

# M · E · M · O

## Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority

November 9, 2017

<b>To:</b>	Governing Board
<b>From:</b>	John T. Doherty, Chief Executive Officer
<b>Subject:</b>	<i>ACTA Federal Advocacy Services (APPROVAL)</i>

**Recommendation:**

Authorize the issuance of a new Request for Proposals (RFP) for continued ACTA Federal Advocacy Services on an on-call task order basis.

**Discussion:**

At its September 2017 meeting, the Governing Board requested that the ACTA government affairs staff meet with the respective government affairs staff at both Ports (collectively, the "Group") to discuss whether ACTA should continue to retain its own federal advocacy consultant. At the September 2017 Governing Board Meeting, the Board also approved extending the existing federal advocacy contract through January 31, 2018, while awaiting the recommendation of the Group.

The Group met on October 16, 2017 at ACTA's offices. Attendees included: from the Port of Long Beach – the Director of Government Relations, the Government Relations Officer, and the Government Relations Analyst; from the Port of Los Angeles – the Senior Director Government Affairs, the Director of Legislative Affairs, and the Legislative Representative; and from ACTA – the Director of Government and Community Relations.

The Group considered four options to address ACTA's advocacy needs, which are listed in order of most favorable to least, as determined by the Group:

- Option 1 is to modify ACTA's contract for services to be provided on an on-call hourly basis rather than through a fixed fee monthly retainer. The scope of work for the contract would focus on two annual visits to Washington, D.C. which would include the government affairs staff of ACTA, POLA and POLB. The timing of the visits would coincide with conferences where the Ports' staff will already be in Washington D.C., such as those with the Coalition for America's Gateways and Trade Corridors (CAGTC), the American Association of Port Authorities (AAPA), and the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce's ACCESS Washington, D.C. The Ports' staff also suggested that ACTA join organizations like CAGTC that focus on expanding U.S. freight transportation capabilities.



This option is the Group's recommended alternative, as it will allow ACTA to have basic representation in Washington, D.C. that can be bolstered when ACTA has specific needs at the federal level.

2. Similar to Option 1, the federal advocacy contract could be used for two ACTA visits to Washington, D.C. without being accompanied by the Ports' staff. The Ports would provide information relevant to their goods movement interests and objectives.
3. Option 3 is to continue with a monthly fixed fee (retainer) arrangement for ACTA's new federal advocacy contract.
4. Option 4 is to eliminate ACTA's federal advocacy contract and have ACTA's government affairs staff collaborate with both Ports and their respective consultants to support ACTA at the federal level. This would require each port to determine whether the additional work and budget for ACTA's advocacy services could be added to any of the five existing agreements (three POLA and two POLB) or whether new competitive selection procedures would need to be conducted. This is the Group's least preferred option.

It is recommended that the Board approve Option 1, and ACTA staff will accordingly move forward with a new RFP.