

Subject:

Request for Bid Award – Joint-use Recreation Facility Feasibility Study

Recommendation:

THAT the Request for Bid for the Joint-Use Recreation Facility Feasibility Study be awarded to aodbt architecture + design in the amount of \$44,000.

Background and Description:

A resolution was adopted by council on July 16, 2018 to move forward with conducting a feasibility study for a joint-use recreation facility by way of a request for proposal (RFP). Sara Snow of Midgard Project Management was contracted to manage the RFP process. On August 14, 2018, the Town of White City (town) released a Request for Proposal (RFP) through SaskTenders for consulting services to develop a feasibility study. Seven proposals were submitted by the September 4, 2018 deadline. After stage I screening, six proponents were moved to the stage II evaluation. Stage II evaluations were carried out on September 12, 2018 by the evaluation committee consisting of:

- Andrew Boschman, Councillor
- Mauricio Jimenez, Town Planner
- Carla Ferstl, Recreation Director

Evaluation areas included:

- Proponent Organization and Understanding
- Project Experience
- Methodology
- Schedule
- Innovative Ideas and Value-Added Services
- Fees

aodbt architecture + design (AAD) was the highest scoring bidder, achieving a score of 80.37 out of 100. AAD confirmed their ability to meet the project schedule, complete the study prior to winter months, can start immediately on the project, demonstrated experience on similar projects, offered strong value-added options and falls within the project budget.

Implications:

Strategic: Awarding the Joint-Use Recreation Facility Feasibility Study to the highest scoring bidder using a value-based approach will help the town reach it's responsive and progressive goal. Specifically, it will help to achieve the objective to have responsible management of the town's financial and

other resources, ensuring transparency and accountability.

Financial: AAD's \$44,000 fixed fee is on the low end of anticipated feasibility study costs. Proposal fees submitted ranged from \$19,320 to \$95,000. This project will be funded by recreation development levies.

Policy/Legal: Policy No. FIN 001-2017 (the Purchasing Policy) provided direction and guidance through the tendering process for this project. According to section 1 of the Purchasing Policy, the town is to use a principle-based approach to purchasing, ensuring the Town:

- 1) Receives the best value for its investment;
- 2) Is protected against fraudulent activity;
- 3) Treats vendors fairly;
- 4) Can act efficiently;
- 5) Complies with municipal, provincial and federal regulation; and
- 6) That all expenses have budgetary approval.

Administration, with the assistance of Midgard, followed section 8 of the Purchasing Policy which requires all purchases for goods and services over \$75K to be compliant with the New West Trade Partnership Agreement by publicly advertising the potential purchase. As the project had the potential to cost more than \$75K, the RFP was publicly advertised.

When evaluating tender submissions, the town followed subsection 13. a. by evaluating bidders based on price, schedule, sub-contractors, qualifications and experience, reputation and other criteria considered relevant by the town. In this case, the highest scoring bidder did not submit the lowest bid, therefore clause 13. f. i. of the Purchasing Policy requires council to make the decision to award the tender when administration recommends awarding the contract to a proponent other than the lowest qualified bidder.

Communications: Once a decision has been made on the successful bidder, Midgard will issue a letter of intent and facilitate execution of the feasibility study contract between the bidder and the town. When the contract has been fully executed, Midgard will issue thank-you letters to remaining bidders.

Alternatives:

1. Selecting the lowest bidder

The lowest bidder scored 41.67/100. This bidder was competitive on cost; however, the proponent focused on construction of the building and didn't address overall needs and did not have related project experience as a firm or team. These elements were part of the value-based bidding process established under this RFP and would provide the evaluation committee with confidence the vendor could provide a quality product.

2. Cancel the project

Recreation facility needs are of high importance to the community. Cancelling the project would mean a delay in addressing those needs and future critical development of the community.



Carla Ferstl, Recreation Director