



Report Number: 2009- 31

Date: August 31, 2009

**SUBJECT: Health and Wellness Centre – Prime Design Consultant Services**

**1) PURPOSE:**

This report was written based on the recommendation from the Architect Review Subcommittee to provide Council with a recommendation in respect of a contract to engage the services of the Prime Design Consultant Services (Architect) in respect of the City's new Health and Wellness Recreation Centre.

**2) HISTORY, BACKGROUND, COUNCIL POLICY, PRACTICES**

The City called for submissions in a request for proposal (RFP). There were a total of twenty-one registered potential proponents. Sixteen submitted a proposal. City staff followed the policies of Council during the rating process. The two-envelope system was employed as is the City's practice (quote or bid in a second envelope and opened only for the final six proponents who were interviewed).

**3) STAFF COMMENTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

In the RFP process, a detailed system of evaluation was developed. The RFP was broken down into four components, each with a point assignment for evaluation as follows and were weighted as described in the RFP:

		Weighting
Methodology and Workplan	30 points	25%
Corporate Qualifications	25 points	20%
Individual Qualifications	10 points	30%
Fee Proposal	25 points	25%

The interview consisted of five interview questions and the proponent's presentation with points assigned as follows:

Interview Questions	25 points
Interview presentation	10 points

Six members of the advisory committee (one at large, two Councillors, Mayor and two staff) and our Project Administrator from MHPM were each given a copy of each of the sixteen submissions (except for the price proposal envelopes) and independently reviewed each submission. Ratings were produced, summarized, averaged and analyzed by the committee. The seven highest scores were selected for interview. One did not show up for the interview.

For the interview, each proponent was given 15 minutes to make a presentation. As well, there were five questions posed to all proponents. The proponents interviewed were each rated on their presentation and their answers to the questions. Those ratings were added to the original ratings. Finally the fee proposal was opened and the points assigned were also added to the evaluations. The final rating schedule is attached.

The committee reviewed the top two proponents based on the rating and were unanimously chosen as the top proponents. The committee agreed that both were very equal in all respects being a 1 point difference and with the fees within \$81,000 of each other. The committee felt that either proponent would provide a top quality service in design and to achieve a consensus, the committee voted in favour of MacLennan Jaunkalns Miller Architects (MJM) to provide the Prime Design Consultant Services for the Health and Wellness Recreation Centre. MJM provided the lower proposal fee at \$1,995,000.

The submission by MJM is recommended for approval of Council. A copy of the detailed submission is attached for Council's information.

#### **4) OPTIONS AND FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS:**

##### **a) Do nothing.**

Council has already directed the construction of the facility, the appointment of a Contract/Project Administrator and Owner's Representative and now the Prime Design Consultant is required. The funding agreement signed with the upper levels of government commit the City to this project. Therefore is it staff's opinion that this option is not available.

##### **b) Other Options**

As recommended in this report, approval to contract with MJM to provide the Prime Design Services for the facility. The base fee proposed is \$1,995,000 for the services specified in the RFP and based on a construction cost of \$30,000,000. In addition, MJM has provided a single percentage fee adjustment figure of 6.7% that will be applied to the base fee should the construction budget increase or decrease. It should be noted that the cost of the Prime Design 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 proponent. The evaluation team worked diligently in the evaluation of the submissions. The emphasis was on the fact that the design 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, it is only built once.

Based on the process thus far, it does not appear that there are other viable options available; consequently none are recommended.

**5) COMPLIANCE WITH STRATEGIC PLAN INITIATIVES**

N/A

**6) ATTACHMENTS**

Appendix A: Summary of evaluations for proponents interviewed

Appendix B: Copy of the submission from MJM (Mayor and Council only)

**7) RECOMMENDATION**

1/ That MacLennan Jaunkalns Miller Architects (MJM) be approved as the City's Prime Design Consultant and that the appropriate by-law is prepared for approval by Council.

2/ That the Mayor and City Clerk be authorized to execute the agreement with MJM for consulting services

**8) SIGNATURES**

Prepared on August 28, 2009 by:

Reviewed and Respectfully Submitted:

Peter Senese  
Director of Corporate and Community  
Services

Councillor Bill Steele  
Chair of the New Community Centre  
Advisory Committee

Reviewed and Respectfully Submitted:

Robert J. Heil  
Chief Administrative Officer