

7

CONSULTANT SERVICES FOR CONSTRUCTION OF MOUNT ALBERT WELL 3 AND CONNECTING WATERMAIN TOWN OF EAST GWILLIMBURY

The Transportation and Works Committee recommends the adoption of the recommendations contained in the following report, December 12, 2006, from the Commissioner of Transportation and Works:

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

1. The consulting engineering firm of Marshall Macklin Monaghan Limited be engaged to undertake the detailed design and contract administration for the Mount Albert Well 3 and Centre Street watermain to provide additional water supply to the community of Mount Albert at an upset limit of \$432,600 excluding GST.
2. The Regional Chair and Regional Clerk be authorized to sign an engineering agreement with Marshall Macklin Monaghan Limited for the completion of these services, subject to review by Legal Services.

2. PURPOSE

This report seeks authorization to retain consulting engineering services related to the additional water supply for the Community of Mount Albert, specifically the detailed design, construction administration and inspection services for Mount Albert Well 3 and Centre Street watermain.

The purchasing by-law requires council authorization to award Request for Proposals (RFP) when the recommended proponent does not have the lowest cost. In this case, the recommended proponent has the highest technical score and second lowest cost. Therefore, council authorization is required.

3. BACKGROUND

The Regional Municipality of York is responsible for the water production, treatment, storage and transmission for its local municipalities, including the East Gwillimbury community of Mount Albert. Mount Albert is serviced by a system of wells owned by the Region.

The current water supply system in Mount Albert is provided by two municipal wells (Numbers 1 and 2) located on Hi-View Drive and a relatively new elevated tower with

the capacity of 2.7ML located at the northeast corner of Mount Albert on the Ninth Line. The system is equipped to produce a maximum flow rate from the well field of 6.55ML/day; however, the Permit to Take Water (PTTW) for the system allows for a maximum withdrawal of 4.35ML/day.

The current “firm capacity”, defined as the capacity of the supply system with the largest source (one well) out-of-service, is 3,273m³/day and generally meets current needs. This, however, will not meet projected future needs as the planned growth for Mount Albert is expected to reach 5,300 by the year 2026 with an ultimate anticipated population of 6,000 through intensification and infill within the approved community settlement boundary.

Due to their close proximity, the two existing wells form a single water source. The development of a back-up water supply is recommended by a provincial policy to maintain two independent sources of water. There is, currently, no evidence of degradation in the water quality at the existing wells.

3.1 Status of the Mount Albert Water Supply Class EA

York Region filed the Mount Albert Water Supply in December 2006 with the Ministry of Environment (MOE). The document is currently available for a 30-day public review. Given that staff expects the conclusion of the Class EA process in early 2007, York Region is in a position to move ahead with the design phase. It is, therefore, appropriate to move forward with the consultant selection for the engineering services to start the project as recommended in the Environmental Assessment process for the production well and connecting watermain to the community of Mount Albert.

3.2 Proposed Scope of Work

The assignment includes the detailed design of a production well including the wellhouse, pumping and treatment requirements. As part of the Environmental Assessment, a ground water exploration program was completed and two sites were explored. A full-scale production well was drilled as part of the testing program and is to be developed as part of this project. The assignment also includes the detailed design of a 1.7km of 300mm diameter watermain on Centre Street to connect the production well to the community of Mount Albert (*see Attachment 1*). The services will include all contract administration and full-time site inspection.

4. ANALYSIS AND OPTIONS

Proponents responded to Request for Qualifications (RFQ) P-04-53. Based on the statements of qualifications received in response to the RFQ, four firms were invited to respond to Request for Proposal (RFP) No. P-06-99 for this project. Proposals were received from all four firms.

The proposals were evaluated using the two-envelope system, with technical and financial information kept in separate envelopes. The technical proposal was judged prior to any knowledge of financial bids. Technical content was weighted at 80%. The technical evaluation was based on the following criteria:

- Project Team Experience on similar projects.
- Project Understanding.
- Approach and Methodology.
- Quality Assurance and Quality Control.

Financial scores were assigned comprising the remaining 20% weight of the total evaluation. The best proposal was deemed to be the one with the highest total score.

In this circumstance, none of the remaining three proposals' overall scores were within five points of the highest overall score; therefore, the "dollar cost methodology" was not required as adopted by Regional Council on June 22, 2006.

A summary of the evaluations of the consultants' proposals is presented in Table 1 below and includes the technical score, the upset limit fee (excluding GST), the corresponding financial score, and the total score for each proponent.

Table 1
Consultant Proposal Evaluation Summary

Firm	Technical Score /80	Upset Limit Fee \$	Financial Score /20	Total Score /100
Marshall Macklin Monaghan	57.8	\$432,600	15.6	73.4
Trow Consulting Engineers	48.3	\$337,529	20	68.3
UMA Engineering Ltd.	54.1	\$519,956	13.0	67.1
Chisholm, Fleming and Associates	52.2	\$465,671	14.5	66.7

The firm with the best overall score (combination of technical and financial) with an upset limit cost of \$432,600 was Marshall Macklin Monaghan.

Marshall Macklin Monaghan technical proposal had a good combination of project management, technical staff and sub-consultants that formed a competent design team with the commitment of the necessary resources to complete this assignment. Their proposal presented a sound understanding of the project requirements and a clear methodology to deliver a quality project on schedule. Considering Marshall Macklin Monaghan also completed the Environmental Study Report for the Mount Albert Water

Supply allows for a seamless understanding of the report; more specifically involvement of approval agencies and stakeholders.

The Supplies and Services Branch has reviewed the evaluation summary and has issued their internal report confirming that Marshall Macklin Monaghan be recommended as the successful overall proponent for this assignment.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The upset limit cost included in the highest rated proposal is \$432,600, excluding GST. Sufficient funds have been identified in the 2007 capital budget for all anticipated expenditures in this year.

The fees for contract administration and site inspection for the wellhouse were based on 140 working days. If the actual contract duration varies from the estimate, the fees for contract administration and site inspection will be adjusted based on the working fee provided in the proposal.

The fees for contract administration and site inspection for the watermain were based on 45 working days. If the actual contract duration varies from the estimate, the fees for contract administration and site inspection will be adjusted based on the working fee provided in the proposal.

6. LOCAL MUNICIPAL IMPACT

This project provides additional water supply within the community of Mount Albert and the production well and watermain will provide the necessary infrastructure to facilitate the additional water supplies.

All construction to provide the watermain will be in the Town of East Gwillimbury's right-of-way. The wellhouse will require purchase of property. The watermain will be located within the boulevard with minimal disruption to local traffic along Centre Street.

7. CONCLUSION

Consultants' proposals for this project were called and evaluated in accordance with the Region's purchasing by-law. It is recommended that the consulting engineering firm Marshall Macklin Monaghan be engaged to undertake the assignment at an upset limit cost of \$432,600, excluding GST.

Report No. 1 of the Transportation and Works Committee
Regional Council Meeting of January 25, 2007

For more information on this report contact Bala Araniyasundaran, extension 5131, Director, Capital Delivery of the Water and Wastewater Branch in the Transportation and Works Department.

The Senior Management Group has reviewed this report.

(The attachment referred to in this clause was included in the agenda for the January 10, 2007 Committee meeting.)