



Report to: General Committee

Report Date: February 1, 2017

SUBJECT: Staff Awarded Contracts for the Month of January 2017
PREPARED BY: Alex Moore, Ext. 4711

RECOMMENDATION:

1. THAT the report entitled “Staff Awarded Contracts for the Month of January 2017” be received;
2. And that Staff be authorized and directed to do all things necessary to give effect to this resolution

PURPOSE:

To inform Council of Staff Awarded Contracts >\$50,000 for the month of January 2017 as per Purchasing By-law 2004-341.

BACKGROUND:

Council at its meeting of May 26th, 2009 amended By-Law 2004-341, A By-Law Establishing Procurement, Service and Disposal Regulations and Policies. The Purchasing By-Law delegates authority to staff to award contracts without limits if the award meets the following criteria:

- The award is to the lowest priced bidder
- The expenses relating to the goods / services being procured is included in the approved budget (Operating/Capital)
- The award of the contract is within the approved budget
- The award results from the normal tendering process of the City (i.e. open bidding through advertisements that meet transparency and enables open participation)
- The term of the contract is for a maximum of 4 years
- There is no litigation between the successful bidder and the City at the time of award
- There are no bidder protests at the time of contract award

If one (1) of the above noted criteria is not met then any contract award >\$350,000 requires Council approval.

Where the contract being awarded is a Request for Proposal (RFP) the approval authority limits of staff is up to \$350,000.

Community & Fire Services

Award Details	Description
Lowest Priced Supplier	• 262-T-16 Curb Box Rehabilitation Program
Highest Ranked / Lowest Priced Supplier	• 238-R-16 Consulting Engineering Services for 2017 Structures Rehabilitation Works – Stage 1
Highest Ranked / Second Lowest Priced Supplier	• 242-R-16 Consulting Engineering Services for Streetlight Pole Condition Inspection Program - 2017

Corporate Services

Award Details	Description
Lowest Priced Supplier	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 251-Q-16 New Mechanical Room & HVAC Replacement at Markham Train Station• 268-Q-16 Window Cleaning Services
Non-Competitive Supplier	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 275-S-16 Markham Portal Content Strategy, Mapping and Rewriting Services

Development Services

Award Details	Description
Highest Ranked / Second Lowest Priced Supplier	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 246-R-16 Consulting Services, Development of Parking and Loading Study

2/3/2017

X



Joel Lustig
Treasurer

03/02/2017

X



Trinela Cane
Commissioner, Corporate Services



STAFF AWARD REPORT

To:	Andy Taylor, Chief Administrative Officer
Re:	262-T-16 Curb Box Rehabilitation Program
Date:	December 22, 2016
Prepared by:	Vikas Thakur, Infrastructure Project Engineer, Waterworks, ext. 6210 Tony Casale, Senior Construction Buyer, ext. 3190

PURPOSE

To obtain approval to award the contract for the curb box rehabilitation program for one (1) year with an option to extend the contract for two (2) additional years at one year increments based on the same terms, conditions and pricing.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommended Supplier (s)	Grand-Mac Construction Ltd. (Lowest Priced Supplier)	
Current Budget Available	\$ 330,300.00	053-6150-17224-005 Water System Upgrade Program – Curb Box
Less cost of award	\$ 282,986.98	2017 inclusive of HST
	\$ 28,298.70	Contingency (10%)
	\$ 311,285.68	Total 2017 Award
	\$ 141,598.53	2018 inclusive of HST
	\$ 14,159.85	Contingency (10%)
	\$ 155,758.38	Total 2018 Award*
	\$ 141,598.53	2019 inclusive of HST*
	\$ 14,159.85	Contingency (10%)
	\$ 155,758.38	Total 2019 Award*
	\$ 622,802.45	Total Three-Year Award
Budget Remaining after this award	\$ 19,014.32	** (\$330,300 - \$311,285.68)

*Staff be authorized to amend the estimated award amounts in 2018 and 2019 subject to Council approval of the 2018/2019 budgets. The curb box rehabilitation program was not carried out in 2016 and the existing contract was terminated due to manpower and financial issues by the contractor. The 2017 award amount represents a consolidated volume of 3,729 curb boxes which encompasses volume for 2016 / 20 17. The volume in 2018 and 2019 is estimated to be 1,800 per year.

**The remaining balance in the amount of \$19,014.32 will be returned to original funding source.

BACKGROUND

Curb box and curb stop valve are the main control appurtenance for the City to turn on/off water supply to the private property. Curb boxes are normally located at the public right-of-way line and private property. Curb boxes are either located in front of the property, or on the side in case of a corner lot. Through normal wear and tear over time, curb box and valve deteriorate and become inoperable. Proactive inspection, maintenance and repairs are required to ensure continuous water supply and reduce service interruption.

