MEETING DATE: September 22, 2004

SUBJECT: Notice Of Award Of Procurement Authorization On-Grade Paving Rehabilitation Hillcrest Yard Contract M1-50 Change Directive M1-50-6

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Commission authorize the acceptance of the revised proposal submitted by Traf-Park Inc. (Traf-Park) in the amount of \$2,536,512.25, which includes Optional Pricing Items 1 to 8, as outlined in Appendix B, for Contract G50-5 – Design, Supply and Install Commuter Parking Lot Gate Control, Revenue Collection and Communication Equipment.

FUNDING

Sufficient funds for this expenditure are included in Project 3.3 Yards and Roads, under Commuter Parking Expansion Program, Phase I as set out on pages 569 to 578 and Phase II, as set out on pages 607 to 614 (Improvements Category) of the TTC 2004-2008 Capital Program which was approved by City Council on April 21, 2004.

BACKGROUND

The Commission operates 26 commuter parking facilities throughout the City of Toronto that utilize three (3) different methods of fare collection, as follows:

- Cash/credit card lots controlled by pay and display technology;
- Metropass/cash facilities controlled by coin units, card readers and gate equipment; and
- Metropass only facilities controlled by card readers and gate equipment.

Since the Commission recently purchased new pay and display revenue collection and communications equipment technology, the lots that incorporate the pay and display units do not require replacement. A total of 18 commuter parking lots – (of which 16 lots are existing and 2 are new) require new equipment under the G50-5 contract. The equipment at these lots is 10-15 years old, maintenance problems are a significant on-going issue and the existing technology severely limits the ability to implement variable rate pricing by time of day or day of the week. Currently all existing parking lot equipment is maintained by the Toronto Parking Authority (TPA), on behalf of the TTC with the exception of the Metropass reader and pedestal, which are maintained by staff.

Request for Proposal (RFP) documents were prepared for Contract G50-5, and the RFP was publicly advertised on TTC's web site on April 21, 2004. Ten (10) companies were issued copies of the RFP documents out of which only two companies submitted proposals at the time of closing. Evaluations completed by staff indicated that both proponents were considered unacceptable because Traf-Park's proposal contained two different price offers, which is considered an error apparent on the face of the proposal, and WPS did not submit all of the mandatory submission requirements. The other companies did not bid for the following reasons: the specified requirement would require too many modifications to standard equipment; bonding requirements, which also cover the warranty period, were too cumbersome; some companies are distributors for the equipment manufacturers bidding to the TTC; and, some companies had indicated partnering with others. Given the specialized nature of the requirement, staff determined that re-issuing an RFP would not result in more submissions or provide a better outcome. Management approval was therefore obtained to cancel the existing RFP, and negotiate with the two companies.

DISCUSSION

Following further meetings with the two proponents and reissue of the specification for a revised proposal submission (under a new proposal number), revised pricing was submitted by both proponents in August 2004 as summarized in Appendix 'A'.

Traf-Park submitted the lowest acceptable proposal price.

The proposal submitted by WPS North America Inc. (WPS) contained several exceptions to the technical requirements, which they did not withdraw after being given several opportunities; therefore, their submission is considered unacceptable.

Optional pricing was also requested by the Commission as outlined in Appendix 'B'. Traf-Park submitted pricing for all of the options. WPS also submitted pricing for all of the options except for item 3. The optional pricing for items 1 through 8 have been evaluated and accepted as they will achieve the following objectives:

- It will harden TTC equipment against vandalism and theft;
- Provides improved communication capability with customers including lot full signs and directions to alternative available spaces;
- Provides improved flexibility to respond to equipment malfunctions, peaking and on-street traffic congestion; and
- Modifies the fare collection equipment to permit the addition of bill acceptors at a later date (if required).

Since Traf-Park has not previously worked for the Commission, reference checks were completed which indicate that they have satisfactorily performed work of a similar size and nature within the past five years, including parking control equipment at the University of Toronto and York University.

Based on a review of the proponent's financial statements, it appears they have the financial capability to perform this contract.

The Agreement to Bond submitted by Traf-Park covers both a Labour & Material Payment Bond and a Performance Bond. The Surety Company noted on the Agreement to Bond is licensed to transact business under the Insurance Act of Ontario.

JUSTIFICATION

| The submission by Traf-Park is the lowest priced acceptable proposal. | |
|---|--|
| | |
| | |

August 18, 2004 50-31-JM 1066593

Attachments

APPENDIX 'A'

DESIGN, SUPPLY AND INSTALL COMMUTER PARKING LOT GATE CONTROL, **REVENUE** COLLECTION AND COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT CONTRACT G50-5

SUMMARY OF RESUBMITTED PROPOSALS

| COMPANY | BASE PROPOSAL PRICE | OPTIONAL PRICING TOTAL | TOTAL PROPOSAL PRICE |
|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| Traf-Park Inc. | \$2,086,027.25 | \$450,485.00 | \$2,536,512.25 |
| WPS North America | \$2,163,630.00* | \$359,595.00** | \$2,523,225.00 |
| Engineer's Estimate | \$2,330,000.00 | \$444,000.00 | \$2,774,000.00 |

^{*} Proposal is considered unacceptable.
** Optional Pricing Item 3 was not submitted.