



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 of Toronto's transportation system.

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 PM on Tuesday, April 13, 2004.**

AGENDA

- A. Declarations of Conflict of Interest.
 - B. Confirmation of the minutes of the March 23, 2004 meeting.
 - C. Ms. Diana Brouwer and Mr. John Teti of Ernst & Young will be present at 4:10 PM to present the Audited Financial Statements for calendar year 2003 (refer to Item 1.3).
-

1.0 FINANCE

- 1.1 List of Cheques issued, for information only, and shown as Annex A. to this April 13, 2004 Agenda (vouchers 19159 - 19466).
- 1.2 Staff memorandum dated April 6, 2004 regarding an invoice received. **Details to be discussed in-camera.**
- 1.3 Staff memorandum dated April 7, 2004 recommending approval of the 2003 Audited Financial Statements.
- 1.4 Staff memorandum dated April 7, 2004 recommending that the Consulting Services Contract for the proposed Rehabilitation of Municipal Carpark No. 43-C2 at 2 Church Street, 2004-2008 Repair Program be awarded to Yolles Partnership Inc. for a total amount of \$49,000.00 plus GST.

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

3.0 **DEVELOPMENT**

3.1 Staff memorandum dated April 6, 2004 regarding a Lease Assignment and Amending Agreement. **Details to be discussed in-camera.**

5.0 **OTHER BUSINESS**

5.1 Copies of the following articles recently appearing in local newspapers:

- 1) "Your car's lot in life won't come cheap" (Toronto Sun, April 7, 2004);
- 2) "Ya gotta go with the flow – Traffic patterns have changed" (Toronto Sun, April 7, 2004);
- 3) "Park 'N' Cry Prices" (Toronto Sun, April 7, 2004);
- 4) "Mt. Pleasant and Manor Road development slides into home base" (Town Crier, April 1, 2004);
- 5) "Probe clears Police Board head" (Toronto Star, March 26, 2004);
- 6) "Why Jays don't like senior's site" (Toronto Star, March 22, 2004);
- 7) "Business paying more than share" (Toronto Star, March 19, 2004);
- 8) "City ratifies dealings for Thelma and Spadina proposal" (Town Crier, March 19, 2004); and,
- 9) "Devices identify stolen cars" (Toronto Star, March 15, 2004).



BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Maurice J. Anderson FILE NO: 5043-38
FROM: Amir Nathoo DATE: April 7, 2004
SUBJECT: **Rehabilitation of Municipal Carpark No. 43-C2 at 2 Church Street
2004 – 2008 Repair Program
Proposals for Consulting Services**

MEETING DATE: April 13, 2004

RECOMMENDATION:

To award the Consulting Services Contract for the proposed Rehabilitation of Municipal Carpark No. 43-C2 at 2 Church Street, 2004-2008 Repair Program to Yolles Partnership Inc for the amount of \$39,973.15 plus \$4,000.00 for disbursements, and an additional amount of \$5,026.85 as contingency allowance, being a sum total amount of \$49,000.00 plus G.S.T.

BACKGROUND:

1. The Toronto Parking Authority (TPA) is proposing to carry out a phased rehabilitation or restoration repair program of Municipal Carpark No. 43 at 2 Church Street over a four to five year period.
2. The Esplanade parking structure was built in two phases utilizing two different structural systems. The West end of the parking garage (C1 or Phase I) containing 1038 spaces, was opened on January 20, 1983. The East part (Phase II or C2) which was design-built by Inducon Consultants of Canada Inc., provides an additional 970 spaces and was opened on March 9, 1990.
3. The C1 parking garage was built as cast-in-place while C2 having five split level and slab on grade utilizes pre-cast concrete construction. The consultant Read Jones Christoffersen Ltd. (RJC) was retained in May 2003 to carry out a condition survey of C2 garage structure in order to identify problem areas for phased restoration work.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS:

1. TPA solicited through an RFP (see attached copy) proposals for consulting services from four (4) restoration engineering companies. Proposals received are listed below in the ascending order of the upset fee amount quoted without the G.S.T.

Table 1

Standing	Company	<i>As Submitted in Proposal</i>				Total Fee
		Phase I Preliminary	Phase II Design	Phase III Const.	Phase IV Warranty	
1	Yolles Partnership Inc.	\$ 3,348.75	\$ 4,665.45	\$ 29,059.55	\$ 2,899.40	\$ 39,973.15
2	Halsall Engineers	2,803.74	6,542.06	70,093.46	5,327.10	84,766.36
3	Remy Consulting	3,250.00	3,950.00	94,800.00	3,500.00	105,500.00
4	Read Jones Christoffersen	1,600.00	10,500.00	122,500.00	9,000.00	143,600.00
TYPICAL AVERAGE		\$ 2,750.62	\$ 6,414.38	\$ 79,113.25	\$ 5,181.63	\$ 93,459.88

2. The consultants were required to base their proposals on TPA's RFP which details the scope of service required, the duration of the service required, the terms and conditions of the agreement to be entered into, including the anticipated project construction schedule and the warranty completion date. The consultants were also required to complete and submit various fee schedules with their proposals.

