



**ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS DEPARTMENT
ENGINEERING DIVISION**

Report Number: 2013-06

Date: February 25, 2013

SUBJECT: PROJECT 2012-21, 2012-23, 2012-24 - REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – COST CONSULTANT, LAND SURVEYOR, GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTANT FOR THE PORT COLBORNE OPERATIONS CENTRE (PCOC) DESIGN-BID-BUILD PROJECT

1) PURPOSE

This report is prepared by Jim Hupponen, Manager of Engineering Services under the direction of Ron Hanson, Director of Engineering and Operations. The purpose of the report is to inform Council of the outcome of the Request for Proposals (RFP) that were issued for the selection of a Cost Consultant, Land Surveyor and a Geotechnical Consultant for the Port Colborne Operations Centre (PCOC) Design-Bid-Build Project and to obtain approval from Council to award the contracts to the successful consultants.

2) HISTORY, BACKGROUND, COUNCIL POLICY, PRACTICES

The City's Works Yard is no longer adequate for the present Operations and Public Works fleet and Council has agreed that a new facility is required, through presentations made at Strategic Planning and budget deliberations. In 2008 a Class Environmental Assessment (EA) was initiated to address the long term requirements of the Operations Division of the City. The Study was completed in November 2009 and after a site selection process, the City-owned land comprising of 5.7 hectares of industrial land on Stonebridge Drive was selected as the preferred site.

During budget deliberations for the 2012 Capital Budget, City Staff requested a debenture of \$800,000 which would be used to hire a Project Management firm and an Architectural firm to complete the detailed design for the construction of the new facility.

In 2011, City Staff meet with the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority (NPCA) to review the preferred site and discuss any environmental constraints. A 30.0m wetland buffer was found to be in place along the north property line and a 100 year floodplain transverses diagonally across the northeast quadrant of the property. Based on the preliminary site plan established through the EA process, it was determined that the building configurations would need to be manipulated to ensure that the site was still adequate for the New Operations Centre to be built within the environmental constraints. City Staff met with Staff from AMEC Environmental on February 23, 2012 to review the preliminary site plan. AMEC revised the buildings on the site to determine if the site was still adequate for the requirements of the Operations Department. AMEC sent a revised site plan to City Staff on March 8, 2012 showing that the site was still adequate for the requirements of the Operations Department.

During the December 10, 2012 Council meeting, Report # 2012-38 was presented to Council. Council approved the following recommendation:

- A) That the Council of the City of Port Colborne award the Request for Proposal – Architect for the Port Colborne Operations Centre (PCOC) Design-Bid-Build Project to McCallum Sather Architects Inc. of Hamilton, Ontario for the total proposed price of \$361,400 plus applicable taxes.**
- B) AND THAT the project be debentured in the amount of \$361,400 excluding taxes through the Infrastructure Ontario Loan Program for a period of 30 years.**
- C) AND THAT the appropriate By-laws be drafted and submitted for execution by the Mayor and City Clerk.**

An agreement between the City and McCallum Sather Architects Inc. was prepared in January of 2013. The Architects have attended several Technical Advisory Committee meetings to discuss preliminary design requirements since the contract award in December of 2012.

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) consists of the Mayor Badawey, Councillor Danch, the Director of Engineering & Operations, the Manager of Engineering Services, the Public Works Superintendent, PRISM Partners and McCallum Sather Architects.

Based on the proposed schedule, the TAC prepared RFP documents to hire a Cost Consultant, Land Surveyor and a Geotechnical Firm and a public call for submission of proposal documents was issued. Proponents were required to submit proposals in accordance with the Terms of Reference prepared by PRISM Partners and the City.

RFP 2012-21 - Cost Consultant

The RFP document was issued on January 3, 2013 with a closing date of January 21, 2013. Twelve (12) documents were received during the RFP process.

The proposals, using a “one envelope” system were reviewed and scored according to:

Category	Factor
▪ Team Strength and Leadership	15
▪ Similar Work Experience and Local Expertise	35
▪ Project Understanding	10
▪ Methodology (Work Plan, Innovation, Client Admin. Input, Workload, Schedule)	15
▪ Pricing	25

Each Category above was rated with a value ranging from 1-10 and then pro-rated by the factors above.

