BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF GRANTING AN EXEMPTION TO THE PUBLIC CONTRACTING PROCEDURE FOR THE PURCHASE OF COMPUTER EQUIPMENT FOR TRANSPORTATION PURPOSES	)))))	RESOLUTION NO. 85-574 Introduced by the)Executive Officer

WHEREAS, Metro Code Section 2.04.011(c) provides that specific contracts may be exempted from the lowest bid competitive bidding process by Board resolution, subject to the requirements of ORS 279.015(2) and ORS 279.015(5); and

WHEREAS, Pursuant to ORS 279.015(2)(a) this exemption is unlikely to encourage favoritism or substantially diminish competition for public contracts because all potential vendors will receive copies of the Request for Proposal attached as Exhibit "A" which clearly states the contractual requirements and evaluation criteria which will be used by a competent committee as described in Exhibit "B" in selecting a vendor; and

WHEREAS, Pursuant to ORS 279.015(2)(b) the awarding of a contract using the request for proposal process will result in substantial cost savings because Metro will be able to select the most effective and flexible proposal, as described in Exhibit "B"; and

WHEREAS, Pursuant to ORS 279.015(5) the request for proposal process described in Exhibit "B" will reflect marketing realities consistent with encouraging the competitive process; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

That the contract for purchase of computer equipment described in Exhibit "A" is exempted from the low bid public contracting process because the Metro Council acting as the Contract Review Board finds the process described in Exhibits "A" and "B" to be in compliance with Metro Code Section 2.04.011(c).

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this 23rd day of May, 1985.

Ernie Bonner, Presiding Officer

amn
3567C/411-1
05/14/85

EXHIBIT "A"

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL TO PURCHASE A SUPER-MICROCOMPUTER AND PERIPHERALS FOR TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

PRIMARY USE

The hardware and operating system will be used to run EMME 2, a proprietary transportation planning software package currently in use at Metro. The existing computer base is too small to cope with the demand and a second system, with the ability to link to the existing application via a LAN (preferably Ethernet), is required.

REQUIREMENTS

1. Micro processor -- a true 16 or 32 bit architecture with 24 bit direct addressing capability (examples, M68000, M68010, M68020, NS32032...etc.). Full 32-bit is preferred.

2. Memory -- 2 Mbyte minimum

3. Operating System -- UNIX or look-alike, adherence to true Berkeley 4.2 or AT&T System V will be preferred.

4. Fortran Compiler -- Should support standard FORTRAN 77 as well as FORTRAN IV extensions (or vice versa). The compiler should be able to accept:

```
      Integer I,J
      Character*4 C
      Equivalence (I,C)
      Data J/'abcd'/
      .
      .
      .       1,
      Write (1u,10)J
   10 Format (a4)
      .
      .
      .
```

   (It may be necessary to set particular compiler options in order to compile the above sequence, e.g.$CHAREQU for SVS Fortran). Furthermore, the compiler must allow the calling of C-routines, possibly using 'wrapper' - routines in assembly code.

5. Floating Point Processor -- A Floating Point Processer (FPP) is required. It should handle all floating point operations using traps to allow the use of the same object code as that used without the FPP.

6. Disk -- Proposal should include 120 (required) and 160 (preferred) Mbyte of hard disk storage. If available, a high speed, high capacity winchester drive (such as the Fujitsu Eagle - 470 Mbyte) should be priced as an option.

7. Tape -- A tape backup facility must be included in the RFP. Prices for both cartridge and standard 1/2-inch, 9-track 1600 bpi tapes should be quoted.

8. Local Area Network (LAN) -- The possibility of interconnecting several computers through an Ethernet (TCP/IP) Local Area Network, though not required for the operation of EMME 2, will be beneficial in view of later expansion of the system. It would allow the addition of CPUs without the need to duplicate databases and peripheral resources. The ability to install and operate Ethernet at some time is required.

9. Ports -- The proposal should include eight ports (RS-232-c). The maximum number and cost of additional ports should be stated.

10. Maintenance -- Maintenance must be provided for two years and maintenance costs for two years for each piece of suggested equipment and software should be specified.