This project is part of Waterworks annual system upgrade program to reduce service interruption and provide better customer service. Repair and maintenance under this project is conducted with minimal excavation and surface disruption, by utilizing the vacuum excavation method with specialized tools. Disruption to traffic under this project is also minimized.

This project involves location, inspection, repair and replacement defective curb boxes using the vacuum excavation method. There are eight (8) areas covered under this project: Area D1 Adrian Crescent/Marion Crescent, Area D2 Bauer Crescent/Vaselle Crescent, Area D3 Ambleside Crescent and Westmoreland Court, Area D4 Ashmore Crescent and Manston Crescent, Area E1 Peterson Street and Raymerville Avenue, Area E2 Amberwood Court and Webber Crescent, Area E3 Baycliffe Road and Warden Avenue and Area E4 Brewsland Crescent and Whittington Court. There are a total of 3,729 curb boxes to be inspected within these areas and repairs or replacement of the curb boxes or curb stop valves will be conducted as needed based on inspection results. The first year of the contract will commence in May 2017 and will be completed by October 2017.

BID INFORMATION

Advertised	ETN
Bids closed on	December 8, 2016
Number picking up bid documents	13
Number responding to bid	7

PRICE SUMMARY

Suppliers	Total Bid Price (including taxes)
Grand-Mac Construction Ltd.	\$282,986.98
Super Sucker Hydra Vac Service Inc.	\$300,380.10
Brass Industrial Services Inc.	\$322,449.75
Ontario Excavac Inc.	\$325,645.00
Trisan Construction	\$562,366.00
CC Underground 1737126 Ontario Inc.	\$599,077.67
Hawkins Contracting Services Limited	\$934,146.57

Grand-Mac Construction Limited is the lowest supplier. The lowest bid represents a 12% increase as compared to the 2013 contract. The price increase is considered to be standard industry cost inflation for material and labour. Seven (7) bids were received for this RFT reflecting competitive bidding and pricing. The 2017 contract also requires the contractor to adhere to the City's new design and restoration standards.

The contract term is one year with an option to renew for two additional years at the same terms, conditions and pricing.

OPERATING BUDGET AND LIFE CYCLE RESERVE IMPACT

The cost of award will be funded within capital budget 053-6150-17224-005. The life cycle reserve includes funding for the curb box rehabilitation program on an annual basis.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

The works through this project will not impact trees or plantation across the City. Any areas affected through construction will be restored back to current City approved standards.



STAFF AWARD REPORT

To:	Andy Taylor, Chief Administrative Officer
Re:	238-R-16 Consulting Engineering Services for Structures Rehabilitation Works
Date:	December 8, 2016
Prepared by:	Shipra Singh, Senior Asset Coordinator, Asset Management ext. 2747 Flora Chan, Senior Buyer ext. 3189

PURPOSE

To obtain approval to award the contract for detailed condition survey, preliminary design and financial analysis for 11 structures.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommended Supplier	McIntosh Perry Consulting Engineers Ltd. (Highest Ranked / Lowest Priced Supplier)	
Current Budget Available	\$ 178,000.00	058-6150-17209-005 Structures Rehabilitation (11 Structures)
Less cost of award	\$ 134,267.23	Award - Stage 1 (Incl. of HST)
	\$ 13,426.72	Contingency 10%
	\$ 147,693.95	Total Award
Budget Remaining after this award	\$ 30,306.05	*

*The remaining budget of \$30,306.05 will be utilized to fund Stage 2 (Detailed design) and Stage 3 (Contract administration) which has a total estimated cost of \$129k, resulting in a potential shortfall of \$99k. Upon completion of Stage 2 detailed design, Staff will reassess the budgetary implications and any funding shortfall will be funded from the construction component (\$789,400) as outlined on the 2017 Capital Budget Request form.

The Bid was issued requesting pricing for the following:

- Detailed condition survey, preliminary design and financial analysis (**Recommended under this report**)
- Detailed design (Not being awarded at this time)
- Contract administration (Not being awarded at this time)

Staff is seeking approval to award the detailed condition survey, preliminary design and financial analysis for 11 structures under this report. Upon completion and dependant on performance, Staff will seek the appropriate approval authority to award the Detailed Design and Contract Administration.

BACKGROUND

In meeting the legislative requirement of the Public Transportation and Highway Act- Regulation 104/97, the City implements annual structures inspection program to identify the maintenance needs to protect and prolong the life of the structures. Since 2004, the City has undertaken regular inspection of the structures.