The Successful Proponent was required to possess a comprehensive understanding of operations centre expertise using accurate market costs. The RFP required consultants to provide details on the above listed categories as well as indicate the assigned Cost Consultant Lead. The RFP also requested that a pricing option be given for the cost analysis of a second storey above the administrative office area, for the possible relocation of the Engineering Staff to the new facility.

RFP 2012-23 – Land Surveyor

The RFP document was issued on December 11, 2012 with a closing date of January 21, 2013. Eight (8) documents were received during the RFP process.

The proposals, using a “one envelope” system were reviewed and scored according to:

Category	Factor
▪ Proponent Information (Experience and work on Similar Projects)	15
▪ References (Appendix C)	15
▪ Project Understanding	15
▪ Methodology/Schedule/Work Plan	15
▪ Project Management and Staff (CV's)	15
▪ Pricing – Appendix B	25

Each Category above was rated with a value ranging from 1-10 and then pro-rated by the factors above.

The Successful Proponent was required to possess a comprehensive understanding of land surveying techniques in accordance with the requirements in the RFP document. The RFP required consultants to provide details on the above listed categories as well as indicate the assigned Project Lead.

RFP 2012-24 – Geotechnical Consultant

The RFP document was issued on January 3, 2013 with a closing date of January 21, 2013. Seven (7) documents were received during the RFP process.

The proposals, using a “one envelope” system were reviewed and scored according to:

Category	Factor
▪ Letter of Introduction	5
▪ Form 2 – Consultant Overall Qualifications	10
▪ Form 3 – Sub-consultant Qualifications	10
▪ Form 4 – Qualification of Key Individuals	10
▪ Reference Checks	10
▪ Proposal Quality	5
▪ Form 5 – Fee Proposal	50

Each Category above was rated with a value ranging from 1-10 and then pro-rated by the factors above.

The Successful Proponent was required to possess a comprehensive understanding of geotechnical techniques in accordance with the requirements in the RFP document. The RFP required consultants to provide details on the above listed categories as well as indicate the assigned Project Lead.

The results of the RFP openings are attached. The entire process and opening proceedings adhered to policies and past practices as previously adopted and endorsed by Council.

3) STAFF COMMENTS AND DISCUSSIONS

RFP 2012-21 – Cost Consultant

Proposals were received from the following twelve (12) Cost Consultants:

- A.W. Hooker
- AECOM
- Altus Group
- BTY Group
- Chanada Consultants Inc.
- Clare Randall Smith Pendlebury Cost Consultant
- CRG Consulting
- Faithful + Gould
- Hallex Engineering Ltd.
- Hanscomb Limited
- Marshall & Murray Inc.
- Turner & Townsend CM2R

The TAC scored all submissions based on technical content and then applied the scores for the Pricing.

The top three (3) proposals based on technical content were Clare Randall Smith Pendlebury Cost Consultant, BTY Group and Hanscomb Limited.

Once the Pricing scores were factored in, the top three (3) proposals were Clare Randall Smith Pendlebury Cost Consultant, Hallex Engineering Ltd. and Hanscomb Limited.

A.W. Hooker did not submit the proposal as per the instructions in the RFP document; as such this proposal was not reviewed.

Clare Randall Smith Pendlebury Cost Consultant scored the highest as indicated on the scoring chart with the Pricing scores added as shown in Attachment 1.

The proposal Pricing was based on the estimated construction cost of \$5.17 million based on the most recent “order of magnitude” cost estimate prepared during the previous Environmental Assessment Report (EA) for the Operations Centre. The fee submitted by Clare Randall Smith Pendlebury Cost Consultant for the original scope of work as defined by the previous EA is \$46,307 excluding taxes. This fee was not the lowest price received, however; based on technical merit, the successful proponent scored the highest.

As part of the RFP, optional pricing was requested for the cost analysis of a proposed second floor above the administrative area. The optional Pricing submitted by Clare Randall Smith Pendlebury Cost Consultant was \$13,100 excluding taxes. This cost will need to be factored into the total budget if Council directs the TAC to pursue the second floor option.

The TAC feels that Clare Randall Smith Pendlebury Cost Consultant’s past project experience and capabilities will compliment the needs of the City’s selected Architect. Our Project Manager, PRISM Partners has previously worked with Clare Randall Smith

Pendlebury Cost Consultant on similar projects with very positive results.

