



Toronto Parking
Authority

Office des parcs de
stationnement de
Toronto

The Toronto Parking Authority exists to provide safe, attractive, self-sustaining, conveniently located and competitively priced off-street and on-street public parking as an integral component

NOTICE OF MEETING AND AGENDA

A meeting of the Toronto Parking Authority will be held at **City of Toronto City Hall, located at 100 Queen Street West, Meeting Room B, 2nd Floor, at 4:00 p.m. on Monday, April 20, 2009.**

AGENDA

- A. Declarations of Conflict of Interest.
- B. Confirmation of the minutes of the March 25, 2009 meeting
- C. Election of Board Chair and Vice Chair positions.

It is noted that City Council, at its meeting on April 23 and 24, 2007, by its adoption of Civic Appointments Committee Item CA7.8, made the following citizen appointments to the Toronto Parking Authority Board for a term of office to commence on April 1, 2009 and ending November 30, 2010 at the pleasure of Council and until successors are appointed to replace George K. Soulis (Chair), Stan Kumorek (Vice Chair) and John Maletich (Director) are: Thomas Carter, Valentine Lovekin and Franklin Sinanan.

- D. Appointments to Board Committees
(Rate Review, Finance, Marketing, Policy Resolution and Greening Committees)

Copy of letter dated March 25, 2009 from Frank Sinanan to TPA Board Chair attached for information.

Italicised items: Approval of these items will result in expenditure/receipt of funds

1.0 FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION

- 1.1 List of Cheques issued, for information only, and shown as Annex A to this, April 20, 2009 Agenda (vouchers 44441 – 44786 and voucher 400023).
- 1.2 ***Staff memorandum dated April 14, 2009 recommending that the Toronto Parking Authority continue to support the Toronto Association of Business Improvement Areas (TABIA) for the 2009 Citywide Campaign with a contribution of \$50,000.00.***
- 1.3 Staff memorandum dated April 13, 2009 recommending approval of new Policy Resolution 4-22 "Workplace Harassment & Violence Policy".

33 Queen Street East
Toronto, Ontario
M5C 1R5
Tel: (416) 393-7275
Fax: (416) 393-7352
www.greenp.com

- 1.4 **Staff memorandum dated April 7, 2009 recommending:**
- 1) **approval of the expenditure of \$71,696.68 (taxes included) plus \$4,000 contingency to provide for the purchase of four (4) 2009 Chevrolet Uplanders from the dealership Humberview Pontiac Buick GMC, 1650 The Queensway, Toronto; and,**
 - 2) **authorization for the decommissioning of Vehicle No. B-03 – 1996 Ford Aerostar Van, Vehicle No. B-06 – 1997 Ford Aerostar Van, Vehicle No. B-15 – 2002 GMC Sonoma Pick-up Truck and Vehicle No. B-16 – 2002 GMC Sonoma Pick-up Truck. These vehicles are to be sold at City auction on a later date this year.**
- 1.5 **Staff memorandum dated April 13, 2009 recommending approval of the expenditure of \$16,273.22 plus GST and PST for the purchase and installation of a new high density mobile filing system from TAB Products of Canada Co. to expand the Toronto Parking Authority's current Central File system for future needs.**
- 1.6 Staff memorandum dated April 16, 2009 regarding the 2009 Conference Budget for Board Directors.

2.0 DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION

- 2.1 **Staff memorandum dated March 25, 2009 recommending that the consulting services contract for the Proposed Electrical Lighting System Upgrade for Carpark No. 29 – 75 Holly Street and Carpark No. 68 – 20 St. Andrew Street be awarded to URS Canada Inc. for the sum total amount of \$56,000.00 plus GST.**
- 2.2 **Staff memorandum dated March 31, 2009 recommending that the consulting services contract for the Proposed Electrical Lighting System Upgrade for Carpark No. 36 at 100 Queen Street West and Carpark No. 111 at 74 Clinton Street be awarded to URS Canada Inc. for the sum total amount of \$68,000.00 plus GST.**

3.0 PARKING OPERATIONS

No items for this Agenda.

4.0 DEVELOPMENT & MARKETING

No items for this Agenda.

5.0 **IN-CAMERA**

5.1 ***Staff memorandum dated March 31, 2009 regarding an invoice received.***

5.2 Staff memorandum dated April 14, 2009 regarding a Management Agreement for municipal parking purposes.

5.3 Staff memorandum dated April 14, 2009 regarding a real estate and development update.

6.0 **OTHER BUSINESS**

6.1 Copies of the following articles recently appearing in local newspapers, publications and media:

- 1) "Etobicoke to get a new court", Toronto Sun, April 8, 2009;
- 2) "Pay hike denied to city staff", Toronto Sun, April 8, 2009;
- 3) "Councillors freeze pay for others", Toronto Star, April 8, 2009;
- 4) "Users protect TTC parking perks", Toronto Star, March 31, 2009;
- 5) "Transit: Free TTC parking for Metropass users ends next week", Inside Toronto, March 27, 2009; and,
- 6) "Tax dollars at work", Town Crier, March 19, 2009.

6.2 Staff memorandum dated April 16, 2009 regarding the appointment of a Toronto Parking Authority representative to the Canadian National Exhibition Association for the remainder of the 2009 term. The position was previously held by former Board Director John Maletich.



BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Directors FILE NO:
FROM: Gwyn Thomas / Bob Kretschmer DATE: April 13, 2009
SUBJECT: **Policy Resolution 4-22 – Workplace Harassment & Violence Policy**

MEETING DATE: April 20, 2009

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Board of Directors approves the attached Policy Resolution 4-22 – Workplace Harassment & Violence Policy.

