

## CHECKLIST TO DESIGNATE AREAS OF EVALUATION FOR REQUESTS FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)

	REQUISITION NUMBER	DUE DATE	TIME DUE
MDOT PROJECT MANAGER	JOB NUMBER (JN)	CONTROL SECTION (CS)	

DESCRIPTION

MDOT PROJECT MANAGER: Check all items to be included in RFP			CONSULTANT: Provide only checked items below in proposal
WHITE = REQUIRED ** = OPTIONAL  Check the appropriate Tier in the box below			
<input type="checkbox"/> TIER I (\$50,000 - \$150,000)	<input type="checkbox"/> TIER II (\$150,000-\$1,000,000)	<input type="checkbox"/> TIER III (>\$1,000,000)	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Understanding of Service **
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Innovations</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Organizational Chart
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Qualifications of Team
Not required as part of Official RFP	Not required as part of Official RFP	<input type="checkbox"/>	Quality Assurance/Quality Control **
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Location:</b> The percentage of work performed in Michigan will be used for all selections unless the project is for on-site inspection or survey activities, then location should be scored using the distance from the consultant office to the on-site inspection or survey activity.
N/A	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	Presentation **
N/A	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	Technical Proposal (if Presentation is required)
3 pages (MDOT Forms not counted)	7 pages (MDOT Forms not counted)	14 pages (MDOT forms not counted)	Total maximum pages for RFP <b>not including key personnel resumes.</b> Resumes limited to 2 pages per key staff personnel.

**PROPOSAL AND BID SHEET EMAIL ADDRESS – [mdot-rfp-response@michigan.gov](mailto:mdot-rfp-response@michigan.gov)**

### GENERAL INFORMATION

Any questions relative to the scope of services must be submitted by e-mail to the MDOT Project Manager. Questions must be received by the Project Manager at least five (5) working days prior to the due date and time specified above. All questions and answers will be placed on the MDOT website as soon as possible after receipt of the questions, and at least three (3) days prior to the RFP due date deadline. The names of vendors submitting questions will not be disclosed.

MDOT is an equal opportunity employer and MDOT DBE firms are encouraged to apply. The participating DBE firm, as currently certified by MDOT's Office of Equal Opportunity, shall be listed in the Proposal.

### MDOT FORMS REQUIRED AS PART OF PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

**5100D** – Request for Proposal Cover Sheet

**5100J** – Consultant Data and Signature Sheet (Required for all firms performing non-prequalified services on this project.)

**(These forms are not included in the proposal maximum page count.)**

# REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

The Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) is seeking professional services for the project contained in the attached scope of services.

If your firm is interested in providing services, please indicate your interest by submitting a Proposal, Proposal/Bid Sheet or Bid Sheet as indicated below. The documents must be submitted in accordance with the latest (Consultant/Vendor Selection Guidelines for Services Contracts) **AA**

.....

## RFP SPECIFIC INFORMATION

ENGINEERING SERVICES                       BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING                       OTHER

THE SERVICE WAS POSTED ON THE ANTICIPATED QUARTERLY REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS  
 NO                       YES                      DATED \_\_\_\_\_ THROUGH \_\_\_\_\_

<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Prequalified Services</b> – See the attached Scope of Services for required Prequalification Classifications.	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Non-Prequalified Services</b> – If selected, the vendor must make sure that current financial information, including labor rates, overhead computations, and financial statements, is on file with MDOT’s Office of Commission Audits. This information must be on file for the prime vendor and all sub vendors so that the contract will not be delayed. <b>Form 5100J is required with proposal for all firms performing non-prequalified services on this project.</b>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Qualification Based Selection** - Use Consultant/Vendor Selection Guidelines.

**For all Qualifications Based Selections**, the selection team will review the information submitted and will select the firm considered most qualified to perform the services based on the proposals. The selected firm will be asked to prepare a priced proposal. Negotiations will be conducted with the firm selected.

**For a cost plus fixed fee contract**, the selected vendor must have a cost accounting system to support a cost plus fixed fee contract. This type of system has a job-order cost accounting system for the recording and accumulation of costs incurred under its contracts. Each project is assigned a job number so that costs may be segregated and accumulated in the vendor’s job-order accounting system.

**Qualification Based Selection / Low Bid** – Use Consultant/Vendor Selection Guidelines. See Bid Sheet instructions for additional information.

For Qualification Review/Low Bid selections, the selection team will review the proposals submitted. The vendor that has met established qualification threshold and with the lowest bid will be selected.

**Best Value** – Use Consultant/Vendor Selection Guidelines, See Bid Sheet Instructions below for additional information. The bid amount is a component of the total proposal score, not the determining factor of the selection.

**Low Bid** (no qualifications review required – no proposal required.)

## BID SHEET INSTRUCTIONS

Bid Sheet(s) are located at the end of the Scope of Services. Submit bid sheet(s) with the proposal, to the email address: [mdot-rfp-response@michigan.gov](mailto:mdot-rfp-response@michigan.gov). Failure to comply with this procedure may result in your bid being rejected from consideration.

À

## PARTNERSHIP CHARTER AGREEMENT

MDOT and ACEC created a Partnership Charter Agreement which establishes guidelines to assist MDOT and Consultants in successful partnering. Both the Consultant and MDOT Project Manager are reminded to review the [ACEC-MDOT Partnership Charter Agreement](#) and are asked to follow all communications, issues resolution and other procedures and guidance’s contained therein.

**NOTIFICATION  
MANDATORY ELECTRONIC SUBMITTAL**

**Proposals submitted for this project must be submitted electronically.**

**The following are changes to the Proposal Submittal Requirements:**

- Eliminated the Following Requirements:
  - Safety Program
  - Communication Plan
  - Past Performance as *a separate section*
  - Separate section for DBE Statement of goals. Include information in Qualification of Team section
  
- Implemented the Following Changes:
  - All proposals require an Organization Chart
  - Resumes must be a maximum of two pages
  - Only Key (lead) staff resumes may be submitted
  - Tier III proposal reduced from 19 to 14 pages
  - Forms 5100D, 5100I, and 5100G combined – 5100D
  - Forms 5100B and 5100H combined – 5100B
  - RFP's will be posted on a weekly basis -- on Mondays

**The following are Requirements for Electronic Submittals:**

- Proposals must be prepared using the most current guidelines
- The proposal must be bookmarked to clearly identify the proposal sections (See Below)
- For any section not required per the RFP, the bookmark must be edited to include “N/A” after the bookmark title.  
**Example:** Understanding of Service – N/A
- Proposals must be assembled and saved as a single PDF file
- PDF file must be 5 megabytes or smaller
- PDF file must be submitted via e-mail to [MDOT-RFP-Response@michigan.gov](mailto:MDOT-RFP-Response@michigan.gov)
- MDOT's requisition number and company name must be included in the subject line of the e-mail. The PDF shall be named using the following format:
  - Requisition#XXX\_Company Name.PDF
- MDOT will not accept multiple submittals
- Proposals must be *received* by MDOT on or before the due date and time specified in each RFP

**If the submittals do not comply with the requirements, they may be determined unresponsive.**

The Consultant's will receive an e-mail reply/notification from MDOT when the proposal is received. Please retain a copy of this e-mail as proof that the proposal was received on time.  
**Consultants are responsible for ensuring the MDOT receives the proposal on time.**

**\*\*Contact Contract Services Division immediately at 517-373-4680 if you do not get an auto response\*\***

**Required Bookmarking Format:**

- I. Request for Proposal Cover Sheet Form 5100D
  - A. Consultant Data and Signature Sheet, Form 5100J (if applicable)
- II. Understanding of Service
  - A. Innovations
- III. Qualifications of Team
  - A. Structure of Project Team
    - 1. Role of Firms
    - 2. Role of Key Personnel
  - B. Organization Chart
  - C. Location
- IV. Quality Assurance / Quality Control Plan
- V. Resumes of Key Staff
- VI. Pricing Documents/Bid Sheet (if applicable)

**2/14/12**

**NOTIFICATION  
E-VERIFY REQUIREMENTS**

E-Verify is an Internet based system that allows an employer, using information reported on an employee's Form I-9, Employment Eligibility Verification, to determine the eligibility of that employee to work in the United States. There is no charge to employers to use E-Verify. The E-Verify system is operated by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) in partnership with the Social Security Administration. E-Verify is available in Spanish.