Based on the 2015-2016 inspection program, staff requested budget for rehabilitation of the following eleven (11) structures under the 2017 capital budget:

1. B000: Vehicular Bridge at John Street 550m E/ Bayview Avenue
 2. B018: Vehicular Bridge at Reesor Road 1400m N/ Elgin Mills Road
 3. C022: Culvert at Elgin Mills Road 400m W/ Highway 48
 4. C030: Culvert at Frontenac Drive 100m N/ Highway 7
 5. C035: Culvert at John Button Blvd. 25m W/ Rodick Road
 6. C052: Culvert at Reesor Road 750m S/ Highway 7
 7. C134: Culvert at 14th Avenue 75m W/ Alden Road
 8. P009: Pedestrian Bridge at Cedar Valley Park W/ Snider Drive
 9. P026: Pedestrian Bridge at Summerdale Park N/16th Avenue
 10. P046: Pedestrian Bridge at John Button waterway N/16th Avenue
 11. P051: Pedestrian Bridge at German Mills Settler's Park N/Sixpenny Court
- Stage 1 work will commence in January 2017 and be completed by September 2017.

BID INFORMATION

Advertised	ETN (Electronic Tendering Network)
Bids closed on	October 27, 2016
Number picking up bid document	8
Number responding to bid	4

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

The Evaluation Team was comprised of staff from the Asset Management Department and facilitated by staff from the Purchasing Department. Due to the complexity of the project, staff wanted to ensure that Suppliers had the necessary qualifications and experience to carry out the work and as such, the City released this RFP utilizing a two-stage approach.

Stage One (1) – Technical Evaluation:

Stage 1 Technical Proposal were evaluated against a pre-established evaluation criteria as outlined in bid document: Experience/Past Performance of the consulting firm 20%, qualifications and experience of the project manager and team member 20% and project delivery 30%; totaling 70%.

Upon completion of Stage 1 (technical evaluation), the Price Proposal (Bid Form) provided by those Suppliers who qualified from Stage 1, (minimum score of 75%, or 52.5 points out of 70 required), proceeded to Stage 2 for price evaluation.

The results of the Stage 1 evaluation are outlined below:

Suppliers	Score (70 points)	Rank Results
Morrison Hershfield Ltd.	63.7	1
McIntosh Perry Consulting Engineering Ltd.	61.8	2
Stephenson Engineering Ltd.	48.3	3
Kihl Construction Management Ltd.	44.1	4

Stage Two (2) – Price Evaluation:

Based on the Stage 1 evaluation, Suppliers who received a minimum of 75% or 52.5 points out of 70 proceeded to Stage 2 - Price Evaluation. The price proposal provided by the Suppliers is evaluated out of 30 points, based on the criteria outlined in the RFP.

The results of the Stage 2 evaluation are outlined below:

Suppliers	Score (out of 30)	Rank Results
McIntosh Perry Consulting Engineering Ltd.	30.0*	1
Morrison Hershfield Ltd.	19.4	2

*Bid prices for detailed condition survey, preliminary design and financial analysis for 11 structures ranged from \$134,267.23 to \$172,992.00.

Stage 1 & 2 – Combined Overall Scoring:

The scores from the Stage 1 and 2 evaluations were combined to formulate final overall scoring, as summarized below:

Suppliers	Score (out of 100)	Rank Results
McIntosh Perry Consulting Engineering Ltd.	91.8	1
Morrison Hershfield Ltd.	83.1	2

The highest ranked Supplier, McIntosh Perry Consulting Engineering Ltd., demonstrated a good understanding of the project, had an experienced and qualified project team and illustrated a comprehensive plan and methodology for the project. McIntosh Perry Consulting Engineering Ltd completed similar project in 2016 (241-R-15) and their performance was satisfactory.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

The following table summarizes the financial details of this award:

Account Name	Account #	Budget Amount	Budget Available for Design + CA	Amount to be allocated for Stage 1 Works	Budget Remaining After Stage 1 Award
Structures Rehabilitation (11 structures)	058-5350-17209-05	\$967,400	\$178,000	\$147,693.95	\$30,306.05*

**The remaining budget of \$30,306.05 will be utilized to fund Stage 2 (detailed design) and Stage 3 (contract administration) which has a total estimated cost of \$129k, resulting in a potential shortfall of \$99k. Upon completion of Stage 2 detailed design, Staff will reassess the budgetary implications and any funding shortfall will be funded from the construction component (\$789,400) as outlined on the 2017 Capital Budget Request form.

