

# TORONTO TRANSIT COMMISSION REPORT NO.

**MEETING DATE:** March 24, 2010

**SUBJECT:** PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION  
FINCH AND EGLINTON MAINTENANCE AND  
STORAGE FACILITIES (MSF) – DESIGN SERVICES  
CONTRACT TC85-14

## **ACTION ITEM**

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Commission authorize the award of contracts, in the upset limit specified, to the following firms, for a total upset limit of \$33,000,000:

**Package 1 - Design Services - Eglinton Maintenance and Storage Facility**

|                                   |              |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Hatch Mott MacDonald Ltd. (Hatch) | \$22,000,000 |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

**Package 2 - Design Services - Finch Maintenance and Storage Facility**

|                                   |              |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Hatch Mott MacDonald Ltd. (Hatch) | \$11,000,000 |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

### **FUNDING**

Sufficient funds are included in Transit City Program initiatives under Project 6342 LRT MSF – Eglinton (Transit City) and under Project 6341 LRT MSF – Finch (Transit City) of the TTC 2010-2014 Capital Program, which was approved by City Council December 8, 2009.

Sufficient project approval exists for these elements to accommodate work in 2010, however, pending confirmation of project scope and funding commitments, additional project approval may be required to release the full scope of this work. Work plan releases will not be approved and issued unless approvals in place are sufficient to accommodate the increased expenditure commitments.

## **BACKGROUND**

The new Transit City lines require the addition of strategically located maintenance and storage facilities constructed during the Transit City build-out plan. On completion of the Transit City network, the maintenance facilities would accommodate all necessary aspects of vehicle maintenance and storage.

In December 2008, the Commission awarded Contract TC85-6 Program of Requirements and Conceptual Design Low Floor Light Rail Vehicle Maintenance and Storage Facilities to provide the needs analysis, detailed facility program, conceptual design and site plan options for the new facilities. Terms in Contract TC85-6 had an option to allow for the completion of the design work and environmental assessment for all of the MSFs. This option was exercised for the Sheppard and Fleet Replacement MSFs due to timing commitments to opening of these facilities. It was determined that timing allowed for the flexibility to competitively bid the remaining two MSFs which is the subject of this RFP.

This Contract is for the provision of Consultant services to complete the environmental assessment, preliminary design and output specification development, construction administration and support along with providing technical compliance service for both Eglinton and Finch Transit City MSFs. This requirement contained two distinct packages: one for Eglinton and one for Finch in order that the work could be managed individually by two separate project management teams.

## **DISCUSSION**

A Request for Proposals was publicly advertised on the Commission's Website on December 15, 2009. Twenty-five companies requested and/or picked up copies of the proposal documents, out of which five submitted a proposal on Package 1, Eglinton MSF, and six submitted a proposal on Package 2, Finch MSF, as summarized in Appendix A.

The recommendation for award is based on the highest rated qualified proponents with reasonable pricing. All proposals received were reviewed and all proposals that appeared to be compliant were rated by the evaluation team qualitatively, based on the criteria listed in Appendix A.

### **Package 1**

As stated, five proposals were received. The proposal submitted for both Package 1 and 2 by one proponent contained team members of a firm who had been retained under another contract by the Commission to develop and/or approve engineering standards for Transit City. Terms of that contract stated that the firm shall not tender or be awarded future Transit City work if there is any current involvement. It was determined that the team

member list provided by the proponent created a conflict of interest and therefore the submission could not be evaluated further. Another proponent was disqualified due to a stated exception. The pricing envelopes for the remaining three proposals were opened. One proponent was disqualified as they did not provide the hourly rate for the Project Manager. Of the two proponents remaining, Hatch provided a lower composite rate and, therefore, was recommended.

Package 2

As stated, six proposals were received. As noted under Package 1, one proponent was disqualified due to a conflict of interest. Also, as above, one proponent was disqualified due to a stated exception. Of the four remaining proponents evaluated, Hatch was rated the highest.

The confidential pricing information submitted by Hatch, for both Package 1 and Package 2, is considered to be fair and reasonable based on the experience and qualifications of the project team and also had the lowest composite hourly billing rate of the proponents evaluated. It was decided that it was acceptable for one firm to be awarded both assignments.

**JUSTIFICATION**

Hatch Mott MacDonald Ltd. was the highest rated proponent for both packages with fair and reasonable pricing to undertake the work.

-----

March 3, 2010  
55-11-12

Attachment – Appendix A

# APPENDIX A

## PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION FINCH AND EGLINTON MAINTENANCE AND STORAGE FACILITIES (MSF) – DESIGN SERVICES CONTRACT TC85-14

---

### LIST OF PROPONENTS

#### PACKAGE 1 – EGLINTON MAINTENANCE AND STORAGE FACILITY

- AECOM Canada Ltd.
- Delcan & LTK JV
- Hatch Mott MacDonald Ltd. (\*)
- Maintenance Facility Consultants
- URS Canada Inc.

#### PACKAGE 2 – FINCH MAINTENANCE AND STORAGE FACILITY

- AECOM Canada Ltd.
- Delcan & LTK JV
- Hatch Mott MacDonald Ltd. (\*)
- HDR Corporation
- Maintenance Facility Consultants
- URS Canada Inc.

(\*) – Indicates Recommended Proponent

#### EVALUATION CRITERIA

- A. CORPORATE QUALIFICATIONS/EXPERIENCE
- Background and Capabilities
  - Number of Years in Business
  - Depth of Available Relevant Resources at Proponent's Local Office
  - Relevant Corporate Experience
- 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/Subconsultants
- Number of Years Experience
  - Work of a Similar Size and Nature
  - Technical Qualifications