The State of Michigan is requiring, under Public Act 200 of 2012, Section 381, that as a condition of each contract or subcontract for construction, maintenance, or engineering services that the pre-qualified contractor or subcontractor agree to use the E-Verify system to verify that all persons hired during the contract term by the contractor or subcontractor are legally present and authorized to work in the United States.

Information on registration for and use of the E-Verify program can be obtained via the Internet at the DHS Web site: <http://www.dhs.gov/E-Verify>.

The documentation supporting the usage of the E-Verify system must be maintained by each consultant and be made available to MDOT upon request.

It is the responsibility of the prime consultant to include the E-Verify requirement documented in this NOTIFICATION in all tiers of subcontracts.

9/13/12

## Michigan Department of Transportation

### SCOPE OF SERVICES

#### FOR

### SPECIALTY SERVICES

Michigan Aviation System Plan (MASP) Update

FY 2016-2017

**REVISED 4/7/2016 to add list of Airports**

**Revised 4/13/2016**

#### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

To manage and maintain the significant federal and state investment in Michigan's commercial and general aviation airports and facilitate continuing enhancement of Michigan's aviation system, the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) Office of Aeronautics (AERO) is requesting development of the 2017 *Michigan Aviation System Plan* (MASP). The MASP was last updated in 2008. In order to guide future development and funding, the plan will establish a desired level of infrastructure consistent with MDOT's vision, mission and goals, identify aviation needs and make recommendations on the future of the state's aviation system.

In conjunction with the MASP update, AERO is seeking development of a Michigan Aviation Economic Impact Study to measure both the direct and in-direct economic impacts of individual airports. Impacts included but not limited to: on-airport activities, air cargo, aviation-related businesses, construction activities, visitor spending, etc. A statewide report will be generated as well as individual airport reports for the 94 National Plan of Integrated Airports System (NPIAS) airports in Michigan. This information can be critical in competing for and justifying future aviation funding in Michigan as well as demonstrating to individual communities the benefit of their airports

#### **CONSULTANT'S QUALIFICATION/EXPERIENCE**

As a minimum, the Consultant shall have the following:

- Experience in developing state aviation system plans
- Knowledge of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) planning process
- Experience in developing airport Master Plans and Airport Layout Plans
- Experience in developing airport Economic Impact Studies

**Anticipated Start Date: 5/1/2016**

**Anticipated End Date: 12/31/2016**

**MDOT PROJECT MANAGER:**

Mark Grennell, PE  
Office of Aeronautics  
2700 Port Lansing Road  
Lansing, MI 48906  
517-335-9024

**SCOPE OF WORK**

- 1.0 Study design, project management, coordination and communication
- 2.0 Review the vision, mission, and goals of the MASP
- 3.0 Data Collection, Airport Classification, and Forecasting
- 4.0 Evaluate benchmarks for the MASP
- 5.0 Recommendations based on findings
- 6.0 Update MASP documents
- 7.0 Economic Impact Study

**1.0 Study design, project management, coordination and communication**

This will define work items, methods of project management and coordination and communication with the MASP Steering Committee and others as defined by AERO project management staff. These administrative tasks will be important to the overall success of the project.

**1.1 Study Design**

Study design will include refinement of the scope of services, definition of the effort necessary to accomplish the work scope, and preparation of realistic work schedules and cost budgets for completing the work. It will also specifically define participant roles and responsibilities of all members of the Consultant Team and MDOT/AERO staff to assure comprehensive and thorough development and review of the MASP.

## **Project Management, Coordination, and Communication**

Define and refine responsibilities of project managers, designate personnel responsible for project coordination, and establish the lines and means of communication required for timely coordination with MDOT/AERO staff through the anticipated ~~12~~ 8 month duration of the study. The project management and coordination process will include the following elements:

### **1.2. A Project Management**

Coordination and monitoring of work tasks among project team members will include:

- Developing and documenting the project plan
- Organizing the project team
- Launching project activities
- Executing project activities
- Monitoring and controlling the project to achieve results
- Manage/mitigate risks and solve problems
- Monthly invoicing by percentage complete
- Project close out
- Quarterly reports for Project Steering Committee use

### **1.2.B Sponsor Project Briefings**

Bi-monthly (every two weeks) project status briefings will take place throughout the anticipated ~~12~~ 8 month study process. Within the bi-monthly time-frame, these briefings can take place via telephone, or concurrent with other study meetings. The briefings will include a status of current progress on specific work efforts, upcoming meetings, upcoming work efforts, and discussion of potential challenges in the study effort.

### **1.2.C Stakeholder Involvement**

The Consultant Team will utilize several different methods to gather input from parties necessary to assure a comprehensive study.

#### **AERO Involvement**

AERO staff, especially the Project Manager, will play a critical role in:

- Providing copies or electronic files of existing data

- Providing Geographic Information System (GIS) data for use in development of graphics
- Providing data from other state agencies and regional interests
- Reviewing and approving draft and final documents
- Securing cooperation of airport managers in providing information critical to the study
- Evaluating data received from airport managers to update the state aviation database(s)
- Securing meeting locations for regional public information workshops
- Providing Pavement Condition Index (PCI) ratings for all airfield pavements
- Providing electronic copies of existing airport Capital Improvement Plans (CIPs)

To streamline the coordination process with AERO, a specific staff member will be identified as the single Point of Contact (POC) for the collection, review, and approval of all edits recommended by the AERO as they pertain to the documents developed by the Consultant Team. The Consultant Team will provide hard copies of all documents to the AERO for review. The AERO POC will provide a hard copy of documents to the MASP Steering Committee (defined below) for their review. The MASP Steering Committee will channel their comments back to the AERO POC who will consolidate the comments into a single deliverable to the Consultant Team. If any additional comments are collected, the AERO POC will compile the comments into a single document which reflects the AERO selected edits. This single commented document will be provided to the Consultant Team for updating the specific document. Specific review periods will be identified to maintain the overall schedule of the project. It is anticipated that these will be not be more than 15 day comment periods, more typically 10 days. If additional time is required by AERO staff, the schedule will be extended accordingly.

This process will streamline overall project flow and assure appropriate review of working papers, chapters, educational materials and other documentation. Consultant questions regarding comments will be accomplished as designated by the POC through appropriate communication medium.

### **Project SharePoint Page**

To facilitate timely exchange of information (data, draft documents, graphics, etc.) between AERO and the Consultant Team, a SharePoint page will be developed specifically for the MASP project. The site will contain a project calendar, contact information, and folders to organize deliverables. Documents stored on the site will be editable by all parties and will also allow uploads without restriction to size. The site will be developed and hosted by the Consultant Team.

