

CITY OF SAN ANTONIO INTERDEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE AVIATION DEPARTMENT

TO:

Mayor and City Council

FROM:

Kevin C. Dolliole, Aviation Director

THROUGH:

Terry M. Brechtel, City Manager

COPIES TO:

City Manager, Christopher J. Brady, Finance, Budget,

City Attorney

SUBJECT:

Airport Financial Consulting Services

DATE:

May 1, 2003

SUMMARY & RECOMMENDATION

The proposed ordinance approves an amendment to the professional services contract with Unison-Maximus, Inc. in an amount of \$59,600.00 for airport consulting services. T echnical assistance is required for the development of a Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) amendment to the FAA to obtain the necessary authorization to use PFC revenues for projects included in the Airport System Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The contract amendment supports the implementation of the CIP financing plan approved by City Council on January 31, 2002.

The contract also includes the local M/WBE accounting/management consulting firm of Theresa Y. Britts, P.C. as a subcontractor for approximately 45% of the total.

Staff recommends approval of this ordinance.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Pursuant to the Airport Master Plan, a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) in excess of \$425 million is being implemented over a 10-year period. A significant portion of the Program will be funded through PFC revenues. The services of an airport consultant are needed to assist in the development of a PFC amendment to the FAA for the authority to utilize PFC funds for projects, which now meet eligibility requirements.

A certain portion of the cost for Concourses B and C were not included in the original PFC application because the required supporting documentation was not available at that time. Subsequently, the Terminal Programming Study has been completed and this information is available for submission to qualify for the use of PFC revenues. These PFC revenues were included in the Airport System's CIP Financing Plan approved by City Council.

An airport bond issue is planned for early 2004 to finance the next phase of the CIP. FAA approval of the PFC amendment is a prerequisite to the issuance of the PFC bonds. The FAA approval process requires approximately nine months to complete. Accordingly, the contract amendment is necessary in order to complete the prerequisite work within the available time frame. Future professional services in support of the financing plan will be accomplished through the solicitation of proposals for a new contract.

The contract with Unison-Maximus to be amended was awarded on August 24, 2000 through Ordinance 92428 in the amount of \$175,000.00. The scope of the contract is for the development of funding sources to finance the cost of the Airport System Capital Improvement Program. A key element of this work was the development of the City's PFC application and the initial work on a Letter of Intent (LOI) with the Federal Aviation Administration for grant funding.

POLICY ANALYSIS

The proposed professional service contract is consistent with the City policy of developing San Antonio International Airport to accommodate future growth.

FISCAL IMPACT

The proposed ordinance appropriates and authorizes \$59,600.00 in professional fees. Funds are available within the Airport Capital Improvement Fund for this expenditure.

COORDINATION

This item was coordinated with the City's Asset Management and Finance Departments and the City Attorney's Office.

SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS

Completed Ethics Ordinance Disclosure forms from Unison-Maximus and Theresa Y. Britts, P.C. are attached.

SIGNATURES

Kevin C. Polliole Aviation Director

Christopher J. Brady / Assistant City Manager

Approved:

Terry M. Brechtel City Manager

City of San Antonio Discretionary Contracts Disclosure*

For use of this form, see City of San Antonio Ethics Code, Part D, Sections 1&2
Attach additional sheets if space provided is not sufficient.
State"Not Applicable" for questions that do not apply.

* This form is required to be supplemented in the event there is any change in the information under (1), (2), or (3) below, before the discretionary contract is the subject of council action, and no later than five (5) business days after any change about which information is required to be filed.

Disclosure of Parties, Owners, and Closely Related Persons

For the purpose of assisting the City in the enforcement of provisions contained in the City Charter and the Code of Ethics, an individual or business entity seeking a discretionary contract from the City is required to disclose in connection with a proposal for a discretionary contract:

(1) the identity of any individual who would be a party to the discretionary contract:
None
(2) the identity of any <u>business entity</u> that would be a party to the discretionary contract:
Unison-Maximus, Inc. 409 West Huron Suite 400 Chicago, IL 60610
 and the name of: (A) any individual or business entity that would be a subcontractor on the discretionary contract;
Theresa Y. Britts, P.C. 4241 Piedras Drive East, Suite 150 San Antonio, TX 78228
and the name of: (B) any individual or business entity that is known to be a partner, or a parent or
subsidiary business entity, of any individual or business entity who would be a party to the discretionary contract;
Parent of Unison-Maximus, Inc: Maximus, Inc.
11419 Sunset Hills Road Reston, VA 20190-5207

