

**MEETING DATE:** July 16, 2003

**SUBJECT:** Procurement Authorization - Employee Family Assistance Program

### **RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Commission approve the issuance of a purchase order in the total upset limit amount of \$1,700,000 to Family Guidance Group Inc. (FGI) for the provision of employee family assistance counselling and related services for the five-year period from August 1, 2003 to July 31, 2008.

### **FUNDING**

Sufficient funds have been included in the TTC Human Resources Operating Budget for 2003 and will be included in future Operating Budgets as required.

### **BACKGROUND**

The Commission has had an Employee Family Assistance Program (EFAP) in place since 1977 to provide professional, confidential counselling services to TTC employees and dependant family members. The counselling services include, but are not limited, to the following areas: substance abuse; individual and family counselling; stress and lifestyle management; marital/relationship problems; personal, career or work-related problems; critical incident response services (trauma); telephonic support services; legal consultation; financial consultation; elder and/or childcare services; and health and wellness promotion.

### **DISCUSSION**

Eight companies were invited to submit proposals in addition to the public advertisement on the TTC Website on May 9, 2003 out of which eight companies submitted proposals as detailed in Appendix A.

Proponents were required to submit a per capita fee for counselling services and trauma services for a 3 year term with an option for 2 additional years based on an estimated TTC population of 10,500. For evaluation purposes the utilization rate of 8% of the total population was used, which is based on the current usage.

The proposals were evaluated by a team with staff from the Occupational Health and Claims Management Section of the Human Resources Department, the Materials and Procurement Department, and a representative from each of the TTC's three unions (ATU Local 113, CUPE Local 2, and IAMAW Lodge 235). The evaluation was based on pre-determined weighted criteria as indicated in Appendix A and the proposals were ranked accordingly.

FGI submitted the highest ranked proposal and they also submitted the lowest proposal pricing. FGI submitted an excellent methodology and very detailed approach to the work. In addition, they have a comprehensive, dedicated project team who clearly understand and are able to handle all aspects of the work. FGI is the current provider for this service and has performed in a satisfactory manner. FGI did not state any exceptions or qualifications and their submission is considered commercially acceptable and they are recommended for award.

Staff recommends proceeding with the full five-year contract as FGI provided the lowest overall pricing for the base proposal of three years and the optional fourth and fifth years.

Family Services Employee Assistance Programs (Family Services) submitted the second highest ranked proposal and they also submitted the second lowest proposal pricing. They did not state any exceptions or qualifications and their submission is considered commercially acceptable.

The Great West Life Assurance Company (Great West Life) submitted the third highest ranked proposal and the sixth lowest proposal pricing. Great West Life's proposal included two exceptions to the Commission's Terms and Conditions (Termination and Terms of Payment) which are deemed to be unacceptable, consequently, their submission is considered commercially non-compliant.

The other proponents were not considered qualified to provide the required services to the Commission's standards in various areas including proposed methodology, approach to the work, specialized areas, addressing of common problems in a specific work location, etc. As a result, they are considered technically unacceptable and were not evaluated further from a commercial perspective.

Source Line Corporate Wellness, Inc. did not include the Commission's Form of Proposal or any other acceptable form of proposal. Consequently, their proposal is considered non-compliant and was not considered further.

The recommended upset limit amount includes a contingency allowance of 5% to cover increases in the utilization rate and the TTC population during the term of the contract.

## **JUSTIFICATION**

Employee family assistance programs are universally accepted as being successful in addressing the personal problems of employees and their family members. The resulting reduction in stress, family problems, substance abuse, and other behavioural health problems contributes to improved productivity while reducing absenteeism, accidents and on-the-job errors. The TTC's program is no exception. A continuation of the program will benefit the TTC, its employees and their families. The TTC is committed to providing an employee family assistance program for its employees and has included this provision in its collective agreements.

-----

June 26, 2003

40.77

Attachment – Appendix A

## **APPENDIX A**

### **EMPLOYEE FAMILY ASSISTANCE COUNSELLING PROGRAM**

#### **PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

<b>PROPONENT</b>	<b>TOTAL EVALUATED PRICE (5YEARS)</b>
Family Guidance Group Inc. (FGI) *	\$1,614,135
Family Services Employee Assistance Programs	\$1,635,700
Great West Life Assurance Company	\$2,307,800
Wilson Banwell	\$2,565,920

Baylis and Associates	\$2,064,385
C.J. Brown	\$2,083,300
Link EAP	\$1,750,240
Source Line Corporate Wellness, Inc.**	N/A

\* Recommended for Award

\*\* Proposal was non-compliant

<b>QUALITATIVE EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>
Corporate qualifications/experience
Project staff qualifications/experience
Understanding of the work
Reporting and implementation