BACKGROUND:

Under the *Occupational Health and Safety Act* all employers must take every precaution reasonable in the circumstances to protect the health and safety of their workers in the workplace.

The purpose of this **Workplace Harassment & Violence Policy** is to clearly state the Toronto Parking Authority's commitment to the requirements, duties and standards set out in the Occupational Health and Safety Act; its commitment to the health and safety of all of its employees, and to clearly define the responsibilities of Management, Managers / Supervisors and unionized personnel.

The **Workplace Harassment & Violence Policy**, recommended herein, will ensure that every worker is protected from workplace related harassment or violence through guidelines and processes for identifying, eliminating and dealing with incidents of workplace related harassment or violence.

This policy, reviewed by legal counsel of *Hicks Morley*, specifically emphasizes and articulates strong communication, early intervention, prevention awareness and training development for all workers, including those who exercise managerial functions.

(Minutes to be confirmed at the April 20, 2009 Board Meeting)

TORONTO PARKING AUTHORITY

A meeting of the Board of Directors of the Toronto Parking Authority was held at the Toronto City Hall, 100 Queen Street West, 2nd Floor, Meeting Room B at 4:00 p.m. on Wednesday, March 25, 2009.

Present: George K. Soulis, Chair
Stan Kumorek, Vice Chair
John W. Maletich
Ron Y.M. Tsin
Diana Birchall

Gwyn Thomas, President
Teresa Toigo, Board Secretary

Absent: Councillor Kyle Rae
Councillor Michael Feldman

09-029 The Board confirmed the minutes of the February 25, 2009 meeting.

FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION

09-030 The Board received, for information only, a list of cheques issued and shown as Annex A to the March 25, 2009 Agenda (vouchers 44065 – 44440 and voucher 400022).

09-031 The Board received, for information only, a staff memorandum dated March 19, 2009 regarding the on and off-street revenue results for February 2009 and year to date.

DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION

09-032 The Board approved a staff memorandum dated March 13, 2009 recommending that the Consulting Services Contract for the proposed two-floor addition for Municipal Carpark 1 at 20 Charles Street be awarded to Read Jones Christoffersen Ltd. for the sum total amount of \$630,000 plus GST.

09-033 The Board approved a staff memorandum dated March 13, 2009 recommending that:

- 1) the construction contract for the 2009 Line Marking Program for Surface Carparks be awarded to College Parking Liners for the sum total amount of \$30,700.00 plus GST; and,
- 2) the amount of \$6,900.00 (plus GST) be recovered from the Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) for the 2009 Line Marking Program carried out for the TTC parking lots.

09-034 The Board approved a staff memorandum dated March 19, 2009 recommending that the 2009 Line Marking Program for Parking Garages be awarded to College Parking Liners for the sum total amount of \$27,000.00 plus GST.

(Minutes to be confirmed at the April 20, 2009 Board Meeting)

09-035 The Board approved a staff memorandum dated March 26, 2009 recommending that the consulting services contract for the proposed Retrofit and Upgrade of the Sprinkler System for Municipal Carpark 68 at 20 St. Andrew Street be awarded to LKM Division of SNC Lavalin Inc. for the sum total amount of \$36,000.00 plus GST.

09-036 The Board approved a staff memorandum dated March 17, 2009 recommending that the consulting services contract for the proposed Fire Alarm System Upgrade for Municipal Carpark 15 at 37 Yorkville Avenue be awarded to LKM Division of SNC Lavalin Inc. for the sum total amount of \$34,000.00 plus GST.

DEVELOPMENT & MARKETING

09-037 The Board approved a staff memorandum dated March 19, 2009 recommending the expenditure of \$50,000.00 to retain Filament Creative to redesign the Toronto Parking Authority's website www.greenp.com. A total of \$45,000.00 was allocated for the project in the 2009 Operating Budget.

IN-CAMERA

09-038 The Board approved a staff memorandum dated March 2, 2009 regarding an invoice received.

09-039 The Board approved a staff memorandum dated March 19, 2009 regarding an equipment upgrade.

09-040 The Board received, for information only, a staff memorandum dated March 19, 2009 regarding the Toronto Parking Authority's coin processing.

09-041 The Board approved a staff memorandum dated March 19, 2009 regarding a security equipment upgrade.

09-042 The Board approved a staff memorandum dated March 19, 2009 regarding the retention of an IT security consultant.

09-043 The Board approved a staff memorandum dated March 19, 2009 regarding the purchase of security management software.

09-044 The Board received, for information only, a memorandum dated March 24, 2009 regarding Board remuneration.

(Minutes to be confirmed at the April 20, 2009 Board Meeting)

OTHER BUSINESS

09-045 The Board received, for information only, copies of the following articles recently appearing in local newspapers, publications and media:

- 1) "Recession toppling businesses in Beach", Toronto Star, March 9, 2009;
- 2) "Mercifully, Green P is a public gold mine that is not for sale", Globe & Mail, March 5, 2009;
- 3) "Lot pays for its own end" Town Crier On-line, March 4, 2009;
- 4) "Company found parking 'loophole': City Hall" Toronto Sun, March 3, 2009;
- 5) "Police to probe city ticket-fixers", Toronto Sun, February 26, 2009;
- 6) "The fast life of a yellow tag", Toronto Sun, February 25, 2009;
- 7) "TDSB pay parking stalls", Town Crier On-line, February 24, 2009; and,
- 8) "Ticket Fixers 'Disciplined'", Toronto Sun, February 24, 2009.

