

**FILE NUMBER: 2025-144**

**DATE:** Tuesday, July 15, 2025

**SUBJECT: As-Needed Environmental Review and Consulting Service Agreements**

**DESCRIPTION: As-Needed Environmental Review and Master Planning/Urban Design Consulting Services Agreements for a Total Aggregate Amount Not to Exceed \$5,000,000 From July 1, 2025 Through June 30, 2030: A) Resolution Selecting and Authorizing Agreements with the Following Service Providers for As-Needed Environmental Review Consulting Services: Ascent Environmental, Inc.; Chambers Group, Inc.; Dudek; ECORP Consulting, Inc.; EPD Solutions, Inc.; Eyestone Environmental LLC; GHD Inc.; HDR Engineering, Inc; Stantec; and Summit Planning Group, LLC. All Funds Required for Future Fiscal Years will be Budgeted in the Appropriate Fiscal Year, Subject to Board Approval Upon Adoption of Each Fiscal Year's Budget. B) Resolution Selecting and Authorizing Agreements with the Following Service Providers for As-Needed Master Planning/Urban Design Consulting Services: Ascent Environmental, Inc.; Civitas, Inc.; Dudek; Intersecting Metrics; MIG, Inc; NexusPlan, Inc.; Perkins Eastman; Rick Engineering Company; Rios; Stantec; Summit Planning Group, LLC; and SWA Group, Inc. All Funds Required for Future Fiscal Years will be Budgeted in the Appropriate Fiscal Year, Subject to Board Approval Upon Adoption of Each Fiscal Year's Budget.**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The San Diego Unified Port District's (District) Planning Department performs a variety of environmental and land use planning research, analyses, and regulatory document preparation for District-initiated projects, plans, policies, and studies. The Planning Department develops long-range and master planning programs and projects, and also completes environmental review (e.g., review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)) and entitlements (e.g., coastal development permits) for initiatives in the other departments of the Sustainability & Innovation Branch – Aquaculture and Blue Technology, Climate & Sustainability, Environmental Conservation, and Environmental Protection. For many years, the Planning Department has established as-needed environmental review, technical services and specialties, and master planning consulting services agreements ("as-needed agreements") in order to retain consultants in a more efficient manner to facilitate project processing. The existing as-needed agreements were approved by the Board of Port Commissioners (BPC or Board) in 2020 and staff proposes to establish a new set of as-needed agreements for future projects.

Pursuant to BPC Policy No. 110, District staff issued Request for Qualifications (RFQ) 24-32RH for as-needed environmental review and master planning/urban design consulting services on January 15, 2025. The District received a total of 24 responsive submittals, from 19 different firms. Based on the written proposals and a decision analysis conducted utilizing the criteria stated in the RFQ, District staff is recommending the Board select and authorize 22 agreements with the following 18 firms, within two categories of services:

- **Category 1 – As-Needed Environmental Review Consulting Services:** Ascent Environmental, Inc.; Chambers Group, Inc.; Dudek; ECORP Consulting, Inc.; EPD Solutions, Inc.; Eyestone Environmental LLC; GHD Inc.; HDR Engineering, Inc.; Stantec; and Summit Planning Group, LLC.
- **Category 2 – As-Needed Master Planning/Urban Design Consulting Services:** Ascent Environmental, Inc.; Civitas, Inc.; Dudek; Intersecting Metrics; MIG, Inc.; NexusPlan, Inc.; Perkins Eastman; Rick Engineering Company; Rios; Stantec; Summit Planning Group, LLC; and SWA Group, Inc.

Four of the selected firms (Ascent Environmental, Inc., Dudek, Stantec, and Summit Planning Group, LLC) were selected for both categories (Environmental Review and Master Planning/Urban Design).