OPERATING BUDGET AND LIFECYCLE RESERVE IMPACT

The 2016 lifecycle reserve study includes for \$89.7M for 25 vehicular bridges, 66 pedestrian bridges and 213 culverts for 25 years until 2041.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Not Applicable



STAFF AWARD REPORT

To:	Brenda Librecz, Commissioner of Community & Fire Services
Re:	242-R-16 Consulting Engineering Services for Streetlight Pole Condition Inspection Program
Date:	January 3, 2017
Prepared by:	Shipra Singh, Senior Asset Coordinator, Environmental Services ext. 2747 Flora Chan, Senior Buyer ext. 3189

PURPOSE

To obtain approval to award the contract for Consulting Engineering Services to carry out Streetlight Pole Condition Inspection Program.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommended Supplier	HDR Corporation (Highest Ranked/ Second Lowest Priced Supplier)	
Current Budget Available	\$ 73,700.00	750-101-5699-17207 Streetlight Pole Condition Inspection
Less cost of award	\$ 78,805.75	Cost of Award (Inclusive of HST)
	\$ 7,880.58	Contingency (10%)
	\$ 86,686.33	Total Cost of Award
Budget Remaining after award	(\$ 12,986.33)	*

*The budget shortfall of \$12,986.33 will be funded from Non DC Capital Contingency which has a current balance of \$178,370.

BACKGROUND

As the City's infrastructure ages, it is necessary to carry out condition inspection of assets in order to predict the future maintenance costs and provide reliable life cycle costing. In order to achieve this effectively, in 2011, the City commenced a program to investigate the condition of the City-owned poles. Based on the condition inspection, rehabilitation program will be developed.

The work will commence in January 2017 and will be completed by September 2017.

BID INFORMATION

Advertised	ETN (Electronic Tendering Network)
Bids closed on	November 1, 2016
Number picking up bid documents	21
Number responding to bid	11

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

The Evaluation Team was comprised of staff from the Environmental Services Department and facilitated by staff from the Purchasing Department. Due to the complexity of the project, staff wanted to ensure that suppliers had the necessary qualifications and experience to carry out the work and as such, the City released this RFP utilizing a two-stage system.

Stage One (1) – Technical Evaluation:

Under Stage 1 – Technical Evaluation, suppliers were assessed against pre-determined criteria as outlined in the RFP; Experience/Past Performance of the consulting firm 20%, qualifications and experience of the project manager and team member 20% and project delivery 30%; totaling 70%.

Since only one supplier achieved a technical score of 52.5 points out of 70, the minimum passing score was lowered to 49 as outlined in the RFP. Based on new passing threshold of 49 points, two suppliers (HDR Inc. and Bold Engineering) proceeded to Stage 2 of evaluation.

Stage Two (2) – Price Evaluation:

Under Stage 2 – Price Evaluation, price proposals provided by suppliers is evaluated out of 30 points.

Stage 1 & 2 – Combined Overall Scoring

The scores from the Stage 1 and 2 evaluations were combined to formulate final overall scoring, as summarized below:

Suppliers	Stage 1 Technical (70 points)	Stage 2 Price (30 points)	Total Score (100 points)	Overall Ranking
HDR Corporation	63.0	23.9	86.9	1
Bold Engineering Ltd.	49.8	30.0	79.8	2
Goel Group	48.6	0.0*	-	3
LEA Consulting Ltd. Inc.	46.8	0.0*	-	4
METSCO Energy Solutions	44.5	0.0*	-	5
SCS Consulting	43.8	0.0*	-	6
Costello Associates	38.9	0.0*	-	7
Ontario Pole Inspection	37.4	0.0*	-	8
AECON	36.8	0.0*	-	9
Safe Roads Engineering	35.0	0.0*	-	10
DPM Energy	24.1	0.0*	-	11

*Suppliers who did not achieve a technical score of 49 points or higher did not proceed to Stage 2 evaluation. Bid prices ranged from \$65,431.68 to \$78,805.75, inclusive of HST Impact.

HDR Corporation, the highest ranked supplier with the highest technical score and second lowest price, demonstrated a good understanding of the project, had experienced and qualified project team and illustrated a comprehensive plan and methodology for the project.

HDR Corporation was previously awarded the same contract in 2011 (097-Q-11) and 2013 (283-R-13) in through competitive bidding and performance was satisfactory.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Account Name	Account #	Budget Amount	Budget Available	Award	Contingency (10%)	Budget Shortfall
Streetlight Poles - Condition Inspection	#17207	\$73,700	\$73,700	\$78,805.75	\$7,880.58	-\$12,986.33

*The budget shortfall of (\$12,986.33) will be funded from Non DC Capital Contingency. Budgetary shortfall was mainly due to timing of award where the market price was higher than the budgeted price across all cost components.