09-046 With the current term of the Board ending on March 31, 2009, Chair Soulis, Vice Chair Kumorek and Director Maletich expressed their appreciation for the opportunity of having served on the Toronto Parking Authority Board and thanked the remaining members of the Board, President Thomas and staff for all their continued efforts and dedication.

Meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Board Chair



BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Gwyn Thomas FILE NO: 5000-177
FROM: Amir Nathoo DATE: March 25, 2009
SUBJECT: **Proposed Electrical Lighting System Upgrade for
Carpark No. 29 – 75 Holly Street
Carpark No. 68 – 20 St. Andrew Street
Consulting Services Proposal for Approval**

MEETING DATE: April 20, 2009

RECOMMENDATION:

To award the consulting services contract for the Proposed Electrical Lighting System Upgrade for Carpark No. 29 – 75 Holly Street and Carpark No. 68 – 20 St. Andrew Street to URS Canada Inc. for the amount of \$47,600 plus \$3,000 for disbursements and an additional amount of \$5,400 as contingency allowance; being the sum total amount of \$56,000 plus GST.

A. **BACKGROUND**

1. **Carpark No. 29**

- .1 This carpark is located at 75 Holly Street (nearest intersection is Yonge and Eglinton) has one below-grade and four-above grade parking levels. The parking garage is connected to two TCHC facilities. The high-rise building (70 Dunfield Ave) is on the east side and low-rise building (69 Holly Street) on the south/west side. The carpark was open on March 1, 1979 and provides 460 parking stalls.
- .2 The main incoming electrical system is shared with Toronto Housing Corporation (THC), however, each owner has individual distribution systems located in a common electrical room. The facility is backed up by an emergency diesel generator (in a common generator room), with its own emergency distribution system.
- .3 It is proposed to provide electrical lighting system upgrade which will include:
 - a) Removal of all existing lighting fixtures and reinstalling them to suit new layout and adding new fixtures to suit with new layout to meet TPA standard lighting levels.
 - b) Replacing and adding exit lights for the garage to meet present day code.

- .4 URS Canada Inc was retained by TPA to carryout site review and to prepare Condition Assessment Report – Electrical Lighting System Feasibility Report, dated August, 2008 which formed part of the RFP. This report provides additional information and summary of the scope of work required.

2. Carpark No. 68

- .1 Carpark No. 68 is located at 20 St. Andrew Street or between St. Andrew Street and Baldwin Street, west of Spadina Road. The carpark has two below-grade sublevels and four above-grade parking levels.
- .2 The original carpark was opened on June 13, 1979. The upper two levels were added and opened on January 2, 1997. The carpark provides 450 parking spaces.
- .3 It is proposed to provide electrical lighting system upgrade which will include:
 - a) Removal of existing lighting fixtures and reinstalling them to suit new layout.
 - b) Add new lighting fixtures to meet TPA lighting level requirements.
 - c) Replacing of existing exit lights for the garage and adding new to meet the present day code.
- .4 URS Canada Inc. was retained by TPA to carryout site review and to prepare Condition Assessment Report – Electrical Lighting System Feasibility Report, dated August, 2008 which formed part of the RFP. This report provides the additional information and summary of the scope of work required.

3. Summary of Work

Summary of Work							
Proposal #	Carpark No.	New Generator	Existing Lighting fixture removal	Existing Fixture Re-use	New Fixtures Add	Exit Lights	
						Remove existing	New Exit Lights
1	29	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	68	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes

B. REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (Confidential)

1. On February 9, 2009, Toronto Parking Authority (TPA) solicited through a Request for Proposal (RFP) for consulting services to seven Consultants. Five (5) proposals were received and are listed below under Table 'A' in the ascending order of the upset fee amount quoted without GST. The Consultants were required to base their proposal on TPA's RFP which details the scope of service required, the duration of service required, the terms and conditions of the contract agreement, including the anticipated project construction schedule and fee schedules to be included in the proposal.
2. Table A details the total upset fee and the percentage fee for each phase of work.

TABLE A		As Submitted in Proposal				
		Upset Fee excl GST	% Fee by Phase			
No.	Company		I	II	III	IV
1	LK M Division of SNC-Lavalin Inc. (LKM)	\$46,700	22	40	32	6
2	URS Canada Inc (URS)	\$47,600	26.05	35.72	34.56	3.68
3	Morrison Hershfield Ltd (MHL)	\$58,500	21	44	30	5
4	MMM Group Ont. Ltd (MMM)	\$99,418	32.42	38.34	22.95	6.58
5	MCW Consultants L td (MCW)	\$119,000	20	50	25	5
	Typical Average	\$74,243.60	24.29	41.61	28.90	5.19

3. The category of services under each phase includes:
 - .1 Phase I - Gathering of Data, Develop Scope of Work, Preliminary Design & Cost Estimate; Review and Coordinate with Fire Department
 - .2 Phase II - Detail Design, Building Permit Process, Tender Documents and Tendering Process
 - .3 Phase III - Contract Administration during Construction, Building Permit discharge, Decommissioning Process
 - .4 Phase IV - Post Construction Audit and Warranty Follow-up

4. Table B details the total number of hours allowed under each discipline and for each proponent. The Table also shows average rate per hour for each proponent.