### **MASP Steering Committee**

The MASP Steering Committee will be responsible for review and validation of study deliverables, providing feedback to the project planning team. Committee members will represent their stakeholder interests, attend meetings and workshops and help disseminate information to their constituents. Meetings of the committee will be coordinated with delivery of project reports and analysis. The Consultant Team will be present to summarize study findings and conclusions, and respond to questions.

The MASP Steering Committee will consist of not more than 15 members, as determined by AERO, and will include the following already committed representatives:

- Michigan Department of Transportation – Aeronautics (MDOT-AERO)
- Michigan Department of Transportation – Planning (MDOT-Planning)
- Michigan Aeronautics Commission (MAC)
- Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)
- Michigan General Aviation (GA) Committee
- Michigan Association of Airport Executives (MAAE)
- Michigan Economic Development Corporation (MEDC)
- Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG)
- Michigan Business Aviation Association (MBAA)
- Southwest Michigan Planning Commission (SWMPC)

The specific timing for the MASP Steering Committee meetings is to be defined by AERO and the Consultant Team. Not more than four meetings are planned over the course of the study. Based upon the specific focus of each meeting, appropriate representatives from the Consultant Team will be in attendance.

### **Public Involvement**

To facilitate public involvement required by MDOT planning procedures, the Consultant Team will work with the AERO staff to host public information workshops and engage the public. The timing of these workshops will likely be later in the project. The location of these workshops will be determined by the Consultant Team and AERO staff to facilitate convenient attendance by interested parties from different areas. Four single day workshops are anticipated:

- Upper Peninsula
- Northern Lower Peninsula
- West Michigan
- East Michigan

The Consultant Team will have appropriate personnel available to answer questions and will be responsible for preparing graphics and handouts appropriate to the audience and venue and in sufficient quantities. These will include but not be limited to:

- 8 ½” by 11” in size
- Printed in black and white or color
- Single or double sided

### **Project Web Page**

A project web page will be developed and maintained through the study period to help inform the public and solicit feedback regarding the project. To accomplish this, the Consultant will:

- Set up a web page on the Consultant’s current web site which can be linked from the AERO web page and will be administered by the Consultant
- Provide summary information about the study and survey instruments for study participants to download if necessary
- Exhibit the project schedule
- Maintain a posting of public information and workshop meeting dates and

meeting handouts

- Establish an online feedback form
- Post working documents, as appropriate, for public review

## **2.0 Establish the Vision, Mission, and Goals of the MASP**

Since publication of MASP 2008, changes have occurred in the aviation industry, and the system of Michigan airports. To include these factors in the MASP update, a systematic review of the existing airport system will be performed to, if necessary, clarify or modify existing system goals and objectives and provide a clear vision and mission for the updated MASP. Additional concepts to consider in this task include, but are not limited to:

- Air freight
- Additional focus on air service
- FAA ASSET categories
- MDOT *Prosperity Regions*
- General utility licensing status for funding
- Runway Safety Area (RSA) compliance
- Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) compliance
- Military operations
- Environmental concerns
- Regulatory issues
- Impacts of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs)

Goals and performance measures to be maintained from MASP 2008 and those identified during development of this Scope of Services include:

### **MASP System Goals (7):**

- Serve Significant Population Centers
- Serve Significant Business Centers
- Serve Significant Tourism/Convention Centers
- Provide the General Population Access to the Aviation System
- Provide Adequate Land Area Coverage
- Preserve Regional Capacity
- Serve Isolated Areas

### **MASP Facility Goals (8):**

- Primary Runway System
- Pavement Condition
- Lighting and Visual Aids
- Approach Protection
- Basic Pilot and Aircraft Services
- All-Weather Access
- Year-Round Access
- Landside Access

It is expected the three *Tier* system defined in MASP 2008 will continue to be used. System Goals and Facility Goals criteria used in MASP 2008 will be evaluated during the MASP update.

Deliverables for Task 2 will include a working paper defining the vision, mission and goals of the MASP.

## **3.0 Data Collection, Airport Classification, and Forecasting**

### **3.1 Data Collection - Inventory**

Evaluation of current and future roles for each airport will necessitate accessing or collecting up to date airport data related to the defined goals and objectives. AERO's *Airport System Manager* (ASM) and FAA databases will be used by the Consultant Team to develop the study inventory. Existing inventory data will be shared with the Consultant Team in an appropriate digital format. The Consultant Team will develop a base survey instrument for review by AERO prior to surveying local airport Sponsors.

To provide airport Sponsors an opportunity to confirm and comment on these results, once the initial survey is completed, the project team will provide airport Sponsors an opportunity to review the preliminary inventory for their airport. This will be done utilizing e-mail distribution/response or hard copy as necessary. The Consultant Team will follow up with airport managers via appropriate medium to confirm draft inventory information and make necessary updates. It is estimated that approximately four (4) hours per airport will be necessary for the general

assessment of the airport facilities contained in the existing database. This will include review of the existing MASP database and the FAA 5010 Airport Record database at [www.faa.gov](http://www.faa.gov).

Site visits for data collection quality control will take place at Tier 1 and 2 airports. As part of this effort, current CIPs for airports will be reviewed for types of development proposed with current ten year plans. AERO will provide CIPs for all NPIAS airports to the Consultant Team based on current data available.

To support forecasting and provide a baseline for understanding development in the state, additional U.S. Census data on population, median income, and personal buying power will be collected.

### **3.2 Airport Classification**

Upon completion of the survey effort, data will be summarized in the AERO provided for linkage to the *Michigan Geographic Framework* (MGF). Based upon airport infrastructure, service objectives and current Tier ranking, AERO and the Consultant Team will decide upon appropriate assignment of airport roles. The Consultant Team will review the current status of airports within the Tier classification system and make recommendations on airports that should be reclassified based upon current data.

### **3.3 Forecasting**

Aviation forecasts will be developed for the system airports which will be based upon previous FAA Terminal Area Forecasts (TAF) or airport master plans where available, as well as industry trends and state activities. This update will use the figures from the individual airports in the new project report.

With 2017 as the base year, forecasts will be developed for 2022, 2027, 2032, and 2037. The Consultant Team will work with AERO to determine the preferred forecast methodology for application to all airports. The final document will specify forecasts are for the purposes of long range planning and should not be relied upon or take the place of independently developed forecasts for individual airport planning studies. Recently completed forecasts for airport master plans will be used where available. Forecasts that significantly differ from TAF figures

(greater than 15 percent) will be accompanied by a short justification, outlining how they were developed and why they differ from TAF estimates.

Deliverables for Task 3 will include working papers as noted above for AERO review and consideration and an *Excel* database file with survey updated airport information.

#### **4.0 Evaluate benchmarks established for the MASP**

An evaluation of the existing MASP benchmarks will be provided. AERO will provide a summary of existing benchmarks from MASP 2008 and indicate those benchmarks the agency wishes to carry forward. Using data collected in Task 3, the Consultant will develop an updated assessment of the current system and provide a comparison to the MASP 2008 findings. The Consultant Team will work with AERO to identify and recommend any new benchmarks that may be appropriate. Care should be taken to assure new benchmarks can be compared to available measures in an automated fashion.

The Consultant will work with AERO to define the GIS data format needed to produce the maps for MASP 2017 and which can be integrated with the MGF. Any new GIS data created will be made available to AERO. These maps will not use data from FAA Airports GIS (AGIS) database as data being generated for this study goes beyond the scope of the AGIS website.

