

17

CONSULTANT SELECTION FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE STOUFFVILLE ZONE 2 PUMPING STATION AND STOUFFVILLE ROAD WATERMAIN

The Transportation and Works Committee recommends the adoption of the recommendations contained in the following report, May 31, 2006, from the Commissioner of Transportation and Works:

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

1. The consulting engineering firm of Totten Sims Hubicki Associates Limited be engaged to undertake the detailed design and contract administration for the Stouffville Zone 2 Pumping Station and Stouffville Road Watermain to provide additional water supply to the community of Stouffville at an upset limit of \$570,615 excluding GST.
2. The Regional Chair and Regional Clerk be authorized to sign an engineering agreement with Totten Sims Hubicki Associates 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 Stouffville. The purchasing by-law requires Council authorization to award Requests for Proposal (RFP) in excess of \$500,000.

3. BACKGROUND

The Stouffville Water Supply Environmental Assessment (EA) was initiated in 2003 to identify various options to provide additional water supply to the growing community of Stouffville. The current population of Stouffville is approximately 12,000 and is planned to grow to approximately 36,000 representing a 3-fold increase in water demand. To accommodate the increased demand in water supply, the main options considered in the study included:

- Additional Groundwater Wells.
- Connection to the York Water System (YWS) in 2011.

Due to existing and projected demands in the YWS, additional supply for Stouffville would not be available until 2011. To meet interim supply requirements, additional

supply from new groundwater wells would be required. An exploratory program was initiated to find the supply of 10,500 m³/day (1600 gpm).

However, with the recent capacity limitation at Duffins Creek Sewage Treatment Facility, there is a constraint on new development in all areas serviced by York Durham Sewage System. This constraint on sewage means there is excess water supply available in the York Water System to supply Stouffville in the interim years. With this change, the connection to the York Water System was the recommended alternative for the EA Study and the construction advanced to 2007.

The notice of completion for the Stouffville Water Supply Environmental Assessment was filed in March 2006 and placed on public record for a 30-day review period. The Study identified connection to the York Water Supply as the preferred alternative which will provide additional water supply from the York Water System. The additional water supply will supplement the existing groundwater supply to Stouffville. A pumping station at the North Markham Reservoir, located at McCowan Road and Stouffville Road, will convey the water through a watermain from this site to the community.

3.1 Status of the Stouffville Water Supply Class EA

Through the Ministry of the Environment (MOE), the Region has been notified of a request for a Part II Order (“bump up” request). This request was made on the basis of concerns about a connection to the York Water System (YWS) allowing uncontrolled growth in the Stouffville community, water quality of the blended surface and groundwater supply, and the process followed for public consultation during the Class EA.

3.1.1 Growth in the Stouffville Community

A defined planning process is in place to enable public input into the growth of the Region’s communities through the Region’s Official Plan and community plans for each municipality. Population projections for the Stouffville community are based on approved planned growth. The Region’s Master Plan identified the need for additional water supply to Stouffville to meet this planned growth.

The purpose of the Class EA process is to enable public input into the planning for infrastructure needed to meet planned growth objectives as defined in the Official Plan. The connection of the YWS to the Stouffville community will allow the Region to meet the growth commitments of the Official Plan.

3.1.2 Water Quality of Blended Surface and Groundwater Supply

Similar opposition regarding the use of surface (lake-based) water was also encountered in 2000 as a part of the Aurora Newmarket Water Supply EA, however, on a larger scale. Residents believed the water to be of inferior quality and also submitted a Part II Order request to the MOE on that project. Based on the MOE’s careful assessment, the Part II Order was rejected. The Region anticipates that the Ministry will take the same position

and acknowledge that treated Lake Ontario water meets or exceeds the Ontario Drinking Water Standard.

3.1.3 Public Consultation During the Class EA

As required by the Class EA process, public consultation activities were undertaken to identify and receive input and to provide information on the project. The Class EA process requires that Schedule B projects have two mandatory points of contact during the process. This project had five points of contact: Notice of Commencement, Public Information Centre (PIC) #1, Interim Information Bulletin (#2), PIC #2, and the Notice of Completion.

In addition to the final PIC, Stouffville Council requested a final public comment opportunity in the form of a Council Presentation which occurred on April 4, 2006. This consultation was attended by Region staff and no objections related to the project were raised at this meeting.