TABLE B		Discipline and Hour Assigned				
	Company	Project Management	Electrical	Construction Review	Total Hour	Avg. Cost per Hour
1	LKM	94	300	110	504	92.66
2	URS	110	366	50	526	90.49
3	MHL	60	200	80	340	172.06
4	MMM	200	672		872	114.01
5	MCW	291	571	388	125.60	95.20
Typical Average		151	421.80	125.60	698.40	112.88

C. RFP SELECTION CRITERIA

1. The proposals were reviewed for completeness, suitability of proposed project team members and match to requirements.
2. The evaluation of proposals is based on:
 - .1 Experience of the proponent and the proposed project team members with projects of similar size and complexity, preferably with a public sector organization;
 - .2 Appropriate qualifications and expertise provided by the project team members in their proposed respective roles;
 - .3 Approach to time control and ability to meet the delivery deadline;
 - .4 Acceptance of terms and conditions set out in this Request for Proposals; and
 - .5 Contribution Matrix, Price and delivery.
3. The criteria for selection is based on:

		Yes	No		
1	Mandatory Criteria				
	Acceptance of Terms & Conditions				
	Relevant Qualifications & Project Experience				
	Commitment to Project Schedule				
	Completeness of Submission				
	Criteria	Score	Weighing Factor	Sub-total	Final Score
2	Submission		30%		
	Compliance with RFP				
	Understanding of Scope of Work				
	Commitment to Project Schedule				
	Schedules				
3	Qualifications & Experience of Project Team		20%		
	Principal				
	Project Manager				
	Design Engineer				
	Field Review Engineer				
	Support Staff (measurements, etc.)				
4	Similar Project Experience		10%		
	Project 1				
	Project 2				
	Project 3				
5	Fee Point Calculation		40%		
	Proponents Total Fixed Fee				
	<i>Lowest fee receives 40 points, the remaining proposals are assigned points based on the formula: (lowest priced proposal divided by price of proponents proposal) x 40</i>				
TOTALS			100%		

D. **REVIEW OF PROPOSALS**1. **Proposal Comparison Summary**

	Company	Pros	Cons
1	LKM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Lowest fee proposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Poor presentation and very brief proposal ➤ Projects listed under lighting retrofit lacks details as to the nature of retrofit and other information
2	URS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Second low fee proposal ➤ Complete and detailed proposal ➤ Lowest average rate per hour \$90.49 	
3	MHL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Third low fee proposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Limitation on the number of site meeting and visits to the site ➤ Lowest number of hours allowed for all work (340) ➤ Insufficient hours allowed for contract admin during construction ➤ Highest average rate per hour \$172.06 ➤ Lesser experience proposed PM compared to the other two low proposals
4	MMM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Complete and detailed proposal ➤ Allowed second highest number of hours for the project (836.50) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Second highest proposal
5	MCW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Allowed highest number of hours for the project (1,250) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Project team members resumes missing ➤ Project understanding and work plan is not as detailed compared to other proponents

2. Fees as Percentage

	Company	Upset Fee	Fee Percentage	Total Hours	Avg Rate Per Hr
1	LKM	\$46,700	100	504	\$92.66
2	URS	\$47,600	101.93	526	\$90.49
3	MHL	\$58,500	125.27	340	\$172.06
4	MMM	\$99,418	212.89	872	\$114.01
5	MCW	\$119,000	254.82	1250	\$95.20

E. SELECTION OF PROPOSAL FOR SHORT-LIST

All the companies invited are capable of providing the services required for this project. However, the selection is guided by the Terms and Conditions of the RFP and the selection criteria as noted in the RFP. We have prepared the attached Bid Comparison Sheet to facilitate our review.

1. MCW's proposal has the highest number of hours and the highest fee with the rate of \$95.20/hour. MCW's did not provide resumes of Team Members and is not as detailed.
2. MMM's proposal is complete and detailed; however, it is the second highest proposal.
3. MHL's proposal has the highest average rate per hour, lowest total number of hours compared to the other proponents, and the project manager's experience is less compared to the low proponent.

F. REVIEW OF THE TWO REMAINING LOW FEE PROPOSALS

1. Comparison of two low fee Proposals

No.	Description	LKM	URS
1	Proposal presentation	Poor compared to URS	Complete and detailed
2	Average rate per hour	\$92.66	\$90.49
3	Total hours allowed	504	526
4	Fee quoted	\$46,700	\$47,600
5	Project experience	Similar projects are not detailed	Similar projects are detailed
6	TPA projects	Recently completed sprinkler retrofit for CP No.15	Recently completed lighting upgrade for CP Nos. 15, 404 and 26

2. Selection of URS Canada Inc.

- .1 URS is preferred over LKM because of their more recent experience for a similar lighting system upgrade work for Carpark Nos. 15, 26 and 404.
- .2 URS fee is \$47,600 compared to LKM's \$46,700 or is higher by \$900. However, URS average rate per hour is the lowest and has indicated 22 hours more or \$1,990.78 value of work.
- .3 URS's proposal is detailed and complete.
- .4 We are therefore requesting that the proposal URS Canada be accepted for the consulting services required.

G. FINANCIAL BACKGROUND

.1	Funds available under Capital Budget		\$750,000
.2	Consulting Fees		
	.1 LKM Fees	\$47,600	
	.2 Disbursement	\$3,000	
	.3 Contingency Allowance	\$5,400	
	Sub-total	\$56,000	(\$56,000)
.3	Funds available for construction work		\$694,000

Amir Nathoo

Attachments:

- Proposals
- Bid Comparison Sheet



BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Directors FILE NO: 2130-01
FROM: Gwyn Thomas DATE: April 14, 2009
SUBJECT: **Sponsorship – The Toronto Association of Business Improvement Areas 2009 Citywide Campaign**

MEETING DATE: Monday, April 20, 2009

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Board of Directors approve funding in the amount of \$50,000.00 for the sponsorship of the Toronto Association of Business Improvement Area's 2009 Citywide Campaign.