Utilizing previously developed benchmarks, AERO and the Consultant Team will assess which airports exhibit infrastructure necessary to meet Michigan's aviation system goals, though non-NPIAS airports will not likely be included in the primary evaluations. However, the Consultant Team will use AERO and/or FAA data to develop graphics to locate non-NPIAS airports relative to NPIAS sites. ASM will provide based aircraft counts for these non-NPIAS sites to make general observations on impacts to the overall system if specific non-NPIAS airports were to close or have limits placed upon their usage. AERO will provide latitude and longitudinal coordinates and contact information.

Deliverables for Task 4 will include a working paper for review by AERO staff and GIS graphics will be developed to illustrate findings of the analysis for use in the

final report and working papers. In addition, this data will be provided for inclusion in the MGF if budget allows.

## **5.0 Recommendations Based Upon Findings**

Itemize recommendations for future development of the Michigan aviation system based on data and benchmarks developed in previous Tasks. Recommendations will be tabulated and include graphs to visually address the benchmarks and goals of the system.

As noted in Task 3, AERO staff will provide copies of all existing CIPs. Where not documented in a CIP, generic estimates of cost for recommended projects will be developed to provide AERO a baseline of the funding necessary to accomplish the identified projects. Reports will specify that generic estimates are for fiscal programming and do not have the benefit of any type of field survey.

Once costs for recommended development projects have been determined or estimated, the Consultant Team will estimate total funding needed to complete the comprehensive list of projects over the 10-year CIP horizon. Findings of the CIP evaluation will be broken down by project type to summarize resources needed for project types, such as:

- Airfield pavement
- Environmental
- Approach surveys and planning
- Lighting/Navigational Aids (NAVAIDs)
- Buildings
- Fencing
- Parking lots/access roads
- Wildlife/wetland mitigation
- Land acquisition
- Other

AERO will provide the Consultant Team with estimates of anticipated funding over the 10 year planning horizon. The Consultant Team will develop graphics to illustrate the cost of system needs, versus the cost of projects airports want, versus

anticipated funding levels to show gaps to be addressed. Assumptions on funding levels will be developed with guidance from AERO staff.

Deliverables for Task 5.0 will include a working paper summarizing system recommendations for review by MDOT/AERO, cost estimates for recommended projects, project demands based on system recommendations and CIP requests and summary of funds needed by project type.

## **6.0 MASP Documents**

AERO staff will be consulted to assist with identification of the data appropriate for inclusion in the final MASP documents and the Consultant Team will produce the documents. All reports will be submitted to AERO in hard-copy and electronic format.

Since aviation is an essential method of transportation, as well as a critical economic engine within the State of Michigan, it is important to provide the legislators, local sponsors, local communities, and the general public with a solid understanding of the aviation system of Michigan. Developing and distributing documents that effectively convey the importance, value, and findings of the system plan to these interest groups is essential to their education. Development of specific types of deliverables will allow the Consultant Team and AERO to target these different markets in a more effective manner.

### **6.1 Michigan Aviation System Plan Technical Plan**

The technical portion of the MASP document will consolidate working papers from Tasks 1-5 into a single document. The updated information contained in the report will provide the foundation for the 2017 MASP.

Additional topics which may be discussed in the final report and might impact the long-term goals of the aviation system include:

- Wildlife management
- Compatible land use issues
- Effects of future aircraft types on the system (for example the phasing out of turbo-prop aircraft used by airlines)
- Use of GPS for approach procedures

- Radar coverage across the system, particularly the gaps in coverage if there are any
- Effects of seasonal aviation
- Use of UAVs, and their impact on the system
- Impact of private airport closure on the publicly-owned aviation system

Deliverables for this sub-task include the technical report and will be:

- Multiple pages in length (estimated at 400)
- 8 ½” by 11” in size
- Printed in black in white with limited color graphics (350 pages B&W, 50 pages in color)
- Double sided
- An electronic version (Word and pdf) will be generated which will be in full color.

Graphics included in the report will be:

- 8 ½” by 11” or 11” by 17” in size
- Printed in full color
- Single sided

Hard copies of the report will include

- 15 printed copies of the draft report
- 25 printed copies of the final report
- 3-hole punched and presented in a 3-ring binder

Additionally, tabs and appendices can be included in the final report for AERO use. The report will be provided in an electronic format including a Word file, as well as, a PDF format for the web page for AERO. These files will be provided on 20 compact disks (CDs) with labels for distribution to various stakeholders.

## **6.2 Michigan Aviation System Plan Individual Airport Reports**

To assure local decision makers have a more thorough understanding of the long range needs of their airports, individual airport reports will list collected airport physical inventory and approach data, analyze existing conditions, define how the facility meets MASP goals/objectives and explain development necessary to meet

future needs/benchmarks. Consequently, 12 copies of each of these reports will be produced (ten for each airport, one for AERO, and one for the FAA-ADO).

Deliverables for this sub-task include the individual airport reports which will include updated contact information for each airport. Each report will be approximately 10 pages in length, in full color, double-sided and spiral bound. A total of not more than 12 copies of each individual report will be developed with the updated information. An electronic file, in both a Word format, as well as a PDF format will be provided to AERO, and the individual Airport Sponsor for their use.

### **6.3 Michigan Aviation System Plan Executive Summaries**

The Executive Summary will summarize the findings and recommendations of the 2017 MASP technical document in a manner understandable by a wide audience including but not limited to airport sponsors, local communities, legislators, elected officials, aviation advocates, non-aviation interest groups and the general public. If it is not possible to produce a single document for all these groups, the Consultant Team will work with MDOT/AERO to individually tailor separate documents.

### **7.0 Economic Impact Study**

The primary goal for development of the Economic Impact Study is to quantify the positive effects Michigan's airports have on the economic sectors of the state.

#### **7.1 Fieldwork and Data Collection**

A fundamental element of the approach to this study is a comprehensive data collection effort. Direct or initial impacts are crucial inputs to the study. As part of this task, efforts will be undertaken to collect information from each airport, each on-airport tenants, and a wide sample of visitors arriving on commercial airlines or general aviation aircraft. Information to calculate direct economic impacts will be collected in accordance with available FAA guidance.

The data collected in this task will also be used as a basis to document airport users. Collecting and documenting examples of the ways each airport supports the communities it serves is important to educating each community and others on all airport benefits. Airport contacts will be one source used in the effort to identify airport users.

There are currently 108 active airports listed as Tier 1 or 2 in the current MASP. Of the 108, 95 are included in the NPIAS. A list of all 108 study airports is attached to this Scope of Services. Only these airports will be included in this task. Those airports that have recent economic data may be utilized and data collection may be omitted from this task. Airports potentially requiring site visits will be determined based on the funding available. Surveys will be completed for these airports. Surveys will also be distributed via e-mail or U.S. mail to the remainder of the airports. Surveys for airport managers will be reviewed and approved by AERO prior to their distribution.

