

TORONTO TRANSIT COMMISSION REPORT NO.

MEETING DATE: February 17, 2010

SUBJECT: PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION
CONTRACT No.: TC85-20
GEOTECHNICAL, GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL AND
HYDROGEOLOGICAL SERVICES FOR TRANSIT CITY

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Commission authorize the award of contracts to the following companies on the basis of lowest priced qualified in the upset limit amounts listed below for geotechnical, geo-environmental and hydrogeological services for up to a five-year term commencing upon notification of award for Transit City Projects:

- | | | |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1. | Coffey Geotechnics | \$15,000,000.00; and |
| 2. | SPL Consultants Limited | \$15,000,000.00; and |
| 3. | AMEC Earth Environmental
(A Division of AMEC Americas Limited) | \$ 6,000,000.00 |

FUNDING

Funding for the provision of these services is included under various Transit City Approved priority projects in the TTC 2010-2014 Capital Program as amended by the Commission on October 29, 2009 and adopted by the City of Toronto Council on December 8, 2009. A total of \$448.280 million was approved for Transit City and SRT Projects to cover expenditures to the end of 2010.

Payment for the services will be based on work plan releases for actual work performed at the unit rates tendered and charged to the approved projects for which the work is required.

BACKGROUND

This Request for Proposal (RFP) covers the provision of geotechnical, geo-environmental and hydrogeological services. In general, the services include subsurface investigations, field testing and sampling, chemical and physical analysis, subsurface assessment, engineering analysis, monitoring and purging, and preparation of recommendations for the following Transit City Projects:

1. Eglinton Crosstown LRT

2. Scarborough LRT
3. Sheppard LRT
4. Finch LRT
5. Maintenance and Storage Facilities

DISCUSSION

A Request for Proposals (RFP) was publicly advertised on the Commission's web site on Thursday, November 19, 2009. Twenty-one companies picked up copies of the proposal documents out of which ten companies submitted proposals as summarized in Appendix "A".

The intent of the RFP is to award up to three contracts for a three (3) year base term with an optional two (2) individual year extensions to be exercised at the Commission's sole discretion for the required services. The proposals were assessed by staff and the evaluation criteria for the proponents are also summarized in Appendix "A". In a separate envelope, each proponent was also required to submit hourly rates for all staff levels, unit rates for analytical, geotechnical and hydrogeological/environmental testing, drilling services and equipment rental.

All proposals received were reviewed and rated by the evaluation team on the qualitative aspects of the proposals and three firms were shortlisted for further evaluation. The pricing envelopes of the three shortlisted firms were then opened for evaluation.

The proposals submitted by AMEC Earth Environmental, Coffey Geotechnics, and SPL Consultants Limited were considered qualified in all aspects of the proposal requirements over the other proposals submitted. They were rated best choice overall due to the following reasons:

1. The project teams have the best relevant experience and have performed work of this nature for other firms.
2. The proposed Project Managers have extensive experience and the best qualifications required for the overall project.

AMEC Earth and Environmental and Coffey Geotechnics have previously satisfactorily performed work for the Commission.

As SPL has not previously worked for the Commission, reference checks were completed, which indicate that they have satisfactorily performed work of a similar nature. The references contacted indicated that the staff is extremely knowledgeable and their performance has been satisfactory on all assignments completed for each project.

The recommendation for award is based on the lowest priced qualified proponents.

The overall upset limit of \$36 million is recommended to be awarded in the upset limit of \$15 million each for Coffey Geotechnics and SPL Consultants Limited as their overall totals for the five (5) year period are comparable. However, since the pricing from AMEC Earth and Environment was higher overall over the other 2 lower priced qualified companies; the recommended upset limit award amount is for \$6 million and they will be used primarily for areas where their pricing is low or their response time is better than others or where they have a superior expertise.

Based on the "Evaluation Price Schedules" of the qualified firms, Coffey Geotechnics, SPL Consultants Limited, and AMEC Earth Environmental submitted the lowest total evaluation price and their proposals are considered commercially acceptable. Their proposals are recommended for acceptance including the specified optional years four and five, which include annual inflationary increases similar to the 3-year base contract yearly increases.

JUSTIFICATION

The award of contracts for up to a five year term to the recommended three proponents will ensure that competent and effective resources are available to support the Transit City Program for Geotechnical, Geo-environmental and Hydrogeological services.

January 29, 2010

55-06-20

1152794

Attachment: Appendix "A"

APPENDIX "A"
PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION
GEOTECHNICAL, GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL AND
HYDROGEOLOGICAL SERVICES FOR TRANSIT CITY
CONTRACT NO TC85-20

RFP PROPONENTS

- SPI Consultants Ltd. (*)
- Coffey Geotechnics (*)
- AMEC Earth & Environmental (*)
- Conestoga-Rovers and Associates
- Decommissioning Consultant Services
- Trow Associates
- Peto MacCallum
- Golder Associates
- Barenco Inc.
- DBA Engineering

EVALUATION CRITERIA

- A. CORPORATE QUALIFICATIONS/EXPERIENCE
- Number of Years in Business
 - Relevant Corporate Experience
 - Depth of Available Resources
 - CADD facilities, experience and degree of compliance to TTC CADD standards.
- B. Project Staff Qualifications/Experience
- i) Project Manager
 - Number of Years of Direct Experience
 - Work of a Similar Size and Nature
 - Technical Qualifications
 - ii) Project Team
 - Number of Years of Direct Experience
 - Work of a Similar Size and Nature
 - Technical Qualifications

(*) – Indicates Recommended Proponent