

# TORONTO TRANSIT COMMISSION REPORT NO.

**MEETING DATE:** February 17, 2010

**SUBJECT:** PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION  
EASIER ACCESS PHASE III  
DESIGN SERVICES  
CONTRACT G85-271

## **ACTION ITEM**

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Commission authorize the award of contracts to the following firms, in the upset limit of \$5,000,000.00 each, for design services of the Easier Access Phase III project, for a total upset limit of \$15,000,000.00:

1. URS Architects & Engineers Canada Inc.
2. ZAS Architects Inc.
3. HDR Corporation.

### **FUNDING**

Sufficient funds are included in Program 3.9 Buildings and Structures – Easier Access Phase III, as set out on pages 715-723 Legislative Category of the TTC 2010-2014 Capital Program, which was approved by City Council on December 8, 2009.

### **BACKGROUND**

Since March 1990, the Commission has set the goal of making all TTC services and facilities accessible to people with disabilities. To date, twenty-nine (29) stations have been made accessible and the Easier Access Phase III project is scheduled to make all remaining subway and RT stations accessible by 2024. Currently, elevator installation is ongoing at Pape and Victoria Park stations, with construction expected to start at St. Andrew, Lawrence West and Dufferin stations in 2010.

In October 2006, the Commission awarded four design service contracts for the Easier Access Phase III projects. Additional design resources are now required to continue work on the project.

The work of Contract G85-271 includes the provision for complete design and construction support services at various locations throughout the Commission's transit system. The

duration of this Contract will be for a period of ten (10) years, with the option of an extension of an additional three (3) years subject to acceptable performance and reasonable rates. The work of this contract will be administered on a Work Assignment Release basis.

### **DISCUSSION**

A Request for Proposals was publicly advertised on the Commission's website on November 3, 2009. Twenty companies picked up copies of the proposal documents, out of which nine submitted a proposal as summarized in Appendix A.

The recommendation for award is based on the highest rated qualified proponent(s) with reasonable pricing. All proposals received were reviewed and were considered to be compliant. The proposals were rated by the evaluation team qualitatively, based on the criteria listed in Appendix A.

The proposals submitted by URS Architects & Engineers Canada Inc. (URS), ZAS Architects Inc. (ZAS) and HDR Corporation (HDR) were considered superior in all aspects of the proposal requirement over the other proposals submitted. They were rated best choice overall due to their corporate qualifications and experience in contracts of a similar size and nature and due to the relevant experience of the proposed project teams. URS, ZAS and HDR have all previously satisfactorily performed work for the Commission and are considered qualified for this work.

The pricing envelope of the three firms were opened and evaluated. Upon review of the confidential pricing information, the evaluation team considered the pricing from URS, ZAS and HDR as fair and reasonable based on the experience and qualifications of the project team and compared to previous contracts.

### **JUSTIFICATION**

URS Architects & Engineers Canada Inc., ZAS Architects Inc. and HDR Corporation are the highest rated proponents with fair and reasonable pricing to undertake this work.

-----  
January 26, 2010  
50-71-24  
1152315

Attachment – Appendix A

## APPENDIX "A"

### PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION EASIER ACCESS PHASE III DESIGN SERVICES CONTRACT G85-271

---

#### LIST OF PROPONENTS

- AECOM Canada Ltd.
- Arup Canada Inc.
- Giffels Associates Limited/IBI Group
- HDR Corporation (\*)
- MMM Group Limited
- Queen's Quay Architects International Inc.
- Routhwaite Dick & Hadley Architects Inc.
- URS Architects & Engineers Canada Inc. (\*)
- ZAS Architects Inc. (\*)

#### EVALUATION CRITERIA

- A. CORPORATE QUALIFICATIONS/EXPERIENCE
- Number of Years in Business
  - Relevant Corporate Experience
  - Depth of Available Relevant Resources at Proponent's local office
  - CADD facilities, experience and degree of compliance to TTC CADD standards
- B. PROJECT STAFF QUALIFICATION/EXPERIENCE
- i) Project Manager:
- Number of Years of Direct Experience
  - Work of a Similar Size and Nature
  - Technical Qualifications
- ii) Project Team/Subconsultants:
- Number of Years Experience
  - Work of a Similar Size and Nature
  - Technical Qualifications

(\*) — Indicates Recommended Companies