OPERATING BUDGET AND LIFECYCLE RESERVE IMPACT

The 2016 lifecycle reserve study includes for \$1M for streetlight inspection program for 25 years until 2041.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Not Applicable



STAFF AWARD REPORT

To:	Andy Taylor, Chief Administrative Officer
Re:	251-Q-16 New Mechanical Room & HVAC Replacement at Markham Train Station
Date:	January 4, 2017
Prepared by:	Sameem Shah, Facility Asset Coordinator ext. 6190 Flora Chan, Senior Buyer ext. 3189

PURPOSE

To obtain approval to award the contract for the construction of a new mechanical room and HVAC replacement at the Markham Train Station.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommended Supplier	DBC&RR Inc. (Lowest Priced Supplier)	
Current Budget Available	\$ 50,149.63	750-101-5399-16203 Satellite Community Centre Improvements
Add Estimate Rebate	\$ 1,242.88	Powerstream & Enbridge's Commercial Fixed Incentive Program*
Less cost of award	\$ 106,186.56	Award
	\$ 10,618.66	Contingency (10%)
	\$ 116,805.22	Total Award inclusive of HST
Budget Remaining after award	(\$ 66,350.31)	**

*The energy incentive is \$621.44 for each of the two HVAC units totaling \$1,242.88. This one-time incentive will be remitted upon project completion.

**The budget shortfall of \$66,350.31 will be funded from the Non-DC Capital Contingency which has a current balance of \$165,383.67.

BACKGROUND

The contract award is for the construction of the mechanical room and the replacement of the HVAC system as one furnace is out of operation and the second furnace is at the end of its useful life. The existing furnaces are due for replacement in 2021 as per lifecycle but due to unfavourable conditions in the area where existing furnaces are located, the units are failing prematurely. The original budget of \$60,000 was based on the estimates supplied by reputable contractors. The contractors quoting the project underestimated the scope and requirements for applicable code compliance.

The budget shortfall of \$66,350.31 is due to the following factors that were identified after Staff hired a Consultant, and during the design phase, which were not included in the original scope of work:

- To meet Fire Code the mechanical room is required to have fire separations for the walls, ceiling, floor and dampers in the ducts, resulting in the need to evaluate the best location for the mechanical room, therefore the furnaces were proposed to be moved from crawl space to the main floor within a designated mechanical room for the following reasons:
 - The dampness of the crawl space where the existing HVAC systems reside is causing corrosion of the ducts and HVAC equipment which is shortening their useful life. To mitigate confined space entry needs and the dampness of the crawl space to ensure the equipment fulfills its lifecycle expectations, the mechanical room will now be moved above grade on the building main floor level.
 - This requires a fire rated floor to be installed for fire code compliance which requires a re-enforced floor to hold the weight of the new floor finish.
 - Further the new mechanical room is placed above and adjacent to the existing HVAC location in order to minimize any duct, electrical and gas piping changes. This change does not overly affect the function of the building as it is at the end of a hallway leading to the existing crawl space entry and janitor space.
 - Supply and return duct fire dampers and fire proof wall and ceiling materials are also required.
 - Lighting and new wiring for the new mechanical room were required as well.

BACKGROUND (Continued)

- Replacement of existing corroded duct work with galvanized metal due to moisture in the crawl space.

Due to current weather conditions, the work will commence immediately upon award in January 2017 and will be completed by March 10, 2017.

The rebate application can be submitted upon installation and processed in 2-3 months.

BID INFORMATION

Advertised	ETN (Electronic Tendering Network)
Bids closed on	December 7, 2016
Number picking up bid documents	23
Number responding to bid	3

PRICE SUMMARY (inclusive of HST Impact)

Suppliers	Bid Price
DBC&RR Inc.	\$ 106,186.56
Silver Birch Contracting Ltd.	\$ 109,742.05
Dontex Construction Ltd.	\$ 141,883.97

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

In support of BMFT’s Safe and Sustainable goal, the following measures for construction waste and energy efficiency were taken:

- Construction waste will be disposed in accordance with applicable laws, regulations and industry standards.
- The two existing HVAC units are replaced with York International LX TM9V. This model is certified By Energy Star and AHRI (Air-Conditioning, Heating and Refrigeration Institute) and has an efficiency rating of 96%, which one is of the highest of all furnaces.