BACKGROUND:

The Toronto Area Business Improvement Association (TABIA) is an umbrella organization for Toronto's 64 individual Business Improvement Areas (BIA's) that represent over 27,000 businesses throughout the city. One of TABIA's roles is to assist in the promotion and marketing of local events and festivals for individual BIA's that generally can not afford to do so themselves. The Taste of the Danforth and other such community events are typical of those that receive support.

Once again this year TABIA has written to the Toronto Parking Authority to solicit support for the Citywide Campaign (Attachment). For the past seven (7) years the Authority has provided sponsorship for this program. In return for our support the "Green P" has been recognized as a sponsor and featured in all of the promotional material (print and poster campaigns) for these events and has also been included in the many supporting radio advertising spots at the times of year that compliment our own advertising/marketing campaigns.

Since much of the Authority's revenue is generated in the BIA's and in view of the fact that these events enhance our business and our relationships with the local business communities, it is appropriate that our support of this program be continued. The Toronto Parking Authority provided sponsorship in the amount of \$50,000.00 in 2008 and this amount has been allocated for this purpose in the 2009 Operating Budget.

GLT:tt
Attach.

File: d:\files\Board Reports\Gthomas\Board\rec\TABIA-April 20-09 mtg



BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Gwyn Thomas FILE NO: 5000-177
FROM: Amir Nathoo DATE: March 31, 2009
SUBJECT: **Proposed Electrical Lighting System Upgrade
Carpark No. 36 – 100 Queen Street West
Carpark No. 111 – 74 Clinton Street
Consulting Services Proposal for Approval**

MEETING DATE: April 20, 2009

RECOMMENDATION:

To award the consulting services contract for the Proposed Electrical Lighting System Upgrade for Carpark No. 36 at 100 Queen Street West and Carpark No. 111 at 74 Clinton Street to URS Canada Inc. for the amount of \$58,500 plus \$3,000 for disbursements and an additional amount of \$6,500 as contingency allowance; being the sum total amount of \$68,000 plus GST.

A. BACKGROUND

1. Carpark No. 36

- .1 The below-grade Carpark No. 36 is located at 100 Queen Street West, Nathan Phillips Square, Toronto, and is the area bounded by Queen Street on the south side, Bay Street on the east, the Law Courts on the west, and the New City Hall on the north side. The east/west expansion joint divides the carpark into the south part as Stage I and the north part as Stage II. In the Stage I and sublevel 2 west side, there is a car wash commercial component which operates Monday to Saturday. The carpark provides 2086 public parking spaces. In Stage II, sublevel 1 belongs to the City and used as City employee parking. The 3-1/2 levels of Stage I garage and levels 2 to 4 of Stage II belong to Toronto Parking Authority and used as municipal parking areas.
- .2 Stage I garage was opened on July 28, 1958 and Stage II garage (extension) was opened on December 7, 1965.
- .3 The garage is equipped with two (2) emergency diesel generators.
- .4 It is proposed to provide electrical lighting system upgrade which will include:
 - a) Removal of all existing lighting fixtures and reinstalling them to suit new layout.
 - b) Adding new lighting fixtures to meet TPA lighting level requirements.

c) Adding exit lights, if required, for the garage to meet present day code.

.5 The work to upgrade Stage II, Sub-level I will be discussed and paid by the City of Toronto. The City of Toronto is bound by the Laborers' Collective Agreement while the TPA is only bound by the City of Tonto's Fair Wage Policy.

.6 URS Canada Inc. was retained by TPA to carryout site review and to prepare Condition Assessment Report – Electrical Lighting System Feasibility Report, dated September, 2008 provides the additional information and summary of the scope of work required, and forms part of RFP.

2. Carpark No. 111

.1 Carpark No. 111 is located at 74 Clinton Street. The below-grade carpark provides 79 parking spaces. A building development of a commercial/residential complex, including CHIN Radio station and senior citizen's housing has been built over the below-grade one level parking garage.

.2 The carpark was open on August 15, 1975.

.3 It is proposed to provide electrical lighting system upgrade which will include:

a) Removal of existing lighting fixtures and providing new fixtures to meet TPA lighting level requirements.

b) Replacing of existing exit lights for the garage and adding new to meet the present day code.

.4 URS Canada Inc. was retained by TPA to carryout site review and to prepare Condition Assessment Report – Electrical Lighting System Feasibility Report, dated September, 2008 provides the additional information and summary of the scope of work required, and forms part of RFP.

B. Summary of Work

Summary of Work							
Proposal #	Carpark No.	New Generator	Existing Lighting fixture removal	Existing Fixture Re-use	New Fixtures Add	Exit Lights	
						Remove existing	New Exit Lights
2	36	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	111	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes

C. REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (Confidential)

1. On February 9, 2009, Toronto Parking Authority (TPA) solicited through a Request for Proposal (RFP) for consulting services to seven Consultants. Five (5) proposals were received and are listed below under Table 'A' in the ascending order of the upset fee amount quoted without GST. The Consultants were required to base their proposal on TPA's RFP which details the scope of service required, the duration of service required, the terms and conditions of the contract agreement, including the anticipated project construction schedule of seven and a half (7-1/2) months and fee schedules to be included in the proposal.