## **7.2 Site Visits and Airport Manager/Operator**

Input from all airport managers or airport owners/sponsors is important to this study. Airport managers/operators are usually the most complete source of information related to:

- On and off-airport airport-related employment dedicated to airport management, operation, and administration (this includes both full and part-time employees)
- Salaries/payroll for workers employed to support the airport's administrative functions
- Annual costs or spending to operate the airport, including annual PFC collections as applicable
- On-airport tenants/business
- Off airport businesses whose operation is reliant on the airport

The consultant team will prepare a letter to all study airports that will be distributed on letterhead from AERO. The initial study letter/survey will be sent to each airport via U.S. mail and email, when an email address for the sponsor/operator is available. The letter will introduce the study, explain how Michigan airports will benefit from the study, describe study products, and outline the timeline for the project. Along with the letter, each airport will receive a survey requesting data on their employment, payroll and annual spending.

Each airport will also be asked to provide a complete list of all on-airport tenants/businesses at their airport, including business name and available contact

information. Airports will be provided with the option of returning their survey/tenant list by mail or completing the survey and providing a tenant list online. One week after the mailing, a representative of the consultant team will contact each airport. This call will give each airport an opportunity to ask any questions they may have on the survey.

An important objective for the initial call will be to secure each airport's list of on-airport tenants/businesses. The goal will be to have a complete list of all on-airport tenants/businesses assembled by the third month of the study. Information to be collected as part of task will include:

1. Identification of on-airport airport employment dedicated to the operation, administration, and/or maintenance of the airport. If any of these employees are less than full-time, the airport contact will be asked to provide information on the number of hours each "part-time" person works, specifically in support of the airport.
2. Identification of on-airport airport employment that is not dedicated to the operation, administration, and/or maintenance of the airport. These should be categorized as municipal offices, professional services or manufacturing.
3. Identification of off-airport employees who support the airport. Some airports may have employees who work in support of the airport, but who do not work on-site at the airport. Especially for smaller airports, employees who work in administrative, operational, and maintenance functions may "spilt" their time between the airport and other public functions/entities. When this is the case, information on the number of hours the employee works specifically in support of the airport will be collected.
4. Identification of area businesses that are reliant on the airport. The definition is those businesses (jobs) that cease to exist in the community if the airport no longer is in operation.
5. Annual operating budget for the airport, separating out annual payroll for the employees listed above in #1 and #2 and spending related to annual capital improvement projects.
5. Information on the portion of the airport's annual general aviation aircraft arrivals that are visiting in nature. The request for this information will be posed to help the respondent estimate the number of visiting aircraft that arrive at the airport on a weekly basis. Respondents will be asked to provide information on

types (fleet mix) of visiting aircraft they serve and on the number of passengers/pilots that typically arrive on these planes. Consultant follow-up on general aviation visitor estimates will be made with each airport contact.

5. Airport contacts will also be a source for collecting information that will be used to document uses and users for each airport to highlight the airport's value to the community. These contacts will be used to document the ways in which the airport may be supporting segments of the local economy, government services, or health care. Contact information will be sought for businesses that base, charter, rent aircraft, or operate aircraft at the airport. In addition, information on Michigan-based businesses that have customers or suppliers who visit them via each airport will also be sought.

If on-site visits are utilized, a member of the team will meet with the airport contact. The purpose of the visit will be to verify responses and to obtain any missing survey information; to further discuss the nature of visiting general aviation aircraft for the airport; to gain more insight on local businesses that use the airport; and to gather information on the ways the airport benefits the communities it serves. In addition to conducting interviews with the airport contact, the on-site visits also provide the opportunity to meet face-to-face with on-airport tenants/businesses to discuss these same items.

### **7.3 Surveys of Airport Tenants**

The objective of this survey effort is to attain a complete profile for all on-airport tenants/businesses at each study airport. Tenant lists will be compiled working with airport contacts in 7.2. Surveys of on-airport tenants will focus on the nature of their business, services provided, the number of workers employed (full and part-time) at the airport, payroll data, annual operating expenditures, and property taxes. Information on capital improvement projects by individual airport tenants completed with private/third party funding will also be collected. Airport tenants/businesses will also be asked to provide information on off-airport businesses and others that use, rely on, or benefit from the airport on a regular basis. On-airport businesses/tenants include, but are not limited to:

- Airport operations (FAA tower, parking operations, government agencies, and in-terminal retail and service concessions, TSA)
- FBOs (including aviation maintenance, fueling and support services, and flight training)

- Agriculture operators
- Ground transportation providers
- Other providers of aviation services (commercial airlines, life flight, air cargo operators, corporate flight departments, air taxi and aircraft charter services)
- Military units with aviation functions at civilian study airports

A draft tenant survey will be prepared by the consultant team and reviewed by FBO AERO before the surveys are disseminated. All on-airport tenants will be contacted via U.S. mail or email to provide directions for participating in the survey. Options will be available to respond to the survey via e-mail, fax, or via an online link. At the airports where on-site visits are conducted, a time to meet with the tenant may be scheduled. Follow-up phone calls will be made to secure or to clarify any remaining data needs from tenants at all study airports.

#### **7.4 Surveys of Airport Visitors**

Collecting visitor passenger data is important to generate estimates of economic activity, jobs, and payroll supported by air visitor spending. Through passenger surveys, we will profile air visitors, including trip purpose (business or other), trip duration, and local spending patterns. Separate survey methods will be used for commercial airline and general aviation visitors.

##### **7.4.1 Commercial Aviation Passenger Data**

Visitor expenditures represent a primary source of economic benefit for commercial service airports. Each of the commercial airports will be asked to furnish annual and monthly enplanements for 2014 and 2015. Based on this data, an estimate of total enplanements for each commercial airport expected in 2017 will be prepared. Data from USDOT's Origination and Destination (O&D) survey will be used to determine the percent of local versus visiting enplanements for each commercial airport (currently 16 in Michigan).

##### **7.4.2 General Aviation Visiting Pilot and Passenger Survey**

There are two important components for estimating economic impacts related to general aviation visitors. One is a realistic estimate of how many actual visitors arrive in Michigan on general aviation aircraft at each airport, and the other is how much these visitors spend in the community/state. As part of 7.2, information will

be collected that will be used to estimate the number of annual general aviation visitors for each study airport.

A general aviation visitor survey will be distributed/made available to each airport that has a terminal or FBO facility (92 airports shown in attachment). Estimates of total annual visitor operations and estimates of annual general aviation visitors, along with expenditure data collected as part of this task, will be vetted with each airport contact and AERO at the time these estimates are finalized. This information will be assembled and analyzed as part of the task to calculate initial visitor related economic impacts.

The visiting general aviation passenger/pilot survey will be designed to collect information from those arriving via general aviation aircraft. The goal will be to collect airport-specific information on general aviation visitor spending. This survey will collect information on trip purpose, trip duration, expenditures by type, the relationship of the trip to area businesses, and home zip code for the visitor. The general aviation visitor survey will provide another opportunity to collect information on Michigan and visiting businesses that use and benefit from each airport.

General aviation passenger surveys will be distributed via airport managers and FBOs. For all study airports that participate in the general aviation visitor surveys, flyers will be sent to each airport/FBO that provide information on the general aviation passenger survey. These signs will be on display for a multi-month period to provide a sufficient window of time for passenger response. An on-line survey service (ex: SurveyMonkey) will be made available by the consultant for responses. Also, paper copies and electronic copies of the general aviation survey will be distributed to each airport or FBO for additional surveys, the airports will be responsible for collection of the completed paper copy surveys and providing to the consultant. The window for the general aviation visitor survey will parallel that for the commercial airline visitor survey, April – September 2016.