OPERATING BUDGET AND LIFECYCLE RESERVE IMPACT

Annual natural gas savings are expected to be \$238.12 based on Enbridge’s cost modeling between the existing and proposed product. The estimated annual electricity savings will be \$138.75, reducing the electrical energy consumption by approximately 12%.

The new furnaces and condensing units are expected to last approximately 20 years and will be replaced at an estimated cost of \$25,440 in today’s dollars. The 2017 Life Cycle Reserve Study will be updated accordingly.



STAFF AWARD REPORT

To	Graham Seaman, Director of Sustainability & Asset Management
Re	268-Q-16 Window Cleaning Services
Date	January 5, 2017
Prepared by	Amaris Liu, Civic Centre Coordinator, ext. 3526 Flora Chan, Senior Buyer, Ext. 3189

PURPOSE

To obtain approval to award the contract for Window Cleaning Services for ONE (1) year with an option to renew for an additional TWO (2) years at the same terms, conditions and pricing.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommended Supplier	Sparkle Window Cleaning Ltd. (Lowest Priced Supplier)	
Current Budget Available	\$ 25,272.10	Various operating accounts
Less cost of award	\$ 24,926.11	Year 1 – 2017 (Jan 9 – Dec 31)
	\$ 24,926.11	Year 2 – 2018 (Jan 1 – Dec 31)*
	\$ 24,926.11	Year 3 – 2019 (Jan 1 – Dec 31)*
	\$ 74,778.33	Total Award with HST impact
Budget Remaining after this award:	\$ 345.99	**

*Subject to Council approval of the 2018 and 2019 budgets.

** The anticipated annual savings of \$345.99 (\$25,272.10 - \$24,926.11) will be adjusted in the 2018 Operating budget subject to Council approval and fluctuations in volumes.

BACKGROUND

The City currently has 10 facilities requiring window cleaning services with the services currently being performed by Sparkle Window Cleaning Ltd. This quotation was issued for the provision of window cleaning services for the following locations:

- Markham Civic Centre
- 8100 Warden Avenue
- Markham Village Library
- Thornhill Village Library
- Unionville Library
- Museum – Mount Joy Schoolhouse
- Museum – Collections Building
- Varley Art Gallery
- McKay Arts Centre
- Works Yard – Main Building

The cleaning includes all interior and exterior glass including partitions, flashing, frames, entrances and skylights. The Contractor is required to use all the necessary safety equipment. All equipment including but not limited to safety harness, bosun chair, aerial lifts, etc. is to be supplied by the Contractor for the higher areas.

BID INFORMATION

Advertised	ETN
Bid closed on	December 21, 2016
Number picking up document	15
Number responding to bid	9

PRICE SUMMARY (Inclusive of HST Impact)

Suppliers	Total Bid Price
Sparkle Window Cleaning Ltd.	\$ 24,926.11
Bestview Window Cleaning Inc.	\$ 44,621.76
M&M Professional Window Cleaners Limited	\$ 49,501.15
Elite Window Cleaning Inc.	\$ 55,377.79
H. Breiter Window Cleaning Ltd.	\$ 57,891.26
Mister Window Washing	\$ 66,225.41
Gold Standard Property Care	\$ 80,604.10
CSL Group Ltd	\$ 82,554.84
Bluerock Building Care	\$ 88,508.81

Compared to current contract, this award represents annual savings of \$345.99.

OPERATING BUDGET AND LIFECYCLE IMPACT

The anticipating savings of \$345.99 (\$25,272.10 - \$24,926.11) will be a favourable variance in the 2017 results of operations and the 2018 Operating Budget will be adjusted accordingly. There is no lifecycle impact.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

The bid specifications mandated the successful Contractor to comply with the Occupational Health & Safety Act. This criteria reflects reduced risk and impact on people and our environment. The products used to clean the windows will environmentally friendly and Green certified.



STAFF AWARD REPORT

To:	Andy Taylor, Chief Administrative Officer
Re:	275-S-16 Markham Portal Content Strategy, Mapping and Rewriting Services
Date:	December 12, 2016
Prepared by:	Kent Chau, Client Advisor, ext 5368 Rosemarie Patano, Senior Construction Buyer, ext 2990

PURPOSE

To obtain approval to award the contract for Markham Portal Content Strategy, Mapping and Rewriting services to Akendi Toronto Inc.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommended Supplier	Akendi Toronto Inc. (Non Competitive Procurement)	
Current Budget Available	\$ 94,688.00	049-5350-8659-005 (Portal Project)
Less Cost of Award	\$ 94,688.00	Inclusive of HST Impact
Budget remaining after this award	\$ 0.00	

Staff further recommends:

THAT the tendering process be waived in accordance with Purchasing By-Law 2004-341, Part II, Section 7 Non Competitive Procurement, item 1 (h) which states “where it necessary or in the best interests of the City to acquire nonstandard items or Consulting and Professional Services from a preferred supplier or from a supplier who has a proven track record with the City in terms of pricing, quality and service.”