2. Table A below details the total upset fee and the percentage fee for each phase of work. The Table also includes the typical average of the first four Proponents. MCW has bid very high compared to the other proponents. It would seem either they do not want the project or they have misjudged the scope of work.

TABLE A		As Submitted in Proposal				
No.	Company	Upset Fee excl GST	% Fee by Phase			
			I	II	III	IV
1	Morrison Hershfield Ltd (MHL)	\$54,000	23	40	32	5
2	URS Canada Inc (URS)	\$58,500	28.89	34.27	33.76	3.08
3	LKM Division of SNC-Lavalin Inc. (LKM)	\$79,000	29	34	32	5
4	MMM Group Ont. Ltd (MMM)	\$99,418	32.42	38.34	22.95	6.29
5	MCW Consultants L td (MCW)	\$375,000	20	50	25	5
	Typical Average	\$72,729.50	24.29	41.61	28.90	5.19

3. The category of services under each phase includes:
- .1 Phase I - Gathering of Data, Develop Scope of Work, Preliminary Design & Cost Estimate; Review and Coordinate with Fire Department
 - .2 Phase II - Detail Design, Building Permit Process, Tender Documents and Tendering Process
 - .3 Phase III - Contract Administration during Construction, Building Permit discharge, Decommissioning Process
 - .4 Phase IV - Post Construction Audit and Warranty Follow-up

4. Table B below details the total number of hours allowed under each discipline and for each proponent. The Table also shows the typical of the first four proponents. Under typical average MCW's information has not been included for reasons already stated under Table A.

TABLE B		Discipline and Hour Assigned				
	Company	Project Management	Electrical	Construction Review	Total Hour	Avg. Cost per Hour
1	MHL	60	170	80	310	174.19
2	URS	130	469	50	649	90.14
3	LKM	114	428	180	722	109.42
4	MMM	200	672		872	114.01
5	MCW	832	2168	950	3950	94.94
Typical Average		126	434.75	130	638.25	116.54

D. RFP SELECTION CRITERIA

1. The proposals were reviewed for completeness, suitability of proposed project team members and match to requirements.
2. The evaluation of proposals is based on:
 - .1 Experience of the proponent and the proposed project team members with projects of similar size and complexity, preferably with a public sector organization;
 - .2 Appropriate qualifications and expertise provided by the project team members in their proposed respective roles;
 - .3 Approach to time control and ability to meet the delivery deadline;
 - .4 Acceptance of terms and conditions set out in this Request for Proposals; and
 - .5 Contribution Matrix, Price and delivery.
3. The criteria for selection is based on:

			Yes	No		
1	Mandatory Criteria					
	Acceptance of Terms & Conditions					
	Relevant Qualifications & Project Experience					
	Commitment to Project Schedule					
	Completeness of Submission					
	Criteria	Score	Weighing Factor	Sub-total	Final Score	
2	Submission		30%			
	Compliance with RFP					
	Understanding of Scope of Work					
	Commitment to Project Schedule					
	Schedules					
3	Qualifications & Experience of Project Team		20%			
	Principal					
	Project Manager					
	Design Engineer					
	Field Review Engineer					
	Support Staff (measurements, etc.)					
4	Similar Project Experience		10%			
	Project 1					
	Project 2					
	Project 3					
5	Fee Point Calculation		40%			
	Proponents Total Fixed Fee					
	<i>Lowest fee receives 40 points, the remaining proposals are assigned points based on the formula: (lowest priced proposal divided by price of proponents proposal) x 40</i>					
	TOTALS		100%			

E. REVIEW OF PROPOSALS

1. Proposal Comparison Summary

	Company	Pros	Cons
1	MHL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Lowest fee proposal ➤ Complete and detailed proposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Allowed lowest number of total hours compared to other proponents. In fact, less than half the hour compared to next proponent ➤ Has the highest rate per hour compared to all proponents - \$174.19 ➤ Lesser experience; proposed PM compared to the next proponent ➤ Insufficient hours allowed for contract admin during construction and has included a note for claims for extra.
2	URS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Second low fee proposal ➤ Lowest average rate per hour \$90.14 ➤ Complete and detailed proposal 	
3	LKM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Third low fee proposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Poor presentation and very brief proposal ➤ Projects listed under lighting retrofit lacks details as to the nature of retrofit and other information
4	MMM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Complete and detailed proposal ➤ Allowed second highest number of hours for the project (872) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Second highest proposal
5	MCW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Allowed highest number of hours for the project (3950) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Project team members resumes missing ➤ Project understanding and work plan is not as detailed compared to other proponents

2. Fees as Percentage

	Company	Upset Fee	Fee Percentage	Total Hours	Avg Rate Per Hr
1	MHL	\$54,000	100	310	\$174.19
2	URS	\$58,500	108.33	649	\$90.14
3	LKM	\$79,000	146.34	722	\$109.42
4	MMM	\$99,418	184.11	872	\$114.01
5	MCW	\$375,000	600.44	3950	\$94.94
Typical average		\$72,729.50	134.70	638.25	\$121.94
Note: typical average does not include MCW					

F. SELECTION OF PROPOSAL FOR SHORT-LIST

All the companies invited are capable of providing the services required for this project. However, the selection is guided by the Terms and Conditions of the RFP and the selection criteria as noted in the RFP. We have prepared the attached Bid Comparison Sheet to facilitate our review.

