

14

CONSULTANT SELECTION – INSTALLATION OF BAR SCREENS AT THE LESLIE AND NEWMARKET PUMPING STATIONS

The Transportation and Works Committee recommends the adoption of the recommendations contained in the following report, April 19, 2005, from the Commissioner of Transportation and Works:

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

1. Request for Proposal P-05-08 for the design, tendering, and provision of contract administration for the installation of bar screens at the Leslie and Newmarket pumping stations be cancelled.
2. The alternate proposal submitted by R.V. Anderson Associates Limited for this work be received as an unsolicited proposal.
3. The Commissioner of Transportation and Works be authorized to accept the aforementioned unsolicited proposal from R.V. Anderson Associates and to engage that firm to carry out the work.

2. PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to retain an engineering consultant to complete the detailed design, and tendering and to provide contract administration and resident (i.e. on site) services for the replacement of mechanical bar screens at the Leslie and Newmarket Pumping Stations.

3. BACKGROUND

The York Durham Sanitary System includes five major pumping stations. All five stations contain mechanical bar screens to remove large items of rubbish prior to the sewage entering the pumps. These screens are at the end of their operational lifespan, and have been replaced in three of the five stations. This report addresses the replacement of the bar screens at the two remaining stations.

The manufacturer has been pre-selected for the supply of the replacement screens for the Leslie and Newmarket Pumping Stations. The Region must now engage a consulting engineering firm to complete the design of the installation process, prepare the tender documents, and oversee the construction contract.

4. ANALYSIS AND OPTIONS

4.1 Process

Advertisements for a Request for Proposal (RFP) were posted on the ETN on February 24th and appeared in the Daily Commercial News on March 1st and 3rd. Ten consulting engineering firms picked up tender documents. The Request for Proposal closed on March 22nd with seven firms responding.

Proposals were evaluated based on technical and financial merit. The technical evaluation was based on predefined criteria that accounted for 85% of the evaluation score. Firms achieving a score of 60% or higher were further evaluated based on the financial information submitted, which was scored to a maximum of 15%.

4.2 Results

The proposal evaluation results are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1
Consultant Proposal Evaluation Summary

Firm	Technical Score (out of 85)	Fee Proposal	Financial Score (Out of 15)	Total Score (Out of 100)
R.V. Anderson Associates	78.4	\$173,340.00	11.0	89.4
R.V. Anderson –alternative proposal		\$114,490.00		N/A
Conestoga-Rovers & Assoc.	66.3	\$144,758.21	13.2	79.5
Totten Sims Hubicki	68.0	\$166,761.64	11.5	79.4
MacViro Consultants Inc.	63.9	\$127,544.00	15.0	78.9
KMK Consultants Inc.	64.7	\$155,735.83	12.3	76.9
AWS Engineers & Planners	64.7	\$158,808.24	12.0	76.7

One responding firm failed to achieve the minimum required technical score, and its fee envelope was returned unopened. R.V. Anderson included an alternate proposal with a price of \$114,490.00, which was disqualified by the Bid Review Committee for reasons set out in Section 4.3 where the alternate bid is addressed in detail.

Of the considered proposals, R.V. Anderson Associates Limited (RVA) ranked highest in the technical score and in the combined technical and financial score, evaluated using their base bid of \$173,340.00.

There were several factors that resulted in RVA achieving the highest score. Multiple considerations were condensed into scores in ten technical categories. Of these, RVA

achieved the highest scores in four, including the two with the highest weightings. These four categories were:

- Experience and credentials of the firm, where RVA was able to highlight past experience replacing bar screens in several locations plus replacing the sluice gates at the Leslie Pumping Station and being the original designers of the Newmarket Pumping Station.
- Demonstration of a full understanding of the project, its objectives, and the services to be provided, where RVA included a thorough section on a constructability review for the various steps in the work, as well as thoroughly addressing the issue of maintaining operability of the stations during construction.
- Quality of the proposal with respect to methodology and approach, which overlaps to some extent with the preceding item, and
- Schedule of key activities and resources, which was detailed and well thought-out.

4.3 Alternative Proposal

The Newmarket pumping station is located on the same property on which the Region is preparing to construct the Newmarket Equalization Tank. The two projects (equalization tank, and bar screen replacement) are unrelated except by location, and have had different initiation dates and schedules.

RVA is the Region's consulting engineer for the equalization tank, and has identified the fact that the schedules of construction for replacement of the bar screens and for construction of the equalization tank are converging. Their alternate price proposal is simply based upon incorporating the contract for the replacement of the bar screens into the contract for the equalization tank construction, with associated savings arising in preparation of the documents and in contract administration and resident services.

This proposal differs in scope from the work identified in the Request for Proposal, and RVA is the only firm in a position to propose it. To maintain the integrity of the bidding process, it must therefore be rejected as an alternate bid.

As a proposal for work that materially differs from that requested in the RFP, the alternate from RVA becomes an unsolicited proposal, falling under Section 15 of the Region's Purchasing By-law. Sentence 15.2 of the By-law states that "If the Commissioner determines that the unsolicited proposal should be considered a sole source purchase, the award shall be made in accordance with section 10.2 of this by-law." Section 10 addresses sole source purchases.

Following the normal course of the Region's consultant selection process would result in a recommendation to award the work as originally proposed to R.V. Anderson Associates for \$173,340.00.

The alternative available to the Region, and recommended within this report, is to cancel Request for Proposal P-05-08 as issued, and negotiate an engineering agreement with

R.V. Anderson based upon that firm's unsolicited proposal. Section 6.2 of the Request for Proposal states "The Region reserves the right to accept or reject the lowest, or any or all submissions received, and the right to conduct a subsequent request for proposal process."

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The fee for this assignment is \$114,490.00 including GST and there are sufficient funds allocated in the approved 2005 budget.

6. LOCAL MUNICIPAL IMPACT

The bar screens remove deleterious material from the sewage stream before it reaches the pumps where it could cause seizure of the pumps and sewage spills to the environment. The mechanical rakes on the screens automatically remove the material from the screens to prevent build-up.

Replacement of the mechanical bar screens at the two stations will ensure greater reliability of the system and lowered likelihood of adverse environmental impacts to the local municipalities.

7. CONCLUSION

Having followed the prescribed competitive proposal process for consultant selection under RFP-05-08, Region staff recommend that the process now be cancelled.

Staff further recommend that the unsolicited proposal from R.V. Anderson Associates Limited be entertained, and the Commissioner of Transportation and Works and Works be authorized to award the engineering work to complete the detailed design and tendering and to administer the installation contract for new mechanical bar screens at the Leslie and Newmarket Pumping Stations to R.V. Anderson for the upset fee of \$114,490.00 including GST.

There is sufficient funding in the approved 2005 budget for this assignment.

The Senior Management Group has reviewed this report.