## **7.5 Quantification of Direct/Initial Economic Impacts**

Based on information collected in 7.1 through 7.4, the initial/direct employment, payroll and output will be estimated for:

- Airport administration

- Airport tenants
- Capital investment
- Commercial visitors
- General aviation visitors

The primary source of initial/direct impacts will be from the surveys/interviews. However, the Michigan Economic Development Corporation (MEDC) has data that can be used to cross check information collected from the surveys. Information from these sources on agriculture sprayers, air cargo and FAA employees, as examples, will be reviewed.

The purpose of this task is to identify and document airport and tenant related and visitor-related initial or direct economic impacts. Direct impacts are those traceable to airport administration, tenants, construction projects, and visitor spending as determined from survey efforts. Direct impacts come from the provision of aviation services at each airport or through activities supported by visitor spending. Initial economic impacts for all categories are measured in terms of jobs, payroll, and output/spending.

When direct impacts are reported, they reflect how many jobs are supported by activities/businesses at each airport; the annual payroll of these jobs; and the annual spending, sales, or investment for each airport business/entity. It is important to note, that sometimes, especially at smaller airports, those charged with airport management and maintenance are not physically located at the airport; impacts related to these individuals are still included in the direct impact estimate.

As part of direct or initial impacts, benefits from construction/capital improvement projects will be estimated. Spending for capital improvement projects is included in the “output” category. For every \$1 million in output for CIP, the (IMpact analysis for PLANning) (IMPLAN) model (or comparable model) provides a methodology for estimating the jobs and the payroll that are supported by this spending. AERO will be provided information by airports on total annual CIP (state/local/federal) in each of the past 6 years; in addition, they will help to catalog what type of project the investment was for. Additional information on private investment will be sought for each airport and their tenants, as will data on PFC collections. Information from the Michigan Association of General Contractors

(AGC) may be reviewed as part of the process to estimate economic impacts associated with capital projects.

Estimates of direct or initial economic impact are the most tangible of all impacts identified in an economic impact study, and they are the impacts that can most easily be understood. As a result, the technical report and the summary documents will highlight the direct impacts for each airport. When direct impacts, jobs, payroll, and spending (output) are assembled for each airport, these will be posted on AERO's website. All airports will be contacted via email to notify them that their direct impacts are available for review. A one week review period will be provided. Any needed adjustments to direct impact numbers for any of the study airports will be made at this time.

Other initial impacts stem from purchases made off-airport by air visitors. Commercial airports have initial impacts from both commercial and general aviation visitors. Initial visitor impacts for general aviation airports are limited to those that result from spending of visitors who arrive in Michigan on general aviation aircraft. Initial visitor impacts for each airport include visitor expenditures for hotels, restaurants, retail shops, recreation, and entertainment venues. The IMPLAN model (or comparable model) provides ratios to estimate the number of jobs and payroll in Michigan that are supported for every \$1 million dollars in annual visitor spending. Estimates of annual visitor spending for each airport will be derived from surveys of commercial airline and general aviation pilots and passengers in Task 1.

For the commercial airports, initial economic impacts will be calculated so that they can be assigned to commercial airlines or other aviation activities at each airport. This distribution of the initial economic impacts will be used subsequently when estimating benefits from airline service and airline activities. When reporting impacts, we will make the process as transparent as possible so that results are both credible and easily understood.

## **7.6 Estimation of Induced/Multiplier Economic Impacts**

The total economic impact of the Michigan airport system can be viewed as the flow of dollars through the economy, as measured by jobs, payroll, and total annual economic activity or output. As initial/direct impacts are released into the economy,

they circulate among other industry sectors, creating successive waves of additional impacts, which in turn support additional jobs, payroll, and output. These successive rounds of spending result in induced (or “multiplier”) impacts.

Measuring multiplier impacts as part of the statewide economic impact study helps to represent the full effect of each aviation-related dollar in Michigan. For each individual airport, impacts (initial and multiplier) will be reported separately (unless there are confidentiality issues) so that it is more apparent to the reader what portion of each airport’s economic impact stems from the multipliers.

For this task, the economic impact of each airport on just its local market area, as well as its total impact on Michigan’s statewide economy, will be estimated. AERO has a Community Benefits Assessment (CBA) Statewide Database System that was developed in 2003 by Economic Development Research Group, Inc. The system was refreshed this year with 2013 IMPLAN data for county-level and state-level multipliers and economic ratios. This model is licensed to MDOT for unlimited onsite use by MDOT staff, based on this the information gathered will be provided to AERO staff to process and include in the final reports.

## **7.7 Estimation of Tax Revenues from Aviation**

Aviation activities are important contributors to Michigan’s tax base. Aviation related taxes come from these sources:

- State income tax paid by those whose jobs are supported by airports and visitor spending
- Taxes contributed by airport businesses as available from data collection
- Sales tax paid by those whose jobs are supported by airports and visitor spending
- Sales tax paid by visitors (lodging/retail/rental cars/other)

When airports purchase goods, the state collects a sales tax on these purchases. While airport and airport business related sales taxes will be estimated, corporate businesses taxes will not be included in this analysis. Sales taxes also apply to goods purchased by residents in Michigan whose jobs are supported as a direct result of airports/aviation. Information collected from surveys, along with average

statewide sales tax paid by residents, will be used to estimate sales tax contributions from jobs that are airport-supported. Sales tax estimates will be prepared for direct jobs only. Aviation supported jobs in Michigan also contribute to state income tax revenues. Estimates of these revenues will be generated in this analysis.

When visitors come to Michigan by air, they also pay a sales tax on goods they purchase. From expenditure information obtained from visitors as part of this study's survey efforts, we will be able to estimate contributions to the state's sales tax from visitor expenditures. This tax information will be segregated between commercial and general aviation visitors.

Lodging and rental car taxes are paid by visitors to state and local governments. Estimates of visitors by airport and trip duration will enable us to estimate these additional tax contributions. Our approach to the EIS Study will provide an estimate of the annual value Michigan receives from taxes it collects from aviation-related employees and visitors.

Tax revenues will be reported on both a statewide and an airport specific basis as part of this task. Only direct/initial tax revenue impacts will be estimated in this task.

## **7.8 Documentation, Coordination, and Education/Outreach Documentation**

Several reports to document study findings and results will be prepared. An overarching goal for all study documentation will be to make sure that discussion of methodology for estimating reported impacts is straightforward and transparent. All reports will be provided so that they can easily be posted on AERO's website.

- Working Papers and Technical Report – for tasks 7.1 through 7.7 a working paper will be prepared. These documents will form the basis of these tasks technical report. At the conclusion of each subtask, working papers will be submitted to AERO for their review and comment.
- An important objective for this effort is to provide better education on the techniques and assumptions used to calculate economic impacts for airports in Michigan. Electronic copies of each working paper will be delivered to AERO. For the final technical report, 20 hard copies will be provided along with 10 CD's containing the technical report.

- Documentation of Airport Users – through research conducted for this study, examples of the types of users for each airport will be documented in paragraph form. For example, data collected will document how the energy industry, farmers/ranchers, hospitals, doctors, federal/state agencies, colleges/universities, businesses, and others use Michigan’s airports. The use examples for each airport will be included in an appendix to the technical report. Working with AERO the most compelling examples for each airport will be identified and included in the individual airport reports (some may be omitted due to confidentiality).
- Documentation of Business Use – as part of the passenger surveys (commercial and general aviation), airport interviews, and other outreach efforts, businesses that use study airports will be identified. A table will be prepared that shows local and non-local businesses users for each airport (as this information is secured from various data gathering efforts), the type of service the business provides, and for non-local businesses the company’s location outside of Michigan.
- Individual Airport Reports and IFR Flight Maps – Individual airport reports for the economic impact analysis will be provided for the 108 study airports. These reports will incorporate current IFR flight maps for each of the airports that show reported departures and arrivals for approximately 5 to 10 of this highest destinations flown to and from the airport in the past 3 years (the FAA TFMFC database and FlightAware may be utilized). It is possible for some of smaller airports that there may be no IFR data to report.