11. Availability -- The availability and lead time between order and delivery should be addressed.

OPTIONS

1. Terminals -- Initially four terminals will be purchased. They should have both graphics (Tektronix 4100/4010 compatible) and regular display ability (VT100 compatible) with at least a 640 x 480 Pixel resolution. These terminals may be treated as a separate, later bid. Prices for both color and monochrome are requested. The ability to use a "mouse" to control the cursor is desirable.

2. Printer -- Availability and prices of both dot matrix (180 cps) and ink-jet color printers should be included. Graphics capability is needed.

3. General Purpose Software -- The availability of supported general purpose software should be described, and where possible priced. The following are of interest:

   Statistics
   Document Processing
   Graphics Editor
   Project Manager
   Spreadsheet
   Database Manager

CHOICE OF EQUIPMENT

The selection of the vendor will not necessarily be based on the lowest price, but on the most cost-effective and flexible proposal submitted. Speed and flexibility will be balanced against price and the available budget for this acquisition. The ability to expand the system with increasing demand (both CPU and storage) should be addressed.

1. The proposal must meet at least the 11 requirements listed.

2. Preference points will be added for the following areas:

   - Minority or women-owned business participation.
   - Availability of local (Portland area) maintenance service.
   - Expandability of system.
   - Availability of larger disk storage units and associated file-servers.
   - Availability of general purpose software.
   - Reputation of supplier (primarily to be determined through a survey of current users). This to cover both initial delivery and set up, and maintenance. Please include a list of references.
   - CPU processing speed and disk access times. This is a soft area to evaluate but information on these elements is requested, together with any standard benchmark tests available. Information on the processors (CPU, IOP and FPP) should be included.

3. Where possible a visual inspection of an operating system will be made. Preferably at an existing customer site. Only existing and in-use hardware/software should be included in this proposal.

CONTRACT

The final purchase of equipment and maintenance service will be through a negotiated contract. A typical Material Contract document is attached.

KL/gl
3084C/338-5

EXHIBIT "B"

Memo

METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT 527 S.W. HALL ST., PORTLAND, OREGON 97201 503 221-1646
Providing Zoo, Transportation, Solid Waste and other Regional Services

Date: May 15, 1985

To: Metro Council

From: T. Keith Lawton, Technical Manager

Regarding: Request for Proposal (RFP) for Purchase of an Additional Computer for Travel Forecasting (Transportation Department)

PROPOSED ACQUISITION OF ADDED COMPUTER CAPACITY FOR TRAVEL FORECASTING

1. PURPOSE

Proposal - To purchase additional computer equipment to meet growing demands from ODOT, Tri-Met and local jurisdictions for travel forecasts. Estimated cost: $60,000; 50% Tri-Met Sec. 9/50% Metro - Highway Planning funds (UMTA/FHWA).

Background - In July 1983 Metro acquired new computer equipment and software to convert travel forecasting from an UMTA-UTPS system at Multnomah County Data Processing Authority to an in-house system. This change was designed to reduce costs and improve the usability of travel forecasts for Metro's regional transportation planning activity. Funding was provided from FHWA Planning funds. Since then, Metro staff has been concurrently involved in converting and upgrading the travel-forecasting models to the new system, developing forecasts for various regional transportation studies and attempting to meet increased demands of Tri-Met, ODOT and local jurisdictions for travel data.

Current Problem - The capacity of the current system appears adequate for Metro's regional transportation planning requirements. However, it is clearly insufficient to meet the growing demand by ODOT, Tri-Met and local jurisdictions for travel

forecasts. During the past year, as more of the system has been converted from UTPS to EMME 2 and more outside staff became familiar with the operation, demands for information have grown dramatically. Within the limitations of staff availability and machine capacity, efforts have been made to continue the conversion process to EMME 2, to develop new 2005 forecasts, to meet the needs of various Metro studies, and to fill requests for travel forecasts. Because of the excess demand, all projects have suffered delays.