RFP 2012-23 – Land Surveyor

Proposals were received from the following eight (8) Land Surveyors:

- ACI Survey Consultants Inc.
- Chambers & Associates Surveying Ltd.
- Ivan B. Wallace O.L.S. Ltd.
- Matthews Cameron Heywood Kerry T. Howe Surveying Ltd.
- McIntosh Perry Surveying
- Rasch & Hyde Ltd.
- Stantec Geomatics Limited
- The Larocque Group

The TAC scored all submissions based on technical content and then applied the scores for the Pricing.

The top three (3) proposals based on technical content were Chambers & Associates Surveying Ltd., McIntosh Perry Surveying and Ivan B. Wallace O.L.S. Ltd.

Once the Pricing scores were factored in, the top three (3) proposals were Chambers & Associates Surveying Ltd., Ivan B. Wallace O.L.S. Ltd. and McIntosh Perry Surveying.

Chambers & Associates Surveying Ltd. scored the highest as indicated on the scoring chart with the Pricing scores added as shown in Attachment 2.

The proposal Pricing was based on the preferred site location selected during the previous Environmental Assessment Report (EA) for the Operations Centre. The fee submitted by Chambers & Associates Surveying Ltd. for the original scope of work as defined by the previous EA is \$9,944 excluding taxes. This fee was the lowest price received and based on technical merit; the successful proponent scored the highest.

The TAC feels that Chambers & Associates Surveying Ltd.'s past project experience and capabilities will compliment the needs of the City's selected Architect. This surveying firm has completed several projects within the City in the past with much success.

RFP 2012-24 – Geotechnical Consultant

Proposals were received from the following seven (7) Geotechnical Consultants:

- AMEC Environmental and Infrastructure
- Golder Associates Ltd.
- Inspec Sol Inc.
- Peto-MacCallum
- SPL Consultants Ltd.
- Terraprobe Inc.
- Egmond Associates

The TAC scored all submissions based on technical content and then applied the scores for the Fee Proposal.

The top three (3) proposals based on technical content were Terraprobe Inc., SPL Consultants Ltd. and Inspec Sol Inc.

Once the Fee Proposal scores were factored in, the top three (3) proposals were SPL Consultants Ltd., Terraprobe Inc. and Inspec Sol Inc.

AMEC Environmental and Infrastructure, Golder Associates, Peto-MacCallum and Egmond Associates did not submit their proposals as per the instructions in the RFP document; as such these proposals were not reviewed.

SPL Consultants Ltd. scored the highest as indicated on the scoring chart with the Fee Proposal scores added as shown in Attachment 3.

The Fee Proposal was based on the completion of 30 boreholes at a minimum depth of 3m or refusal to bedrock. The fee submitted by SPL Consultants Ltd. for the original scope of work as defined by the previous EA is \$11,380 excluding taxes. This fee was the lowest price received and based on technical merit; the successful proponent scored the highest.

As part of the RFP, additional service pricing was provided by the consultant for ground water monitoring wells. The cost for this additional service is \$1,500 excluding taxes. This additional service may be required depending on the results of the boreholes.

The TAC feels that SPL Consultants Ltd. past project experience and capabilities will compliment the needs of the City's selected Architect. This geotechnical firm has completed several projects within the Region in the past with much success.

Based on the previous approved costs of \$191,000 for the Project Management firm and \$361,400 for Prime Consultant Services – Architect, the above fee proposals as submitted by Clare Randall Smith Pendlebury Cost Consultant, Chambers & Associates Surveying Ltd. and SPL Consultants Ltd. for RFP 2012-21, RFP 2012-23 and RFP 2012-24 respectively are within our current budget of \$800,000. See Attachment 4 for a breakdown of the proposed budget for the PCOC.

City Staff are requesting that the debentured funds allotted for in the 2012 Capital Budget be utilized to hire a Cost Consultant, Land Surveyor and Geotechnical Consultant for the facility as per the process outlined above.

It is the recommendation of Staff at this time that Council accept the proposals as submitted by Clare Randall Smith Pendlebury Cost Consultant, Chambers & Associates Surveying Ltd. and SPL Consultants Ltd. and award the Request for Proposals for a Cost Consultant, Land Surveyor and Geotechnical Consultant for the Port Colborne Operations Centre (PCOC) Design-Bid-Build Project to them. This will allow the City to enter into an agreement with Clare Randall Smith Pendlebury Cost Consultant, Chambers & Associates Surveying Ltd. and SPL Consultants Ltd. and to initiate the site development as soon as details and scheduling allow.