The individual airport reports will be developed in an 11 x 17 double-sided report format; two versions of the individual airport reports will be provided, one version for printing and one version for posting. These individual airport reports will provide the “build-up” or background for identifying each airport’s total annual economic impact. Unless there are confidentiality issues, economic impacts for each airport will be reported separately for airport administration impacts, tenant impacts, construction impacts, visitor impacts (both commercial and general aviation), and multiplier impacts for each of the above. Individual airport reports will also provide the most compelling use examples gathered for each airport.

The consultant team will work with AERO to establish the layout and content for these individual airport reports. The goal for the individual airport reports will be to produce a summary that is airport specific. Ten (10) hard copies of the airport's individual airport report will be provided to each airport, and a three ring binder with all of the reports will be provided to AERO.

- Summary Report for Economic Impact – a statewide summary for the economic impact update will be prepared, 150 copies of the summary report will be provided. The electronic file for the summary report will be provided as a deliverable so that additional copies of the summary report can be subsequently produced by AERO. The summary report will be produced using the following process:
  1. Draft narrative and graphics will be produced and provided to AERO for review and comment.
  2. A discussion between the consultant and AERO will determine the general color scheme, look, and layout for the summary report.
  3. A color draft of the summary report will be provided to AERO for review and comment.
  4. Revisions to the draft summary report will be undertaken based on comments/input from AERO.
  5. A second draft of the summary will be provided to AERO for review; and that draft will be updated to reflect final comments from AERO on the executive summary.
  6. A final draft will be sent to AERO before the report is forwarded to the printer.
  
- Average Annual Impact by Airport Category – final results from the analysis will be used to develop an average annual economic impact by airport type/role/classification. These averages will include FAA's roles for NPIAS Michigan airports as contained in the most current FAA Asset Study. In addition, other airport roles used by AERO will also be considered as these average annual impacts are calculated.
  
- Product Distribution - when the final executive reports are printed, the consultant will prepare for each of the 108 study airports a cover letter from

AERO; a CD containing the technical report, the summary report, a printable copy of the individual airport report, 10 hard copies of the executive summary for the economic impact study, and 30 hard copies of the airport's specific individual airport report.

### **CONSULTANT PAYMENT - MILESTONE**

Compensation for this project shall be on a milestone basis, as individual tasks are completed payment will be made.

The MDOT Project Manager may authorize payment if a milestone is delayed due to circumstances beyond the Consultant's control.

All billings for services must be directed to AERO and follow the current guidelines. Payment may be delayed or decreased if the instructions are not followed.

Payment to the Consultant for Services rendered shall not exceed the maximum amount unless an increase is approved in accordance with the contract with the Consultant. Typically, billings must be submitted within 60 days after the completion of services for the current billing. The final billing must be received within 60 days of the completion of services. Refer to your contract for your specific contract terms.

### **PROPOSAL SELECTION CRITERIA AND TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS**

#### SCORING (130 Points)

##### Proposed Selection Criteria and Total Possible Points

##### Understanding of Service – 30 Points

Describe your understanding of the service to be provided.

##### Qualifications of Team – 40 Points

Describe your team and the roles of key personnel. Provide resumes for key personnel.

##### Past Performance – 20 Points

Provide references and examples of similar work performed for other agencies.

##### Price – 35 Points

CSRT approved formula: Low Bid/Bid \* points assigned

Completed bid sheet required.

(Price must be at least 25% of overall points assigned)

Location – 5 Points

Indicate the percentage of work that will be performed in Michigan.

## CONSULTANT BID SHEET – MILESTONE

This bid sheet is required with the response to the Request for Proposal (RFP). All entries on this page must be handwritten in ink or computer generated. Compensation for this project shall be on a **milestone** basis.

Priced proposal costs will be required after selection, in accordance with MDOT’s Priced Proposal Guidelines which can be found on the MDOT web page under [Vendor/Consultant Services](#). Payment to the Consultant for services rendered shall not exceed the total bid price.

**Note:** MDOT reserves the right to reject any or all bids.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** Update the Michigan Airport System Plan (MASP) to align with MDOT’s current Strategic Plan as well as economic impacts of airport to local economies.

MILESTONE/DELIVERABLES	PRICE
Milestone/Deliverable, Task 1 (10%)    Task 1 Total: Study Design, Project Management, Coordination & Communication	\$
Milestone/Deliverable, Task 2 (5%)    Task 2 Total: Review the vision, mission, and goals of the MASP	\$
Milestone/Deliverable, Task 3 (33%)    Task 3 Total: Data Collection, Airport Classification, and Forecasting	\$
Milestone/Deliverable, Task 4 (7%)    Task 4 Total: Evaluate benchmarks for the MASP	\$
Milestone/Deliverable, Task 5 (9%)    Task 6 Total: Recommendations based on findings	\$
Milestone/Deliverable, Task 6 (6%)    Task 7 Total: Update MASP documents	\$
Milestone/Deliverable, Task 7 (30%)    Task 8 Total: Economic Impact Study	\$
<b>TOTAL BID PRICE: \$</b> <b>(All Milestones/Deliverables of the Project)</b>	

-----

<b>Legal Business Name:</b>	
<b>Consultants Authorized Legal Signer:</b>	
<b>Consultant Address:</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	