In addition to the current constraint, it is clear outside use will continue to grow:

- The year 2005 regional forecasts are nearly complete, a variety of analyses for the various jurisdictions are scheduled and many more are anticipated.

- The requests received to date have been precipitated by the availability of a partial data set since the conversion was not complete (1980 and 2000 highway assignments for the Eastside only). As trip generation/ distribution/mode split/transit assignment is added to the system together with forecasts for the Westside, many more requests are expected.

- To date, staff from ODOT, Portland and Tri-Met have been trained to use the system; additional staff from the cities and counties are scheduled to be trained in the near future. As more travel-forecasting operations are shifted to non-Metro staff, particularly via remote terminals at ODOT and Tri-Met, demand for computer capacity will grow.

- It is clear that the demand for use of the travel-forecasting package will be widespread and sustained. Prospective uses include:

  - preparing future traffic data for highway project development and EISs;
  - analyzing the immediate traffic impacts due to construction;

- updating traffic data for comprehensive plans;
- providing traffic impact data for proposed major developments;
- developing traffic management programs;
- evaluating alternative transit routes, headways, fares, etc.; and
- updating the Five-Year Transit Development Program.

2. NEED FOR RFP PROCESS

The availability of computer technology is constantly changing. At any given time there are computers with relatively small cost separations that are significantly different in processing power. The RFP process is a means of surveying the latest available offerings and carrying out an analysis of performance versus cost, thus ensuring that at decision time an agency can get the best value for the money.

There are three basic criteria for a wise decision:

- Minimum requirement to run specified software must be met.
- Buy as much processing power as can be afforded.
- Buy a system which has significant capacity for expansion.

It should be emphasized that an RFP process is an extremely competitive process with the aim of obtaining the most cost-effective solution.

3. SELECTION PROCESS

The proposals are analyzed and cost-checked to ensure that similar options are being considered and that hidden costs are exposed.

The choice will be recommended by a committee composed of seven people:

ODOT:	Information Systems Representative Planning Section Representative
TRI-MET:	Planning Section Representative
METRO:	Transportation Planning Director Senior Planner, Transportation Systems Technical Manager Data Processing Systems Analyst

Criteria:

- Intrinsic CPU computing power (16 vs 32 bit, cycle rate, architecture)
- Expansion capability of main memory
- Specific capacity of the Fortran compiler
- Existence of a floating point processor
- Availability of expansion in disk storage
- Availability of TC/PIP local area network (Ethernet)
- Expansion capability, number of users
- Maintenance - local is strongly preferred
- Availability - a short delivery date is preferred
- MBE or WBE
- Speed as determined by benchmark tests
- Response of references contacted
- Reputation/size of manufacturers

amn
3569C/411-2
05/15/85

STAFF REPORT

Agenda Item No. 8.2

Meeting Date May 23, 1985

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 85-574, FOR THE PURPOSE OF GRANTING AN EXEMPTION TO THE PUBLIC CONTRACTING PROCEDURE FOR THE PURCHASE OF COMPUTER EQUIPMENT FOR TRANSPORTATION PURPOSES

Date: May 14, 1985 Presented by: Eleanore Baxendale

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

It is customary for purchasing manuals to contain a standing exemption from the low bid award process for "information systems contracts" such as data and word processing equipment, telephone equipment, telephone services and copiers. See Oregon Administrative Rules 125 - 320 - 010 through 030. The standard process used in lieu of straight competitive bid is the "alternative competitive procurement method" of a Request for Proposal (RFP) process. Therefore, when staff proposed an RFP for certain computer hardware for transportation uses, the proposed RFP was approved and is now being used. However, Metro's purchasing rules do not contain the blanket exemption for such contracts; therefore, a special Council resolution is necessary. Staff did not realize this until after the RFP was initiated (but before the financial commitment has been made).

The RFP is contained in Exhibit "A," which describes in technical terms the equipment (and related maintenance) desired and the criteria for selection. Exhibit "B" explains why the equipment is needed and what it will do.