In 2012, council budgeted \$800,000 which will have been used to hire a Project Management firm and a Prime Consultant - Architect and will be used to hire a Cost Consulting firm, a Land Surveying firm and a Geotechnical Consulting firm to complete the detailed design during 2012/2013 for construction to begin later in 2013.

4) **OPTIONS AND FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS:**

a) **Do nothing.**

- Not an Option. The existing Public Works building does not allow the Operations Staff to function safely or efficiently. (not recommended)

b) **Other Options**

- As recommended in this report, Council approve the following contracts with the recommended consultants:
 - Clare Randall Smith Pendlebury Cost Consultant to monitor the costs during the various phases of design for the PCOC to ensure the project stays within budget. The price proposed is \$46,307 for cost consultant services. **(recommended)**
 - Chambers & Associates Surveying Ltd. to prepare a topographical survey of the preferred site at the corner of Highway 58 (Westside Road) and Stonebridge Drive so that the Architect can begin the detailed design of the site. The price proposed is \$9,944 for land survey services. **(recommended)**
 - SPL Consultants Ltd. to perform geotechnical investigation of the preferred site to determine the bearing capacities of the soil for the Architect to analysis and prepare detailed design. The price proposed is \$11,380 for geotechnical services. **(recommended)**
- It is suggested that the Council of the City of Port Colborne initiate discussions to determine if the Additional Scope as discussed above is required as this will alter the foundation designs for the PCOC. It should be noted that the cost of the Cost Consultant, Land Surveyor and Geotechnical Consultant is a component of the original submission and plan. It will form part of the cost of the structure as originally planned.
- Council could direct re-tendering or choosing an alternative bidder. The evaluation team worked diligently in the evaluation of the submissions. The emphasis was on the fact that this phase of the construction of the facility is the most important. It has to be correct the first time as the facility will be a 40 to 50 year facility. (not recommended)

5) **COMPLIANCE WITH STRATEGIC PLAN INITIATIVES**

- 2011 Strategic Planning Session: Engineering & Operations
 - Complete a review of preferred sites for a new Operations Centre and prepare a report to Council outlining a strategy for the location and building of the new facility.

6) **ATTACHMENTS**

1. Technical Content Scoring Sheet with Fee Proposal – RFP 2012-21
2. Technical Content Scoring Sheet with Fee Proposal – RFP 2012-23
3. Technical Content Scoring Sheet with Fee Proposal – RFP 2012-24
4. Breakdown of Proposed Budget

7) RECOMMENDATION

- A) That the Council of the City of Port Colborne award the Request for Proposal – Cost Consultant for the Port Colborne Operations Centre (PCOC) Design-Bid-Build Project to Clare Randall Smith Pendlebury Cost Consultant of Burlington, Ontario for the total proposed price of \$46,307 plus applicable taxes;**
- B) AND THAT the Council of the City of Port Colborne award the Request for Proposal – Land Surveyor for the Port Colborne Operations Centre (PCOC) Design-Bid-Build Project to Chambers & Associates Surveying Ltd. of Welland, Ontario for the total proposed price of \$9,944 plus applicable taxes;**
- C) AND THAT the Council of the City of Port Colborne award the Request for Proposal – Geotechnical Consultant for the Port Colborne Operations Centre (PCOC) Design-Bid-Build Project to SPL Consultants Ltd. of Vaughan, Ontario for the proposed price of \$11,380 plus applicable taxes;**
- D) AND THAT the project be funded from the existing \$800,000 debenture previously approved by Council in By-law #5901/08/13.**
- E) AND THAT the appropriate By-laws be drafted and submitted for execution by the Mayor and City Clerk.**

8) SIGNATURES

Prepared on February 14, 2013 by:

Reviewed by:

Jim Huppunen, A.Sc.T.
Manager of Engineering Services

Ron Hanson, C.E.T.
Director of Engineering & Operations

Reviewed by:

Reviewed and Respectfully Submitted:

Peter Senese
Director of Corporate and
Community Services

Robert J. Heil
Chief Administrative Officer