Due to the numerous work efforts anticipated and the variety of tasks that may be needed, retaining several as-needed consultants will establish a greater capacity to work on multiple projects concurrently and the ability to cover various planning-related specialties (e.g., master planning, urban design, and CEQA analysis). To maximize flexibility and efficiency in retaining the appropriate consultants to assist with the District's planning efforts, staff recommends the Board authorize entering into as-needed agreements with a total of 30 firms covering the scope of services solicited by this RFQ process. A full list of the firms and a summary of their experience is included in Attachment A.

Upon Board approval, Agreement Nos. 54-2025RH through 63-2025RH will be executed for Category 1 (Environmental Review), and Agreement Nos. 64-2025RH through 75-2025RH will be executed for Category 2 (Master Planning/Urban Design). Each agreement is for a five-year period beginning July 16, 2025, and ending June 30, 2030. The aggregate total of all agreements will not exceed \$5 million. All funds for future fiscal years will be budgeted in the appropriate fiscal year, subject to Board approval upon adoption of each fiscal year's budget.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Adopt a resolution Selecting and Authorizing Five-Year Agreements with Ascent Environmental, Inc.; Chambers Group, Inc.; Dudek; ECORP Consulting, Inc.; EPD Solutions, Inc.; Eyestone Environmental LLC; GHD Inc.; HDR Engineering, Inc.; Stantec; and Summit Planning Group, LLC for As-Needed Environmental Review Consulting Services, and with Ascent Environmental, Inc.; Civitas, Inc.; Dudek; Intersecting Metrics; MIG, Inc.; NexusPlan, Inc.; Perkins Eastman; Rick Engineering Company; Rios; Stantec; Summit Planning Group, LLC; and SWA Group, Inc. for As-Needed Master Planning/Urban Design Consulting Services for an Aggregate Amount not to Exceed \$5,000,000 Beginning July 16, 2025 and Ending June 30, 2030. All Funds for Future Fiscal Years will be Budgeted in the Appropriate Fiscal Year, Subject to Board Approval upon Adoption of each Fiscal Year's Budget.

## **FISCAL IMPACT:**

Funds required for Fiscal Year 2026 (FY 2026) are budgeted in the Planning Department's Professional Services expense account. Funds required for future fiscal years will be budgeted for in the appropriate fiscal years and cost account, subject to Board approval upon adoption of each fiscal year's budget.

## **COMPASS STRATEGIC GOALS:**

This agenda item supports the following Strategic Goals.

- A Port that the public understands and trusts.
- 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 with a comprehensive vision for Port land and water uses integrated to regional plans.
- A Port that is a safe place to visit, work and play.

## **DISCUSSION:**

The District's Planning Department performs a variety of environmental and land use planning research, analyses, and regulatory document preparation for District-initiated projects, plans, policies, and studies. The Planning Department develops long-range and master planning programs and projects, and also completes environmental review (e.g., review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act) and entitlements (e.g., coastal development permits) for initiatives in the other departments of the Sustainability & Innovation Branch – Aquaculture and Blue Technology, Climate & Sustainability, Environmental Conservation, and Environmental Protection.

For many years, the Planning Department has established as-needed consulting services agreements in order to retain consultants in a more efficient manner to facilitate project review. The current as-needed agreements were approved by the Board in 2020, and have been extended once since then. All current agreements will expire on June 29, 2026, and staff would like to establish a new set of as-needed agreements for future projects. Accordingly, pursuant to BPC Policy No. 110, the District completed an RFQ process, to solicit consultants to provide professional services for two separate categories of services – Category 1, Environmental Review; and Category 2, Master Planning/Urban Design. Examples of work efforts that would fall within Category 1, Environmental Review consulting services, include but are not limited to: preparation of environmental review documents pursuant to CEQA or the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and associated technical studies (e.g., traffic analysis or air quality analysis). Examples of work efforts that would fall within Category 2, Master Planning/Urban Design consulting services, include but are not limited to: preparation of consistency analyses related to the Port Master Plan Update, preparing massing and test fits, and assisting with the Coastal Commission certification process for the Port Master Plan Update.