Facility Name	Associated City	County	NPIAS Service Level	Item	Description
Lenawee County	Adrian	LENAWEE	General Aviation	Tier	1
Padgham Field	Allegan	ALLEGAN	General Aviation	Tier	1
Gratiot Community	Alma	GRATIOT	General Aviation	Tier	1
Alpena County Rgnl	Alpena	ALPENA	Air Carrier	Tier	1
Ann Arbor Muni	Ann Arbor	WASHTENAW	General Aviation	Tier	1
Huron County Memorial	Bad Axe	HURON	General Aviation	Tier	1
W K Kellogg	Battle Creek	CALHOUN	General Aviation	Tier	1
James Clements Muni	Bay City	BAY	General Aviation	Tier	1
Beaver Island	Beaver Island	CHARLEVOIX	General Aviation	Tier	1
Antrim County	Bellaire	ANTRIM	General Aviation	Tier	1
Southwest Michigan Rgnl	Benton Harbor	BERRIEN	General Aviation	Tier	1
Roben-Hood	Big Rapids	MECOSTA	General Aviation	Tier	1
Bois Blanc Island	Bois Blanc Island	MACKINAC	General Aviation	Tier	1
Wexford County	Cadillac	WEXFORD	General Aviation	Tier	1
Tuscola Area	Caro	TUSCOLA	General Aviation	Tier	1
Charlevoix Muni	Charlevoix	CHARLEVOIX	Air Carrier	Tier	1
Fitch H Beach	Charlotte	EATON	General Aviation	Tier	1
Branch County Memorial	Coldwater	BRANCH	General Aviation	Tier	1
Willow Run	Detroit	WAYNE	Reliever	Tier	1
Coleman A. Young Muni	Detroit	WAYNE	General Aviation	Tier	1
Detroit Metropolitan Wayne County	Detroit	WAYNE	Air Carrier	Tier	1
Grosse Ile Muni	Detroit / Grosse Ile	WAYNE	Reliever	Tier	1
Drummond Island	Drummond Island	CHIPPEWA	General Aviation	Tier	1
Delta County	Escanaba	DELTA	Air Carrier	Tier	1
Bishop Intl	Flint	GENESEE	Air Carrier	Tier	1
Frankfort Dow Memorial Field	Frankfort	BENZIE	General Aviation	Tier	1
Fremont Municipal	Fremont	NEWAYGO	General Aviation	Tier	1
Gaylord Rgnl	Gaylord	OTSEGO	General Aviation	Tier	1
Grand Haven Meml Airpark	Grand Haven	OTTAWA	General Aviation	Tier	1
Abrams Muni	Grand Ledge	CLINTON	General Aviation	Tier	1
Gerald R. Ford Intl	Grand Rapids	KENT	Air Carrier	Tier	1
Grayling AAF	Grayling	CRAWFORD	General Aviation	Tier	1
Houghton County Memorial	Hancock	HOUGHTON	Air Carrier	Tier	1
Harbor Springs	Harbor Springs	EMMET	General Aviation	Tier	1
Harsens Island	Harsens Island	ST CLAIR		Tier	1
Hillsdale Muni	Hillsdale	HILLSDALE	General Aviation	Tier	1
West Michigan Rgnl	Holland	ALLEGAN	General Aviation	Tier	1
Roscommon County, Blodgett Memori	Houghton Lake	ROSCOMMON	General Aviation	Tier	1
Livingston County-Spencer J. Hardy	Howell	LIVINGSTON	Reliever	Tier	1
Ionia County	Ionia	IONIA	General Aviation	Tier	1
Ford	Iron Mountain Kingsfc	DICKINSON	Air Carrier	Tier	1
Stambaugh	Iron River	IRON		Tier	1
Gogebic-Iron County Airport	Ironwood	GOGEBIC	Commercial Service	Tier	1
Jackson Cnty - Reynolds Fld	Jackson	JACKSON	General Aviation	Tier	1
Kalamazoo/Battle Creek Intl	Kalamazoo	KALAMAZOO	Air Carrier	Tier	1
Toledo Suburban	Lambertville	MONROE	General Aviation	Tier	1

Capital Region Intl	Lansing	CLINTON	Air Carrier	Tier	1
Prices	Linden	GENESEE		Tier	1
Mason County	Ludington	MASON	General Aviation	Tier	1
Mackinac Island	Mackinac Island	MACKINAC	General Aviation	Tier	1
Manistee County - Blacker	Manistee	MANISTEE	Commercial Service	Tier	1
Schoolcraft County	Manistique	SCHOOLCRAFT	General Aviation	Tier	1
Marine City	Marine City	ST CLAIR		Tier	1
Marlette Township	Marlette	SANILAC	General Aviation	Tier	1
Sawyer Intl	Marquette	MARQUETTE	Air Carrier	Tier	1
Mason Jewett Field	Mason	INGHAM	General Aviation	Tier	1
Menominee - Marinette Twin County	Menominee	MENOMINEE	General Aviation	Tier	1
Jack Barstow	Midland	MIDLAND	General Aviation	Tier	1
Oscoda County Dennis Kauffman Mem	Mio	OSCODA	General Aviation	Tier	1
Custer	Monroe	MONROE	General Aviation	Tier	1
Mount Pleasant Muni	Mount Pleasant	ISABELLA	General Aviation	Tier	1
Hanley Field	Munising	ALGER		Tier	1
Muskegon County	Muskegon	MUSKEGON	Air Carrier	Tier	1
Oakland Southwest	New Hudson	OAKLAND	Reliever	Tier	1
Luce County	Newberry	LUCE	General Aviation	Tier	1
Ontonagon County - Schuster Field	Ontonagon	ONTONAGON	General Aviation	Tier	1
Oscoda-Wurtsmith	Oscoda	IOSCO	General Aviation	Tier	1
Owosso Community	Owosso	SHIAWASSEE	General Aviation	Tier	1
Pellston Rgnl Airport Of Emmet County	Pellston	EMMET	Air Carrier	Tier	1
Canton-Plymouth-Mettetal	Plymouth	WAYNE	Reliever	Tier	1
Oakland County Intl	Pontiac	OAKLAND	Reliever	Tier	1
St Clair County Intl	Port Huron	ST CLAIR	Reliever	Tier	1
Ray Community	Ray	MACOMB		Tier	1
Presque Isle County	Rogers City	PRESQUE ISLE	General Aviation	Tier	1
Romeo State	Romeo	MACOMB	Reliever	Tier	1
Saginaw County H. W. Browne	Saginaw	SAGINAW	General Aviation	Tier	1
MBS Intl	Saginaw	SAGINAW	Air Carrier	Tier	1
Mackinac County	Saint Ignace	MACKINAC	General Aviation	Tier	1
Sault Ste Marie Chippewa County Intl	Sault Ste Marie	CHIPPEWA	Air Carrier	Tier	1
Paul C. Miller-Sparta	Sparta	KENT	General Aviation	Tier	1
Kirsch Muni	Sturgis	ST JOSEPH	General Aviation	Tier	1
Al Meyers Airport	Tecumseh	LENAWEE		Tier	1
Cherry Capital	Traverse City	GRAND TRAVER	Air Carrier	Tier	1
Oakland Troy	Troy	OAKLAND	Reliever	Tier	1
West Branch Community	West Branch	OGEMAW	General Aviation	Tier	1
Atlanta Muni	Atlanta	MONTMORENC	General Aviation	Tier	2
Baldwin Muni	Baldwin	LAKE		Tier	2
Cheboygan County	Cheboygan	CHEBOYGAN	General Aviation	Tier	2
Clare Muni	Clare	CLARE	General Aviation	Tier	2
Dowagiac Muni	Dowagiac	CASS	General Aviation	Tier	2
Iosco County	East Tawas	IOSCO		Tier	2
Ewart Muni	Ewart	OSCEOLA	General Aviation	Tier	2
Gladwin Zettel Muni	Gladwin	GLADWIN	General Aviation	Tier	2

Greenville Muni	Greenville	MONTCALM	General Aviation	Tier	2
Oceana County	Hart/Shelby	OCEANA	General Aviation	Tier	2
Hastings	Hastings	BARRY	General Aviation	Tier	2
Riverview	Jenison	OTTAWA		Tier	2
Lakeview Airport-Griffith Field	Lakeview	MONTCALM	General Aviation	Tier	2
DuPont-Lapeer	Lapeer	LAPEER	General Aviation	Tier	2
Brooks Field	Marshall	CALHOUN	General Aviation	Tier	2
Jerry Tyler Memorial	Niles	BERRIEN	General Aviation	Tier	2
Woolsey Memorial	Northport	LEELANAU		Tier	2
Sandusky City	Sandusky	SANILAC	General Aviation	Tier	2
Sault Ste Marie Muni/Sanderson Field	Sault Ste Marie	CHIPPEWA		Tier	2
South Haven Area Rgnl	South Haven	VAN BUREN	General Aviation	Tier	2
Three Rivers Muni Dr Haines	Three Rivers	ST JOSEPH	General Aviation	Tier	2
White Cloud	White Cloud	NEWAYGO	General Aviation	Tier	2
Ottawa Executive	Zeeland	OTTAWA		Tier	2