BACKGROUND

Contract award (Awarded in 2015)

Under project 036-Q-15, the City made a contract award to Akendi Toronto Incorporated to provide consultation services for web user experience design as part of the portal initiative to redesign the City’s external facing website – www.markham.ca. The project has successfully progressed through the various stages of the user experience design methodology and is currently in the visual design stage. It is anticipated that this first phase of the portal redesign project will be completed by the end of December 2016 at which time the City will proceed to release a request for proposal (RFP) to address the implementation of the redesigned website.

Contract award (Under this award report)

As part of the project, it has been identified that a significant portion of the content on the City’s website is currently out of date and/or is written and presented in a manner that may be complex or inconsistent for the end user. This was confirmed from feedback received as part of the interview and requirements gathering sessions held with the public. In preparation for the roll-out of the new website, all current content must be reviewed, consolidated and rewritten to conform with the new web templates and address user feedback . It is anticipated that there will be approximately 400+ pages of content on the refreshed Markham website that will require review and rewriting.

The scope of work for this award include the following: Content Strategy (Review of Approach & Process), Audit & Mapping to new Website Information Architecture; Content Copy Writing; Training (Content Review & Writing for Websites); and Content Review Oversight with Authors/Reviewers.

RATIONALE

The Portal Steering Committee recommends engaging Akendi for professional services in content mapping and website content writing to assist the City in providing a consistent approach to information posted on the site content as part of the initial rollout of the newly designed website. This initiative would require significant staff effort if it were to be completed in-house. The approach to engage Akendi would ensure timeliness of content mapping and creation to ensure a state of readiness for the implementation of the new website by Fall 2017. Once the newly designed website and content is deployed, staff representatives (content authors) identified from each business unit will continue to keep the website content up to date per the City’s Web Governance policy, while applying best practices for web accessibility and writing for websites.

Akendi also brings the following expertise and value to the City:

- **Quality Services:** Akendi has a proven track record, in terms of quality of work delivered, as well as significant familiarity with the architecture of the City’s website, organizational structure and services, and content.
- **Synergies:** Given past experience and the current work with the development of the new website Information Architecture, Akendi and would be in the best position to help the City map content to the new website structure. This will avoid costs associated with additional learning curve from a separate vendor to map required content to the Information Architecture of the new website.
- **Experience:** Engaging a professional web content writer will allow content to be optimally and succinctly presented to the website’s audience to ensure relevancy and consistency throughout.
- **Staff Engagement:** Customized web content training (i.e. writing for websites) will be provided to City’s staff and tailored to the content of the new site structure based on Akendi’s knowledge of the various user personas of the website. This will allow staff to sufficiently maintain the website moving forward.
- **Cost Competitiveness:** Staff undertook an analysis of the quoted price provided to ascertain its competitiveness. Staff reviewed a recent consultant project which was awarded to the lowest priced bidder which received more than one submission, Akendi’s web content writer’s hourly rate of \$80/hour is competitive when compared with the standard market rate of \$100/hour.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Not Applicable

OPERATING BUDGET AND LIFECYCLE RESERVE IMPACT

Not Applicable



STAFF AWARD REPORT

To:	Andy Taylor, Chief Administrative Officer
Re:	246-R-16 Consulting Services, Development of Parking and Loading Study
Date:	December 21, 2016
Prepared by:	Tom Villella, Manager, Zoning and Special Projects Rosemarie Patano, Senior Construction Buyer, Purchasing

PURPOSE

To obtain approval to award consultation services to provide expertise and support to develop and carry out a Parking and Loading Study.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommended Supplier	HDR Corporation (Highest Ranked / Second Lowest Priced Supplier)	
Current Budget Available	\$ 297,480.00	083-5350-9328-005 Parking Management Program
Less cost of award	\$ 211,679.11	Cost of Award
	\$ 21,167.91	Contingency (10%)
	\$ 232,847.02	Total award (Inclusive of HST)
Budget Remaining after this award	\$ 64,632.98	*

* The remaining budget in the amount \$64,632.98 will be returned to the original funding source.