1. MCW's proposal has the highest number of hours and the highest fee of \$375,000 with the rate of \$94.94/hour. MCW's did not provide resumes of Team Members. It would seem MCW has misjudged the scope of work required or is not interested and hence has bid so high.
2. MMM's proposal is complete and detailed; however, it is the second highest proposal.
3. MHL's proposal has the lowest fee, lowest total hours, and highest rate per hour of \$174.19. Under the proposal of MHL, Article 4.3.3 states our service during the construction stage of the project will include: periodic attendance at construction meetings – fifteen (15); arrange such that it can be combined with a site visit for general review; prepare site visit reports; estimated number of site visits per location – eight (8).
4. RFP includes construction duration of seven and a half month with bi-weekly construction site meetings. On March 25, 2009, at 3:25 pm the writer expressed concern to Mr. Titel Gurau of MHL in providing a level playing field to all proponents and that the above constraint of limited site visit amounted to a provision for a future claim for extra for additional site visits. The purpose for this clause was to claim extra payment for site visits beyond the site visit number noted and that it would not be fair to other proponents who have already factored in their proposal the cost of all site visits required.
5. MHL has since submitted the attached letter, dated March 26, 2009 offering to remove the provision from the proposal. To maintain a level playing field and maintain assessment fairness for all proponents, TPA has decided not to entertain the offer from MHL.

G. REVIEW OF THE TWO REMAINING LOW FEE PROPOSALS

1. Comparison of two low fee Proposals

No.	Description	URS	LKM
1	Proposal presentation	Complete and detailed	Poor compared to URS
2	Average rate per hour	\$90.14	\$109.42
3	Total hours allowed	649	722
4	Fee quoted	\$58,500	\$79,000
5	Project experience	Similar projects are detailed	Similar projects are noted but not detailed
6	TPA projects	Recently completed lighting upgrade for CP Nos. 15, 404 and 26	Recently completed sprinkler retrofit for CP No.15

2. Selection of URS Canada Inc.

- .1 URS is preferred over LKM because:
- a) Their proposal is detailed and complete;
 - b) Their fee of \$58,500 is lower compared to LKM's fee of \$79,000 or a difference of \$20,500;
 - c) Their average rate per hour of \$90.14 is lower compared to LKM's rate of \$109.42 and
 - d) URS has more experience for similar TPA lighting system upgrade work which includes Carpark Nos. 15, 26, and 404.
- .2 We are therefore requesting that the proposal of URS Canada be accepted for the consulting services required for this project.

H. FINANCIAL BACKGROUND

.1	Funds available under Capital Budget		
	.1 Carpark No. 36	\$800,000	
	.2 Carpark No. 111	\$100,000	\$900,000
.2	Consulting Fees		
	.1 URS Fees	\$58,500	
	.2 Disbursement	\$3,000	
	.3 Contingency Allowance	\$6,500	
	Sub-total	\$68,000	(\$68,000)
.3	Funds available for construction work		\$832,000

Amir Nathoo

Attachments:
Proposals
Bid Comparison Sheet



BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Directors FILE NO:
FROM: Gwyn Thomas DATE: April 16, 2009
SUBJECT: RE-APPOINTMENT OF A TORONTO PARKING AUTHORITY REPRESENTATIVE TO
THE CANADIAN NATIONAL EXHIBITION ASSOCIATION MEMBERSHIP FOR THE
REMAINDER OF THE 2009 TERM

MEETING DATE: April 20, 2009

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that, in accordance with the requirements of the CNEA Act, a Toronto Parking Authority member of the Board be re-appointed to act as representative to the Canadian National Exhibition Association Membership for the remainder of the 2009 term. This position was recently held by former Board member, John Maletich.

In accordance with the CNEA Act, membership of the Association must include representation from the municipality under the "Municipal Section" with specific reference to representation from the Toronto Parking Authority. A member of the TPA Board is nominated each year to represent the TPA for a term of one-year commencing each October. This position was recently held by former TPA Board member, John Maletich, who was appointed as representative at the September 23, 2008 Board meeting (*reference: Minute #08-133*).

The TPA is required to re-appoint a new member to this position. For reference, the CNE has provided the attached schedule of meetings for the remainder of the 2009 term.

GT:tt
Attach.

File: d:\files\Board Reports\Gthomas\Board\recc\CNEA Appointment -resubmitted in April09



BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Directors FILE NO: 7035-01
FROM: Teresa Toigo DATE: April 13, 2009
SUBJECT: PURCHASE AND INSTALLATION OF NEW HIGH DENSITY MOBILE FILING
SYSTEM FOR TORONTO PARKING AUTHORITY OFFICES:
2ND FLOOR – CENTRAL FILE ROOM

MEETING DATE: Monday, April 20, 2009

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Board of Directors approve the expenditure of \$16,273.22 plus GST and PST for the purchase and installation of a new high density mobile filing system from TAB Products of Canada Co. (TAB) to expand the Toronto Parking Authority's current Central File system for future needs.

BACKGROUND:

The file system currently housing Toronto Parking Authority administrative files is a TAB-TRAC high density mobile filing unit (refer to Attachment 1). This file unit has both doubled our storage capacity over the years and provided maximum use of our existing floor space, thus minimizing the need for off-site storage. The original filing system purchased in 1998 from TAB Products of Canada (TAB) has functioned well over the past ten or more years, but has now reached its capacity.

In examining the feasibility of this purchase, the following parameters were considered (refer to Attachments 2 and 3):

- 1) The location of the file room is immediately adjacent to the photocopy room and was originally constructed on the second floor so that files could be readily accessible to the departments that require their use;
- 2) The current configuration of the existing file system does not lend itself to be expanded within the file room space;
- 3) The option of expanding the file room is not feasible as it will impact the adjacent office spaces;
- 4) The only remaining available space to allow for expansion is the adjacent photocopy room; and,
- 5) The copy/file rooms can be retrofitted to accommodate both uses in one space.