3. The Category of Services Includes:

- .1 Phase I – Develop scope of work, conceptual design, preliminary cost estimate
- .2 Phase II – Detailed design and tender documents
- .3 Phase III – Contract administration
- .4 Phase IV – Warranty follow-up

4. RFP Selection Criteria:

The proposals were reviewed for submission, qualification & experience of project team, similar project experience and fee point calculation. The criteria for selection is based on the following evaluation matrix:

Table 2

Criteria	Score	Weighing Factor	Subtotal	Final Score
A SUBMISSION		30%		
Presentation				
Completeness & Compliance with RFP				
Understanding Scope of Work				
Work Plan (realistic, level of detail)				
Commitment to Project Schedule				
Schedules				
B QUALIFICATIONS & EXPERIENCE of PROJECT TEAM		20%		
Principal				
Project Manager				
Design Engineer				
Field Review Engineer				
Support Staff (measurements, etc.)				
C SIMILAR PROJECT EXPERIENCE		10%		
Project 1				
Project 2				
Project 3				
D FEE POINT CALCULATION		40%		
Proponents Total Fixed Fee				
Lowest fee receives 40 points, the remaining proposals are assigned points based on the formula: (lowest priced proposal divided by price of next proposal) X 40				
TOTALS:		100%		

5. Review of Proposals

- .1 Proposals were reviewed with the intent to select the most suitable proponent. Except as noted below, all the proposals generally met the requirements and therefore, the fee is the deciding factor. The following table shows some of the concerns with the proposals.

Table 3 – General Comments

NO.	COMPANY	CONCERNS
1	<i>Yolles</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The fee for Phase III task is low compared to other consultants. We have raised this as a concern. See correspondence. Schedule B – Payment Schedule not completed correctly
2	<i>Remy</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule B – Payment Schedule is not completed correctly
3	<i>RJC</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed PM is a 1997 graduate and fails to meet the criteria set in the RFP of 10 years of minimum experience The involvement during construction is defined in terms of time although with a note to assure to work as needed (page 6)

- .2 *Yolles Partnership Inc.* has submitted the lowest fee. The fee for Phase III task is low compared to other proponents. TPA wrote a letter to *Yolles* expressing this as a concern. *Yolles* have responded that they are comfortable with the fee as quoted.
- .3 We have attached a proposal comparison sheet or fees by task which provides the details of the amount quoted to better understand and facilitate our review of the proposals.
- .4 *Yolles* has not worked with the TPA in the recent past and it would appear they have quoted a lower fee to establish professional relationship with the TPA. TPA obviously gains by paying a discounted fee, and also, it would appear that TPA is spreading the work amongst the consultants.
- .5 Therefore, we recommend that *Yolles Partnership Inc.*'s proposal be accepted as Prime Consultant for the project.

FINANCIAL BACKGROUND:

1.	Funds available – Maintenance Budget		\$200,000.00
2.	Consulting Service		
	<i>Yolles</i> Fee Proposal	\$ 39,973.15	
	Disbursements	4,000.00	
	Contingency Allowance	<u>5,026.85</u>	
		\$ 49,000.00	<u>(49,000.00)</u>
3.	Funds Remaining for Year 1 or 2004 Construction Work		\$151,000.00

Enclosures:

1. TPA RFP
2. Four (4) Proposals from Consultants
3. Proposal Fee Comparison Sheets
4. TPA Letter to *Yolles*
5. *Tolles*' Response to TPA Letter



BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Maurice J. Anderson FILE NO:
FROM: G.C. Daigle DATE: April 7, 2004
SUBJECT: 2003 AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR APPROVAL

MEETING DATE: April 13, 2004

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Board approve the attached Toronto Parking Authority's audited financial statements for the period ended December 31, 2003 and receive for information only the attached report from Ernst & Young.

Attached are the following items for approval and or review by the Board of Directors:

1. Draft copy of the Authority's audited financial statements for the period ended December 31, 2003. This requires approval by the Board. At the foot of the balance sheet the signature of the Chair and President is required.
2. Report from Ernst & Young concerning the results of their audit.

GCD

File: gcdaijle2003FinancialStatement(rec)