BACKGROUND

Currently, Markham’s parking standards are found in By-law 28-97, as amended. In general, By-law 28-97 presents a clear and concise set of parking standards that address both the amount of parking to be provided for a given land use (i.e. parking ratios) and the design of parking spaces in terms of dimensions, on-site location and access. These standards apply uniformly across the City. By-law 28-97 has been amended from time-to-time on an incremental basis.

A principal aim of the Parking and Loading Study is to continue the process of updating the City’s parking and loading standards to produce a comprehensive set of revised standards that can be applied across the City in a clear and consistent manner. The revised standards will support the achievement of the City’s broader planning goals. In particular, a major goal will be to develop parking and loading standards that support the policies of the new Official Plan as they relate to encouraging transit use and active transportation, reducing auto-dependency and supporting the development of the designated, higher density, mixed-use growth areas.

Working independently with support from the City’s Project Team, the successful proponent will provide the City with a Parking and Loading Study and recommended zoning standards. The results of the study will be incorporated into Phase 3B of the New Comprehensive Zoning By-law Project: Development of the New Comprehensive Zoning By-law.

The scope of work for this RFP will consist (at a high level) of the following main objectives:

- Parking Ratios
 - o By-law 28-97 Provides the “Base” Parking Ratios
 - o Structural Variations to the Base Parking Ratios
 - o Refinements to the Base Parking Ratios
- Develop More Detailed Loading Standards
- Bicycle Parking Standards
- Strengthening Design-Related Performance Measures
- Outside Influences

BID INFORMATION

Advertised	ETN
Bids closed on	November 17, 2016
Number picking up bid documents	7
Number responding to bid	3

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

The RFP was released with a three-stage evaluation approach. The Technical Proposal (Stage 1) was evaluated out of 70 points and the Price Proposal (Stage 2) was evaluated out of 30 points. The Evaluation Team for this RFP was comprised of staff from the Planning and Engineering Departments, with Purchasing acting as the facilitator.

Evaluation of Stage 1 – Technical Proposal

The Stage 1 Technical Proposals were evaluated against the pre-established evaluation criteria as outlined in the RFP: 25% experience and qualification of the Supplier and Project Team ; 25% project understanding, methodology and approach; 20% project delivery and management; and 20% price, totaling 100%. Suppliers, who scored a minimum of 75%, or 52.5 points out of 70, continued on to Stage 2 – Price Proposal. The results of the Stage 1 evaluation are outlined below:

Suppliers	Score (out of 70)	Rank Results
HDR Corporation	61.00	1
WSP Canada Inc.	54.00	2
IBI Group Professional Services (Canada) Inc.	53.00	3

Evaluation of Stage 2 – Price Proposal

Based on the Stage 1 evaluation, all three (3) Supplier received a score of a minimum of 75% or 52.5 points out of 70 and therefore, proceeded to Stage 2 - Price Proposal. The price proposal (exclusive of HST) provided by the supplier is evaluated out of 30 points, based on the criteria outlined in the RFP.

Suppliers	Price Proposal Score (out of 30)	Technical Proposal Score (out of 70)	Combined Overall Score Stage 1 & 2 Score (out of 100)
IBI Group Professional Services (Canada) Inc.	30.00	53.00	81.90
HDR Corporation	28.90	61.00	89.90
WSP Canada Inc.	27.90	54.00	84.00

* Bid prices ranged from \$204,183.48 to \$218,491.95 inclusive of HST

HDR Corporation (“HDR”), the second lowest priced supplier scored highest in the technical submission demonstrated a thorough understanding of the project and its requirements. HDR’s proposal demonstrated to the City’s satisfaction that they and their partners; Traffic-Survey-Analysis Inc (parking surveys and data collection services); and R.A. Malatest and Associates (employee / household surveys and data collection), have the ability to undertake the project, and that they have a strong understanding of the project deliverables, key issues and challenges. Through the evaluation process, HDR demonstrated a depth of experience and expertise as it specifically relates to the ability to undertake the parking and loading study, while meeting key milestones and timelines. HDR also provided a detailed project plan with clear check points and expectations of City staff, and their quality control process met our expectations.

HDR is a multidisciplinary leading consulting firm providing planning, engineering, and design services serving a growing list of clients across Canada, the United States and around the world. With over 10,000 employees in more than 225 locations around the world (including 250 employees in six offices across Canada), HDR has undertaken many parking standards studies for the public sector (such as Richmond Hill, Brampton, Aurora, Pickering) and parking studies for residential and non-residential uses for the development industry which allows them to provide insight and apply lessons learned and research to this study.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Not Applicable.

OPERATING BUDGET AND LIFECYCLE RESERVE IMPACT

Not Applicable