Suppliers of mobile filing systems were invited to measure the space and provide quotations and options for re-configuring an additional mobile system. The proposals received only identified free-standing units as an option as their systems are not compatible and cannot connect to the existing unit. With this option, a centre isle for accessibility between the systems would be required and in doing so, reduce the amount of useable space left for the copy room area. TAB's proposal, however, provided an option to attach a new system to the existing unit thereby eliminating the need for a centre isle and reducing the impact to the copy room area. Both existing and proposed add-on file carriages and track and rail systems are compatible.

TAB'S PROPOSAL:

Summary of TAB's proposal:

- Installation will double the capacity of the existing file system to 6,664 Linear File Inch (LFI) from the current 3,332 LFI.
- Current and new file units will be attached and include the following:
 - Mobile System:
 - 4 x High profile add on carriages
 - Laser leveled tracks, fully grouted and anchored to the floor
 - Steel end panels on all carriages
 - Full height back panels on all static units
 - Ergonomic three spoke handles for mechanical assist carriages with integrated lock for end carriage
 - Four Post Shelving:
 - 6 x 30"D x 36"W TMS double faced shelving units
 - 2 x 15"D x 36"W TMS static shelving units
 - All units 7 high letter legal
 - All units include 11 x 8 file dividers
 - Shelf supports and reinforcements
- Warranty for add on system: 10 years - material defects and two years - workmanship
- Warranty for workmanship will be extended to include the entire system.
- Proposal cost of \$16,273.22 to include mobile/shelving, dismantle of existing file unit, file move, installation and freight (GST and PST excluded)

CONCLUSION:

The Toronto Parking Authority has utilized TAB for its current file system and has been satisfied with their product performance and services provided to date. For this reason, the considerations noted above and product compatibility between the existing and proposed mobile systems, TAB Products of Canada is the recommended supplier.

:tt

Attach.

ATTACHMENT 1

TAB-TRAC High Density Mobile Filing System





BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Gwyn Thomas
FROM: Sam Roussos
SUBJECT: PURCHASE OF REPLACEMENT VEHICLES
OPERATIONS DEPARTMENT

FILE NO:
DATE: April 07, 2009

MEETING DATE: April 20, 2009

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that:

1. The Board approve the expenditure of \$71,696.68 (taxes included) plus \$4,000 contingency to provide for the purchase of four (4) 2009 Chevrolet Uplanders from the dealership Humberview Pontiac Buick GMC, 1650 The Queensway, Toronto; and
2. The Board further authorizes the decommissioning of Vehicle No. B-03 – 1996 Ford Aerostar Van, Vehicle No. B-06 – 1997 Ford Aerostar Van, Vehicle No. B-15 – 2002 GMC Sonoma Pick-Up Truck and Vehicle No. B-16 – 2002 GMC Sonoma Pick-Up Truck. These vehicles are to be sold at City auction on a later date this year.

BACKGROUND

All vehicles are used in the On-Street program. These vehicles have 132,151 kilometers (April 03, 2009), 147,167 kilometers (April 01, 2009), 135,000 (April 09, 2009) and 121,000 (April 09, 2009) recorded on them respectively, they are in poor condition and the maintenance costs are escalating annually. The following summarizes the quotations received for these vehicles.

SUMMARY OF QUOTATIONS

Dealership	No. Of Units	Unit Cost	Sub-Total	P.S.T.	G.S.T	Licence Fee	Total	Discounts/ Incentives
Humberview	4	\$15,809	\$62,236	\$5,058.88	\$3,161.80	\$240	\$71,696.68	\$1,800 (\$450 Commercial upfit cash back/per vehicle)
Old Mill	4	\$15,648.76	\$62,595.04	\$5,007.60	\$3,129.75	\$240	\$70,972.39	N/A
Addison	4	\$16,948	\$67,792	\$5,423.36	\$3,389.60	\$240	\$76,844.96	N/A

Although Old Mill's quotation of \$70,732.39 is the lowest quotation, Humberview has offered an incentive of \$450.00 Commercial Upfit cash back /per vehicle to be used as these vehicles will be required to be retrofitted from current passenger vehicles to commercial vehicles.

BUDGET INFORMATION

\$88,000 has been allocated for this project in the 2009 Equipment Budget.

Sam Roussos



BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Directors FILE NO:
FROM: Gwyn Thomas DATE: April 16, 2009
SUBJECT: 2009 CONFERENCE BUDGET FOR BOARD DIRECTORS

MEETING DATE: April 20, 2009

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the 2009 Conference Budget for Board Directors be received for information only.

At its meeting held on November 25, 2008 the Board approved the Toronto Parking Authority 2009 Operating Budget and, in so doing, approved the 2009 Conference Budget. The list of conferences was placed on the January 26, 2009 Board agenda as an information item to make the Board aware of the conferences/dates and to provide the opportunity for members to determine which events they wish to attend (*refer to January 13, 2009 memorandum attached*). The Board, in receipt of the 2009 Conference Budget, had deferred the list of upcoming 2009 conferences for attendance to the new Toronto Parking Authority Board for it's consideration given that the newest Council citizen appointees would commence their term of office on April 1, 2009 and that the majority of conferences listed in the 2009 Conference Budget would be taking place between May and September 2009 (*reference: Minute #09-008*).

GT:tt
Attach.

File: d:\files\Board Reports\Gthomas\Board\recc\2009Conference Budget -resubmitted in April09