Updating the Planning Department's list of as-needed environmental review and master planning/urban design consulting services will continue to streamline the solicitation process for retaining consultants to conduct environmental review and master planning/urban design services. Use of the current as-needed agreements has allowed Planning staff to more efficiently and expeditiously retain consultants as needed, rather than going through a separate RFQ consultant procurement process for each project that is assigned to the Planning Department. Staff has also found that retaining as-needed consultants ensures a prompt response and competitive pricing for the requested services.

For projects assigned to the Planning Department, staff will select a consultant (often through a "mini-solicitation" process amongst the on-call consultants) and develop a scope of work and negotiate an appropriate fee that will be memorialized in an individual task authorization. Any authorized funds for projects will be expended, as needed, and based on specific requirements as determined by the District.

#### RFQ Process, Decision Analysis, and Recommendation

Staff has implemented the process for procurement of consultants in accordance with BPC Policy No. 110. The RFQ (RFQ 24-32RH) for as-needed environmental review & master planning/urban design consulting services was issued on January 15, 2025, and an information exchange meeting was held on January 23, 2025. During the advertisement period, there were 980 vendors notified and 85 vendors who downloaded the RFQ and associated files. Submittals were due on February 18, 2025, with the District receiving 24 responsive submittals from 19 different firms.

Qualifications were reviewed by a panel of District staff from the Planning and Climate and Sustainability Departments. The panel considered the written submittals and, based on a decision analysis process facilitated by the Procurement Department, the firms were evaluated based on the criteria established in the RFQ and weighted scoring system established in the RFQ as illustrated in the following table:

<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>	<u>Weight</u>	<u>Maximum Score</u>
Experience of Proposed Staff	10	100
Approach to the Project	9	90
Capability to Perform	8	80
Fair and Reasonable Cost	6	60

As a result of the decision analysis, 18 firms are recommended for the new as-needed agreements, including 10 firms for Category 1 (Environmental Review) and 12 firms for Category 2 (Master Planning/Urban Design). The selected firms are as follows (in alphabetical order):

#### Category 1 – As-Needed Environmental Review Consulting Services:

- Ascent Environmental, Inc.
- Chambers Group, Inc.
- Dudek

- ECORP Consulting, Inc.
- EPD Solutions, Inc.
- Eyestone Environmental LLC
- GHD Inc.
- HDR Engineering, Inc.
- Stantec
- Summit Planning Group, LLC.

Category 2 – As-Needed Master Planning/Urban Design Consulting Services:

- Ascent Environmental, Inc.
- Civitas, Inc.
- Dudek
- Intersecting Metrics
- MIG, Inc.
- NexusPlan, Inc.
- Perkins Eastman
- Rick Engineering Company
- Rios
- Stantec
- Summit Planning Group, LLC
- SWA Group, Inc.

Four of the selected firms (Ascent Environmental, Inc., Dudek, Stantec, and Summit Planning Group, LLC) were selected for both categories (Environmental Review and Master Planning/Urban Design).

The 18 firms recommended for the new as-needed agreements are being recommended to the Board for five-year agreements not to exceed an aggregate amount of \$5 million. A full list of the firms and a summary of their experience is included in Attachment A.

Conclusion

The recommended firms were selected due to the firms' demonstration of the most relevant staff experience, thorough and well thought-out approach, understanding of the District's needs related to environmental review and master planning/urban design, as applicable to the category in which they submitted for, as well as fair and reasonable cost. District staff therefore recommends that the Board select and authorize as-needed agreements with these firms to provide as-needed environmental review and urban design/master planning consulting services for District-initiated projects, and other projects assigned to the Planning Department, for a total aggregate amount payable under the agreements not to exceed \$5,000,000 for a period of five years (Attachments B – W).

**General Counsel's Comments:**

The Office of the General Counsel has reviewed this staff report and the attachments as presented to it and approves them as to form and legality.