3.1.4 Resolution of the Part II Order (Bump-up) Request

Staff has been in contact with the requestor of the Part II Order to attempt to resolve the concerns raised directly, however, the requestor is not prepared to rescind the request. All efforts have been made to ensure that a valuable public consultation process and a window for communication with Stouffville residents were maintained throughout the EA process. The requestor's concerns are more closely related to the growth of the Stouffville community rather than the actual EA process followed during the Stouffville Water Supply Class EA. Further, staff anticipates that the Ministry will acknowledge that all appropriate communications and Class Environmental Assessment processes have been satisfied in identifying the preferred solution, and that the concerns of the requestor have either been addressed through this process or are beyond the scope of this project.

The MOE, in its correspondence to the Region, advised that "the Region is free to continue planning the Project but cannot implement any part of it, including site preparation, until the Minister has made a decision about the request". The Region responded on May 29th, 2006, to the MOE's request to submit additional information in order to assist with the decision and according to the legislated timeline the MOE is required to make a recommendation within 21 calendar days of the receipt of additional information. Staff assesses the risk of the request for a Part II Order being successful as low. Given that staff expects a positive recommendation from the MOE by June 30th, 2006, the Region is in a position to move ahead with the design phase. It is therefore appropriate to move forward with the consultant selection for engineering services to start the project as recommended in the Environmental Assessment process for the pumping station and connecting watermain to the community of Stouffville.

3.2 Proposed Scope of Work

The assignment includes the detailed design of a 15ML/d (174L/s) pumping station with the ability to expand to 25ML/d (290L/s) and the detailed design of a 600mm diameter watermain on Stouffville Road to connect the pumping station to the community of

Stouffville. The assignment also includes contract administration and full-time site inspection.

4. ANALYSIS AND OPTIONS

Proponents responded to Request for Qualifications (RFQ) P-05-69, which was advertised in the Daily Commercial News and on the Electronic Tender Network in accordance with the purchasing by-law, on September 1, 2005. Based on the statements of qualifications received in response to the RFQ, three firms were invited to respond to Request for Proposal (RFP) No. P-06-16 for this project. Proposals were received from all three 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 60%. The RFP required a proponent to achieve a minimum score (40 out of 60) technically to progress to the financial evaluation.

The technical evaluation was based on the following criteria:

- Project Manager Experience.
- Project Team Experience.
- Project Understanding.
- Approach and Methodology.
- Quality Assurance and Quality Control.

All of the submitted technical proposals received at least 40 out of 60 on the technical evaluation; therefore, three financial proposals were opened. Financial scores were assigned comprising the remaining 40% weight of the total evaluation. The best proposal was deemed to be the one with the highest total score.

The RFP required a proponent to achieve a minimum score (36 out of 60) technically to progress to the financial evaluation. A score of 36 out of 60 corresponds to meeting the minimum requirements of the RFP.

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 /60	Upset Limit Fee \$	Financial Score /40	Total Score /100
Totten Sims Hubicki Associates Limited	44.1	\$570,615	40	84.1
KMK Consultants Limited	46.7	\$627,845	36.4	83.1
Chisholm, Fleming and Associates	43.6	\$882,300	25.9	69.5

The firm with the best overall score as well as the lowest upset limit cost was Totten Sims Hubicki Associates Limited with an upset limit of \$570,615 excluding GST.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The upset limit cost included in the highest rated proposal is \$570,615 excluding GST. Sufficient funds have been identified in the 2006 capital budget for all anticipated expenditures in this year.

The fees for contract administration and site inspection for the pumping station were based on 285 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 120 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.

Totten Sims Hubicki Associates Limited carried the lowest prices for these incremental costs as well.

6. LOCAL MUNICIPAL IMPACT

This project provides additional water supply within the community of Stouffville and the pumping station and watermain was the planned ultimate water supply to the community.

All construction to provide the watermain and pumping station will be on the Region's right-of-way and property. The watermain alignment is in the boulevard and minimal disruption to local traffic will occur along Stouffville Road.

7. CONCLUSION

Consultants' proposals for this project were called and evaluated in accordance with Regional policy. It is recommended that the consulting engineering firm Totten Sims Hubicki Associates Limited be engaged to undertake the assignment at an upset limit cost of \$570,615 excluding GST.

It is further recommended that the appropriate Regional officials be authorized to take all necessary steps to execute a formal agreement with Totten Sims Hubicki Associates Limited for the completion of these services.

The Senior Management Group has reviewed this report.