As explained in Exhibit "B," an RFP is an appropriate process because of the changing technology available to meet the identified need. The only alternative is to analyze all of the possible computer and software combinations before soliciting bids and then requesting bids on the best combination. Because of the nature of the computer market, this would be a sole source contract, which also requires an exemption. This is why the state has authorized a blanket exemption for such purposes, focusing on the RFP process.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends the Council adopt Resolution No. 85-574.

amn
3567C/411-2
05/15/85

Councilor Van Bergen asked about the bonding requirements for the franchise. Ms. Aman replied $500,000 general liability insurance coverage and a $25,000 performance bond - the same bond amount recommended for the original franchise application - had been received from Genstar Waste Transfer, Inc.

Councilor Van Bergen recalled the Council previously adopted a Resolution granting special disposal rates to Oregon Waste Management, the original franchisee. He asked if the special disposal rates would apply to Genstar Waste Transfer. Ms. Aman said the fee variance would transfer to Genstar Waste Transfer. Eleanore Baxendale further explained the initial variance was granted to the original franchisee. The franchise transfer to a different entity, if approved, would not effect the variance, she said, unless the franchisee decided to engage in work different from that for which the variance was granted. After discussion on the matter, Councilor Van Bergen said he would accept Counsel's opinion, but preferred the two matters - granting a franchise permit and a rate variance - should be decided separately.

Motion: Councilor Kirkpatrick moved to approve Resolution No. 85-572 and Councilor Kelley seconded the motion.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors DeJardin, Gardner, Kirkpatrick, Kelley, Van Bergen, Waker and Bonner

Absent: Councilors Cooper, Hansen, Kafoury, Myers and Oleson

The motion carried and Resolution No. 85-572 was adopted.

7.2 Consideration of Resolution No. 85-574, for the Purpose of Granting an Exemption from the Public Contracting Procedure for the Purchase of Computer Equipment for Transportation Purposes

Ms. Baxendale explained she had reviewed a request for proposals (RFP) for computer equipment and authorized staff to distribute the document to qualified computer vendors. After the RFP was distributed, she became aware that Metro's Contract Procedures did not provide for use of an RFP for special equipment purchases unless an exemption to the Procedures were granted by the Council. She requested the exemption be granted due to the specialized requirements of the equipment.

Motion: Councilor Waker moved Resolution No. 85-574 be approved. Councilor Kirkpatrick seconded the motion.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors DeJardin, Gardner, Kirkpatrick, Kelley, Van Bergen, Waker and Bonner

Absent: Councilors Cooper, Hansen, Kafoury, Myers and Oleson

The motion carried and Resolution No. 85-574 was adopted.

Don Carlson announced a special Management Committee Meeting had been scheduled for 5:00 p.m., June 13, 1985, to approve the contract for purchasing a computer.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At 6:30 p.m., Presiding Officer Bonner called an Executive Session of the Council under the authority of ORS 192.660(1)(d). Councilors attending the session were Councilors DeJardin, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Kelley, Van Bergen, Waker and Bonner. The regular session of the Council reconvened at 7:15 p.m.

8. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Councilor Kelley reported Jane Cease sponsored a bill to dedicate two cents of the cigarette tax for handicapped transportation needs.

Presiding Officer Bonner reported the Convention, Trade & Spectator Facilities Task Force, together with three subcommittees, met to review proposals for a combined domed stadium and convention center and the Clackamas Dome.

LADYBUG THEATER

Executive Officer Gustafson reported the Council had received various correspondence regarding the Ladybug Theater and its future at the Zoo. In response to specific concerns, he explained the Master Plan did provide for a new performing auditorium but the Plan did not conclude the Ladybug Theater would have total management and operation rights of this auditorium. The existing Ladybug Theater was not planned to be demolished until the new Zoo entrance was scheduled to be built, he said. However, he explained, the current issue before the Council was the unsafe condition of the existing theater building. He said consultants were inspecting the building on a weekly basis to insure its safety and the theater group had been notified they might have to vacate the building immediately if the building was deemed unsafe for occupancy. Further, he said, staff were preparing to notify the theater it could not occupy the building after September 1, 1985, due to the building's unsafe