA
Sillman Wright Architects	San Diego, CA
The Miller Hull Partnership	San Diego, CA
Tucker Sadler Architects, Inc	San Diego, CA

Qualifications were reviewed by a panel of District staff. Five (5) of the twenty (20) firms were

selected for interviews based on their written proposals and interviews were conducted on June 22, 2021. The evaluation panel considered the written proposals, presentations, and responses to interview questions, and the firms were ranked based on the criteria established in the RFQ. The five (5) top-ranked firms interviewed are described below, in the order in which they were ranked:

#1 Domusstudio Architecture is a locally based company with a robust team with direct architecture experience among multiple local government entities including the District on the Annex Building Restroom and Administration Building Fitness Center projects. Their detailed approach focuses heavily on Building Information Modeling (BIM) and other innovative technology with a strong project management plan. Their labor costs were below average of the interviewed firms.

#2 Sillman Wright Architects is a locally based company that has experience working on multiple District projects. They have forty-five (45) years' experience and a strong number of LEED certified staff. Their approach to projects was clear and defined, with a deep use of technology and a robust quality assurance and quality check process. Their labor costs were also below average of the interviewed firms.

#3 Roesling Nakamura Terada Architect, Inc is a locally based company that has extensive experience in universal design which conceptionally proposes designs for products and spaces for use by everyone, without the need for adaptation or specialized designs. This approach differs from traditional ADA designs. They have also worked previously as a subcontractor on District projects and with port tenants on various architectural design projects. They have a sound project management approach that focuses on client needs using appropriate technology. Their labor costs were higher than the average of the interviewed firms.

#4 Architects Mosher Drew is a locally based company with significant experience working with government and public infrastructure. Their approach to project emphasizes good project management, technology, and quality assurance built into their process. Their labor costs were below average of the interviewed firms.

The last firm (PGAL) was not recommended for award because they did not score as highly in the interview and in the grading criteria as the other firms.

Architects Mosher Drew (4th in Rank) withdrew their proposal as the Port Attorney could not come to agreement with their attorney's request for modifications to the standard Port agreement.

The selection panel found that Domusstudio Architecture, Sillman Wright Architects, and Roesling Nakamura Terada Architects, Inc. were the highest qualified based on the experience of their staff and firm, approach to the project, capability to perform, and fair and reasonable cost. Also, these firms successfully demonstrated their commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Based on this analysis, staff concluded the proposed agreements will achieve the best value to the District. Staff recommends the Board adopt a resolution selecting and authorizing an agreement with Domusstudio Architecture, Sillman Wright Architects, and Roesling Nakamura Terada Architect, Inc. for As-Needed Architectural Services.

General Counsel's Comments:

The Office of the General Counsel has reviewed and approved this agenda, proposed agreements,

and resolutions, as presented, as to form and legality.

Environmental Review:

The proposed Board action, including without limitation, a resolution authorizing various agreements to provide as-needed engineering, architectural, and project management services, does not constitute a “project” under the definition set forth in California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Sections 15352 and 15378 because no direct or indirect changes to the physical environment would occur. CEQA requires that the District adequately assess the environmental impacts of projects and reasonably foreseeable activities that may result from projects prior to the approval of the same. Any project developed as a result of the proposed Board action that requires the District or the Board’s discretionary approval resulting in a physical change to the environment will be analyzed in accordance with CEQA prior to such approval. CEQA review may result in the District, in its sole and absolute discretion, requiring implementation of mitigation measures, adopting an alternative, including without limitation, a “no project alternative” or adopting a Statement of Overriding Consideration, if required. The proposed Board action in no way limits the exercise of this discretion. Therefore, no further CEQA review is required.

The proposed Board action allows for the District to implement its obligations under Sections 35 and 81 of the Port Act, which authorize the Board to do acts necessary and convenient for the exercise of its power; and the use funds for necessary expenses of conducting the District. The Port Act was enacted by the California Legislature and is consistent with the Public Trust Doctrine. Consequently, the proposed Board action is consistent with the Public Trust Doctrine.

The proposed Board action does not allow for “development,” as defined in Section 30106 of the California Coastal Act, or “new development,” pursuant to Section 1.a. of the District’s Coastal Development Permit (CDP) Regulations because it will not result in, without limitation, a physical change, change in use or increase the intensity of uses. Therefore, issuance of a Coastal Development Permit or exclusion is not required. However, development within the District requires processing under the District’s CDP Regulations. Future development, as defined in Section 30106 of the Coastal Act, will remain subject to its own independent review pursuant to the District’s certified CDP Regulations, PMP, and Chapters 3 and 8 of the Coastal Act. The proposed Board action in no way limits the exercise of the District’s discretion under the District’s CDP Regulations. Therefore, issuance of a CDP or exclusion is not required at this time.

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Program:

No direct DEI impact.

PREPARED BY:

Ernesto Medina
Chief Engineer, Engineering Construction

Attachment(s):

Attachment A: Letter to Recommended Firms

Attachment B: Firm Responses to Letter
Attachment C: Draft Agreement No. 47-2021SN Rick Engineering
Attachment D: Draft Agreement No. 48-2021SN Nasland Engineering
Attachment E: Draft Agreement No. 49-2021SN Harris and Associates, Inc.
Attachment F: Draft Agreement No. 50-2021SN Michael Baker International
Attachment G: Draft Agreement No. 51-2021SN NV5, Inc.
Attachment H: Draft Agreement No. 52-2021SN Psomas
Attachment I: Draft Agreement No. 74-2021SN Arcadis U.S. Inc.
Attachment J: Draft Agreement No. 75-2021SN Harris and Associates, Inc.
Attachment K: Draft Agreement No. 76-2021SN AECOM Technical
Attachment L: Draft Agreement No. 77-2021SN HDR Engineering, Inc.
Attachment M: Draft Agreement No. 80-2021SN Moffatt and Nichol
Attachment N: Draft Agreement No. 81-2021SN Simpson Gumpertz and Heger, Inc.
Attachment O: Draft Agreement No. 82-2021SN Triton Engineering, Inc.
Attachment P: Draft Agreement No. 83-2021SN GHD, Inc.
Attachment Q: Draft Agreement No. 102-2021JR Bureau Veritas North America Inc.
Attachment R: Draft Agreement No. 103-2021JR NV5, Inc.
Attachment S: Draft Agreement No. 104-2021JR Interwest Consulting Group, Inc.
Attachment T: Draft Agreement No. 113-2021RH Domusstudio Architecture, LLP
Attachment U: Draft Agreement No. 114-2021RH Roseling Nakamura Terada Architects
Attachment V: Draft Agreement No. 115-2021RH Sillman Wright Architects