¹ A *business entity* means a sole proprietorship, partnership, firm, corporation, holding company, joint-stock company, receivership, trust, unincorporated association, or any other entity recognized by law.

discretionary contract be party to the discretionar	pyist or public relations firm emplo being sought by any individual or y contract.	
None		
connection with a proposa hundred dollars (\$100) or indirectly to any <i>current</i> or than any political action commit business entity whose identifications by an individual's spouse, whether	entity seeking a discretionary control for a discretionary contract all promore within the past twenty-four former member of City Council, and tee that contributes to City Council, and the thind to, contributions made through the to, contributions made through the thind to, contributions made through the thind to, contributions made through the thind the thi	political contributions totaling one our (24) months made directly only candidate for City Council, or to cil elections, by any individual of (1), (2) or (3) above. Indirect to, contributions made by the direct contributions by an entity
To Whom Made: None	Amount:	Date of Contribution:
known facts which, reasona	entity seeking a discretionary contra ably understood, raise a question ² ction 1 of Part B, Improper Ecor discretionary contract.	as to whether any city official or
None		
Signature:	Title: President and CE Company: Unison-Maximus, Inc.	Date: February 19, 2003

² For purposes of this rule, facts are "reasonably understood" to "raise a question" about the appropriateness of official action if a disinterested person would conclude that the facts, if true, require recusal or require careful consideration of whether or not recusal is required.

City of San Antonio Discretionary Contracts Disclosure*

For use of this form, see City of San Antonio Ethics Code, Part D, Sections 1&2
Attach additional sheets if space provided is not sufficient.
State"Not Applicable" for questions that do not apply.

* This form is required to be supplemented in the event there is any change in the information under (1), (2), or (3) below, before the discretionary contract is the subject of council action, and no later than five (5) business days after any change about which information is required to be filed.

Disclosure of Parties, Owners, and Closely Related Persons

For the purpose of assisting the City in the enforcement of provisions contained in the City Charter and the Code of Ethics, an individual or business entity seeking a discretionary contract from the City is required to disclose in connection with a proposal for a discretionary contract:

(1) the identity of any individual who would be a party to the discretionary contract: NOT APPLICABLE
(2) the identity of any business entity that would be a party to the discretionary contract:
NOT APPLICABLE
 and the name of: (A) any individual or business entity that would be a subcontractor on the discretionary contract;
THERESA Y. BRITTS, PC 4241 PIEDRAS DRIVE # 150 SAN ANTONIO, TX 78228 210-735-9101
and the name of:
(B) any individual or business entity that is known to be a partner, or a parent or subsidiary business entity, of any individual or business entity who would be a party to the discretionary contract;
NOT APPLICABLE

¹ A business entity means a sole proprietorship, partnership, firm, corporation, holding company, joint-stock company, receivership, trust, unincorporated association, or any other entity recognized by law.

	NONE		
	tiennum en		and the second s
Political Contributions			
Any individual or business entity s connection with a proposal for a hundred dollars (\$100) or more indirectly to any current or former any political action committee that business entity whose identity contributions by an individual in individual's spouse, whether statinclude, but are not limited to, co registered lobbyists of the entity.	discretionary co within the past member of City C at contributes to must be disclos clude, but are a utory or commo	ntract all po twenty-four council, any City Counci ed under (not limited n-law. Ind	olitical contributions totaling (24) months made directly candidate for City Council, cil elections, by any individua (1), (2) or (3) above. Indito, contributions made by direct contributions by an e
To Whom Made:	Amo	unt:	Date of Contribution:
NONE			
NONE			
Disclosures in Proposals Any individual or business entity so known facts which, reasonably un employee would violate Section official action relating to the discre	derstood, raise a 1 of Part B, Imp	question ² a	as to whether any city officia
н он трак кат като од 1911 година на од 1920 годин вистори 🗨 потражено стројавоја (урод узграничера).			
	NONE		
	NONE		
	NONE Title: Preside	nt	Date:
Signature:	Title: Preside	nt	
			Date: February 20, 200

² For purposes of this rule, facts are "reasonably understood" to "raise a question" about the appropriateness of official action if a disinterested person would conclude that the facts, if true, require recusal or require careful consideration of whether or not recusal is required.