## **Environmental Review:**

The proposed Board action, including without limitation approving the selection and authorization of five-year agreements for as-needed environmental review consulting services and for as-needed master planning/urban design consulting services, does not constitute a project under the definition set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15378 because the proposed Board action will not result in a direct or indirect physical change in the environment. Therefore, the proposed Board action is not subject to CEQA and no further action under CEQA is required.

The proposed Board action complies with Sections 21, 35, and 81 of the Port Act, which allow for the Board to pass resolutions and to do all acts necessary and convenient for the exercise of its powers; and to 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.

Finally, the proposed Board action does not allow for “development”, as defined in Section 30106 of the Coastal Act, or “new development” pursuant to Section 1.a. of the District’s Coastal Development Permit Regulations. Therefore, issuance of a Coastal Development Permit or exclusion is not required.

## **Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Program:**

A 10% SBE goal was established for this opportunity. The recommended firms listed SBE subcontractors as part of their teams to meet the 10% goal.

## **PREPARED BY:**

Lisa Madsen  
Senior Planner, Planning

Anna Buzaitis  
Program Director, Planning

## **Attachments:**

Attachment A:	Summary Information for Selected Firms
Attachment B:	Draft Agreement 54-2025RH with Ascent Environmental, Inc. for Environmental Review Consulting Services
Attachment C:	Draft Agreement 55-2025RH with Chambers Group for Environmental Review Consulting Services
Attachment D:	Draft Agreement 56-2025RH with Dudek for Environmental Review Consulting Services
Attachment E:	Draft Agreement 57-2025RH with ECORP Consulting, Inc. for Environmental Review Consulting Services

Attachment F: Draft Agreement 58-2025RH with Environment Planning Development Solutions, Inc. (EPD) for Environmental Review Consulting Services

Attachment G: Draft Agreement 59-2025RH with Eyestone Environmental, LLC for Environmental Review Consulting Services

Attachment H: Draft Agreement 60-2025RH with GHD, Inc. for Environmental Review Consulting Services

Attachment I: Draft Agreement 61-2025RH with HDR Engineering, Inc. for Environmental Review Consulting Services

Attachment J: Draft Agreement 62-2025RH with Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. for Environmental Review Consulting Services

Attachment K: Draft Agreement 63-2025RH with Summit Planning Group, LLC for Environmental Review Consulting Services

Attachment L: Draft Agreement 64-2025RH with Ascent Environmental, Inc. for Master Planning/Urban Design Consulting Services

Attachment M: Draft Agreement 65-2025RH with Civitas, Inc. for Master Planning/Urban Design Consulting Services

Attachment N: Draft Agreement 66-2025RH with Dudek for Master Planning/Urban Design Consulting Services

Attachment O: Draft Agreement 67-2025RH with Intersecting Metrics for Master Planning/Urban Design Consulting Services

Attachment P: Draft Agreement 68-2025RH with Moore Iacofano Goltsman (MIG), Inc. for Master Planning/Urban Design Consulting Services

Attachment Q: Draft Agreement 69-2025RH with NexusPlan, Inc. for Master Planning/Urban Design Consulting Services

Attachment R: Draft Agreement 70-2025RH with Perkins Eastman for Master Planning/Urban Design Consulting Services

Attachment S: Draft Agreement 71-2025RH with Rick Engineering Company for Master Planning/Urban Design Consulting Services

Attachment T: Draft Agreement 72-2025RH with Rios, Inc. for Master Planning/Urban Design Consulting Services

Attachment U: Draft Agreement 73-2025RH with Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. for Master Planning/Urban Design Consulting Services

Attachment V: Draft Agreement 74-2025RH with Summit Planning Group, LLC for Master Planning/Urban Design Consulting Services

Attachment W: Draft Agreement 75-2025RH with SWA Group, Inc. for Master Planning/Urban Design Consulting Services