



**The Corporation of the Municipality of Wawa
Staff Report**

Office of Community Services and Tourism

Prepared For: Council	Report No.: AP 2017-19
Agenda Date: December 12, 2017	File No.: 2.5, 9.30, 9.32, 9.41, 9.45.3, 23.1

Subject

This report concerns the results of RFP 2017-06 Engineering Services for the Wawa Waterfront Project.

Summary of the Recommendation

This report recommends accepting Kresin Engineering's proposal for engineering services. Their experience and familiarity with the project and the community as well as their budget price showed them to be the most suitable proponent.

Summary of the Issues

The upcoming Wawa Waterfront Project requires a significant amount of engineering and project management services to be successful. This engineering takes the form of the design of the bioswales, shore stabilization, and works on the Lion's Beach stairway. This engineering includes project supervision for the contractors completing the work, the environmental assessment and permitting, as well as the associated design.

List of Stakeholders

- Municipal Council
- Ratepayers
- Municipal Staff
- Funding Organizations

Respectfully Submitted By:

Prepared By:

**Alex Patterson, Director,
Community Services and Tourism**

Purpose of Report

This report originates as part of the RFP process for selection of a suitable contractor to deliver engineering services for the Wawa Waterfront Project. This RFP was done after preliminary engineering was completed by Kresin Engineering for the funding applications submitted to both FedNor and the NOHFC. The NOHFC required a competitive process moving forward for the engineering services of the Project, and therefore the Municipality completed RFP 2017-06 in response. This report will recommend an engineering firm to work on the Waterfront Project.

Analysis

RFP, Respondents and Methodology

Staff issued RFP 2017-06 for a period of one month beginning November 1st and ending December 1st, 2017. This RFP is attached as **Appendix 1**. This ensured that both the appropriate time was given to proponents to analyse the project, as well as for staff to select a proponent in time for the beginning of the project. Staff received a great deal of interest, with 14 firms requesting a copy of the RFP. Out of these 14 firms, 4 firms submitted a final proposal. These proposals were opened December 4th, 2017 and reviewed and scored by the Director and Assistant Director of Infrastructure Services as well as the Director and Assistant Director of Community Services and Tourism. These scores were averaged to determine the successful proponent. The 4 proponents will be discussed individually in the sections below.

Kresin Engineering

Kresin Engineering, as the Municipality's engineering firm, has the most complete understanding of the project requirements. They had completed the preliminary engineering for the project, including a cost forecast, and design work for the bioswales. They have also completed assessments on the stairs at Lion's Beach and geotechnical surveys of the shore stabilization and storm water locations. These were all completed as requirements for funding applications. As such, they were the only proponent with significant advance knowledge of the project. This was reflected in their proposal and pricing. Kresin proposed a significantly lower price than the other engineering firms, primarily based upon the following factors: They have much more familiarity with the project, and will have a significantly smaller requirement for data gathering. They also proposed a single tender of the bulk of the contracting that is relayed to their services, thereby cutting down significantly on the tender and contract work. Their other work within the municipality also allows them to share travel costs, reducing the share of this project significantly. Their proposal as well as our previous experience indicates that they have the required knowledge and expertise to complete this project successfully.

KGS Group Engineering

KGS Group submitted a very detailed and thorough proposal for the Wawa Waterfront Project. Their final budget number was slightly under budget, and in line with the other proposals received. They have an extensive project background and the staff experience included was acceptable to staff. Their timeline was acceptable though it showed some project tasks well into October, which leaves little contingency for early winters or inevitable construction delays. Overall, the proposal was very good, though much higher than what was received by Kresin Engineering.

Tulloch Engineering

Tulloch submitted a proposal with a fees outline slightly under KGS group however still significantly over the proposal submitted by Kresin Engineering. While less detailed, they also have several successful projects listed as their experience, as well as several experienced staff members. The major downside of their proposal was the extremely poor timeline submitted. As per their proposal, they look to spend a large portion of work on alternative solutions exploration. While this is necessary to a point for a Class EA, much of this has already been explored by preliminary engineering work as well as being a part of the 2008 Lapointe study. The sheer amount of time and funds spent on the alternatives is not conducive to the project's success and this time lime would bump the majority of construction onto 2019, again reducing the time contingency for construction and other delays.

Cairns Engineering

A smaller engineering firm, Cairns put together a smaller proposal using many direct parallels to the RFP. This proponent had the least amount of experienced staff, the highest budget figure, and displayed no relevant experience in storm water management. They had some experience with shore stabilization, but staff did not believe that they had the experience necessary to complete this project successfully.

Financial/Staffing Implications**Proposal Budgets**

While all proposals received were within the budget for this project, Kresin Engineering's was an outlier as it came in significantly under the other three proponents. The budget received by Kresin is \$129,000 plus another \$20,000 for geotechnical services they would contract out. This contrasts the other three budgets, all of which were over \$200,000. This is due to the familiarity that Kresin has with the project as well as their work plan that incorporates the design of one large tender instead of multiple smaller ones. As for the overall budget, this will give the Municipality added contingency funds, as the project is funded with a budget of \$235,000 for engineering services.

Policies Affecting Proposal

Municipal Business Plan

The Municipal Business Plan directs staff to improve tourism resources; and specifically mentions the Waterfront as a key resource to be revitalized. By selecting an engineer and moving ahead with the Project, the Municipality is following this direction.

Comments from Relevant Departments/Community and Corporate Partners

Department of Infrastructure Services

The Director and Assistant Director of Infrastructure Services have both gone over the project brief as well as the proposals and have scored them with Community Services and Tourism Staff. They are in agreeance with the recommendation.

Alternatives

Option 1: Do not continue with the Project

Without selecting an engineer for the project, this will cause the project to stop. As this project has been successful in acquiring over 90% funding, and is an important community project, this option is **Not Recommended**.

Option 2: Re Advertise or Select another Proponent

This option would see the Municipality re-evaluate proponents or re advertise and solicit additional proposals. As the Municipality received 4 proposals, staff do not expect there to be a significant difference in any other proposals received. Staff also believe, due to the reasons outlined in this report, that the successful proponent is capable ensuring the success of the project within a reasonable budget. For these reasons, this option is **Not Recommended**.

Option 3: Accept the Proposal from Kresin Engineering

This option would see the Municipality of Wawa accept the proposal from Kresin Engineering. As the engineering firm that is most familiar with the project, and the community, as well as the proposal with the lowest budget, staff believe that they are the best choice for this project. For that reason, as well as others outlined in this report, this option is **Recommended**.

Conclusion

By accepting the Proposal received by Kresin Engineering, this will close RFP 2017-06 and represent the first step of project implementation. This will allow work to begin on the Wawa Waterfront Project at the start of January 2018, and ensure that the project is on time and on budget.

Recommendation

That the Corporation of the Municipality of Wawa does hereby accept the proposal submitted by Kresin Engineering Inc. for Engineering Services for the Wawa Waterfront Project as outlined in RFP 2017-06, a copy of which is attached hereto.

Attachments

Appendix A – RFP 2017-06

Appendix B – Proposal – Kresin Engineering Services