



Report Number: 2009-05

Date: May 25, 2009

**SUBJECT: Community Health and Wellness Centre,  
Contract/Project Administrator and Owner's Representative**

**1) PURPOSE:**

This report, written by the CAO, provides Council with a recommendation in respect of a contract to engage the services of a Contract/Project Administrator and Owner's Representative in respect of the City's new Health and Wellness Centre.

**2) HISTORY, BACKGROUND, COUNCIL POLICY, PRACTICES**

The City called for submissions in a request for proposal (RFP). There were a total of thirty-seven registered potential bidders. Ten submitted a proposal. City staff followed the policies of Council during the bidding process. The two-envelope system was employed as is the practice in Port Colborne (quote or bid in a second envelope and opened only for the final top four bidders).

**3) STAFF COMMENTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

In the RFP process, a detailed system of evaluation was developed. The RFP was broken down into nine components, each with a point assignment for evaluation as follows:

Section 1: Overview	25 points
Section 2: Work Program	100 points
Section 3: Communications	30 points
Section 4: Project Team	
Project management firm and	
Experience, Capacity, and References	85 points
Project management team	30 points
Designated Project Manager	30 points
Section 5: Quality Control	30 points
Section 6: Design-Build or	
Design-bid-build Options	30 points
Section 7: Proposed Time Schedule	25 points
Section 8: Workplace Safety	30 points
Section 9: Fee	85 points

Six members of the advisory committee (one at large, two Councillors, Mayor and two staff) were each given a copy of each of the ten submissions (except for the price proposal envelopes) and independently reviewed each submission. Ratings were produced, summarized and analysed: raw weighted, mean average and with high and

low removed. A summary of the ratings is attached to this report for information of Council. The four highest scores were selected for interview.

For the interview, each bidder was given 20 minutes to make a presentation. As well, there were six questions posed to all candidates. The proponents interviewed were each rated on their presentation and their answers to the questions. Those ratings were added to the original ratings.

Finally the price proposal was opened and the points assigned were also added to the evaluations. The following table illustrates the points assigned (from the original evaluation) plus the points for the interview and the points for the price submitted.

<b>Summary of Evaluation Totals for Top Four Bidders - Community Health and Wellness Centre, Contract/Project Administrator and Owner's Representative</b> (Includes - Initial Review, Interview, Price and Design Bid / Design Bid Build Totals)				
	<b>Bidder #1</b>	<b>MHPM</b>	<b>Bidder #6</b>	<b>Bidder #9</b>
<b>SECTION 1-8 (415)</b>				
<b>Mean Avg</b>	349	<b>382</b>	349	352
<b>High/Low Removed</b>	351	<b>383</b>	369	367
<b>INTERVIEW SCORES (70)</b>				
	39.8	<b>50.7</b>	45.5	42.5
<b>SECTION 9 - PRICE (85)</b>				
<b>Design Build</b>	75	<b>80</b>	70	85
<b>Design Bid-Build</b>	80	<b>75</b>	70	85
<b>TOTALS (570)</b>				
<b>Mean Avg, Design Build</b>	463	<b>512</b>	465	479
<b>Mean Avg, Design Bid Build</b>	468	<b>507</b>	465	479
<b>High/Low Removed, Design Build</b>	466	<b>513</b>	484	495
<b>High/Low Removed, Design Bid Build</b>	471	<b>508</b>	484	495

The submission by MHPM is recommended for approval of Council. A copy of the detailed submission is attached for Council's information. While the decision has not been finalized in respect of design-build or design-bid-build, MHPM has recommended the latter, design-bid-build. Members of the advisory committee will review this and finalize the method to pursue with the advice of MHPM.

#### **4) OPTIONS AND FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

##### **a) Do nothing**

Council has already directed the construction of the facility and the appointment of a Contract/Project Administrator and Owner's Representative is required. The project is complex and doing nothing will mean the City will have to find internal resources to manage the contract. Such is not available. The agreement signed with the upper levels of government commit the City to the project. Therefore is it staff's opinion that this option is not available.

**b) Other options**

As recommended in this report, approve a contract with MHPM to act as Contract/Project Administrator and Owner's Representative. The price proposed is \$419,000 for design-build and \$445,000 for design-bid-build. As noted MHPM recommends design-bid-build. Both options have pros and cons and can be reviewed in the attached submission by MHPM. It should be noted that the cost of the contract administrator is a component of the original submission and plan. It will form part of the cost of the structure as originally planned.

Council could direct re-tendering or choosing an alternative bidder. The evaluation team worked diligently in the evaluation of the submissions. The emphasis was on the fact that this phase of the construction of the facility is the most important. It has to be correct the first time as the facility will be a 40 to 50 year facility, it is only built once.

Based on the process thus far, it does not appear that there are other viable options available; consequently none are recommended.

**5) COMPLIANCE WITH STRATEGIC PLAN INITIATIVES**

N/A

**6) ATTACHMENTS**

Appendix A: Summary of evaluations for all ten submissions

Appendix B: Copy of the submission (excluding appendices) from MHPM

**7) RECOMMENDATION**

That MHPM be approved as the City's Contract/Project Administrator and Owner's Representative and that the appropriate contract be drawn and approved by by-law.

**8) SIGNATURES**

Prepared on May 14, 2009 by:

Reviewed by:

Robert J. Heil  
Chief Administrative Officer

Peter Senese  
Director of Community and Corporate Services

**Summary of Evaluations for all Ten Submissions -  
Community Health and Wellness Centre,  
Contract/Project Administrator and Owner's Representative**

	Bidder #1	Bidder #2	Bidder #3	Bidder #4	MHPM	Bidder #6	Bidder #7	Bidder #8	Bidder #9	Bidder #10	
<b>Section 1: Overview</b>	25	21	18	20	19	<b>23</b>	20	17	21	23	19
<b>Section 2: Work Program</b>	100	91	70	87	87	<b>92</b>	88	72	82	88	72
<b>Section 3: Communications</b>	30	24	20	25	23	<b>28</b>	24	22	24	26	21
<b>Section 4: Project Team</b>	145	125	88	117	115	<b>139</b>	123	102	87	123	117
<b>Project management firm and Experience, Capacity, and References</b>	85	76	48	68	68	<b>84</b>	73	58	46	74	73
<b>Project management team</b>	30	25	20	26	24	<b>28</b>	27	22	20	25	22
<b>Designated Project Manager</b>	30	24	20	23	23	<b>28</b>	23	22	21	24	22
<b>Section 5: Quality Control</b>	30	26	18	22	27	<b>28</b>	28	17	20	24	21
<b>Section 6: Design-Build or Design-bid-build Options</b>	30	24	20	24	25	<b>28</b>	21	22	23	24	24
<b>Section 7: Proposed Time Schedule</b>	25	19	15	15	21	<b>16</b>	22	20	16	21	17
<b>Section 8: Workplace Safety</b>	30	28	15	26	25	<b>28</b>	23	28	27	23	28
<b>TOTAL MEAN AVERAGE</b>	<b>415</b>	<b>349</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>333</b>	<b>341</b>	<b>382</b>	<b>349</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>317</b>
<b>TOTAL HIGH/LOW REMOVED</b>	<b>415</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>345</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>367</b>	<b>319</b>
(total out of 415)											