

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE - APRIL 20, 2010

AWARD OF PROPOSAL – RFP10-046 SELECTION OF CONSULTANT CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR BOWSTRING ARCH BRIDGES ON HUMBER BRIDGE TRAIL AND MCEWEN BRIDGE ON KIRBY ROAD WARD 1

Recommendation

The Commissioner of Engineering and Public Works in consultation with the Director of Reserves and Investments and the Director of Purchasing Services recommends:

1. That the engineering consulting firm of Aecom Canada Ltd. be retained to provide engineering services for the Class Environmental Assessment for the bowstring arch bridges on Humber Bridge Trail and the McEwen bridge on Kirby Road at an estimated cost of \$96,726.00, excluding G.S.T.;
2. That a contingency allowance in the amount of \$10,000.00, excluding G.S.T. be approved within which the Commissioner of Engineering and Public Works or his designate is authorized to approve amendments to the Contract;
3. That the budget of Capital Project EN-1719-08 be increased by \$68,800.00 and funded from Roads Infrastructure Reserve;
4. That inclusion of the matter on a Public Committee or Council Agenda for additional funding request for Class Environmental Assessment for Bowstring Arch Bridges on Humber Bridge Trail and McEwen Bridge on Kirby Road is deemed sufficient notice pursuant to Section 2(1)(c) of By-Law 394-2002; and
5. That the Mayor and Clerk be authorized to sign an Engineering Agreement with Aecom Canada Ltd.

Contribution to Sustainability

The Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) to be conducted on the two bridges will consider the environmental implications of all the possible alternatives. The environmental considerations of the EA process will play a significant role in determining the long term solution the City will implement.

Economic Impact

The total cost for the Class EA is approximately \$110,000.00. The 2008 Capital Budget (Project No. EN-1719-08) for the Class Environmental Assessment for Bowstring Arch Bridges on Humber Bridge Trail and McEwen Bridge on Kirby Road includes \$41,200.00 funded from Roads Infrastructure Reserve.

The additional cost for this project in the estimated amount of \$68,800.00 is also to be funded from Roads Infrastructure Reserve.

Communications Plan

Once this consultant assignment is awarded, the consultant will coordinate with staff and determine the exact level of public participation required by the Environmental Assessment Act. It is anticipated that both bridges included in the project will require a "Schedule B" Class EA, which will require the City to notify all stakeholders of the study's commencement by direct mailing. Newspaper ads and notices on City Page Online will also be created to inform the public of the study's commencement. Interested stakeholders and the general public will have the opportunity to provide input during a Public Information Centre (PIC) or by directly contacting the City or its Consulting Engineer. As required by the Class EA Act, the public will have 30 days to review the completed Environmental Screening Document (ESD) before the report is filed.

Purpose

The basic purpose of a Class EA is to inform the public of the intended action the proponent wishes to undertake, and provide an opportunity for public input. Nearly all road and bridge rehabilitation capital projects are pre-approved, and categorized as "Schedule A or A+" by the EA Act. Pre-approved Class EAs only require public notification of the proponent's intentions, and allowance for public input, such as the notices and Public Information Centres that the Engineering Services Department conducts routinely.

In the case of the two bowstring arch bridges, the Class EA procedure requires that a "Schedule B" Class EA be conducted, since the age of the bridges exceeds 40 years. A "Schedule B" Class EA requires more research into the relevant stakeholders, and a complete review of all possible options to the proponent's preferred alternative. For the purpose of this study, several alternatives were suggested, and the EA process will determine the environmental, cultural, and economic impacts of each alternative. Following the analysis of all the alternatives, the City will have the information needed to make a well-informed decision on the long-term solutions for the two bridges.

Background - Analysis and Options

The bridge on Humber Bridge Trail was constructed in 1914. It is currently in service with a 5-ton load limit, and is used by a single homeowner who uses it to access the property. The Class EA study will investigate the possibility of rehabilitating the bridge, as well as the options of replacing the bridge, or purchasing the property on the east bank of the Humber River, thus eliminating the need to keep the bridge in service.

The McEwen Bridge on Kirby Road was constructed in 1923. It is not currently in service for vehicular use, but is used for recreational purposes, as part of the Humber Valley Heritage Trail. The Class EA study will investigate the possibility of rehabilitating the bridge to allow it to continue in its current recreational-use role. The option of rehabilitating or reconstructing the bridge to allow full traffic loading may not be a preferred option, due to the fact that the bridge is only one lane in width. Should this section of Kirby Road be required as traffic link in the future, an entirely new bridge would be required, whether in the same location, or nearby. The Class EA process will fully evaluate all of the possible alternatives.

Although the bridges are not currently designated as Heritage Sites under the Ontario Heritage Act, they are listed on the Vaughan Heritage Inventory (VHI) as structures with potential cultural heritage value.

In January 2010, the Purchasing Services Department issued Request for Proposal RFP10-046 to retain a consulting firm to provide professional engineering services for the Class EA on the two bridges. In accordance with the City's Purchasing Policy for projects of this value, four consultants were invited to submit proposals. The invited consultants were selected for their

familiarity with the Class EA process on bridges, and for their experience with bridges of this uncommon type and age.

In response to the invitations, three proposal submissions were received on February 16, 2010 from Aecom Canada Ltd., R.V. Anderson Associates Limited, and Planmac Limited for engineering services in connection with this project. The professional engineering fees include conducting a "Schedule B" Class EA on the two bridges.

At the time the original budget for the Class EA study was requested, it was assumed that the two bridges could fall under one Class EA project. Upon review of the proposals received by the City, it was apparent that although the issues concerning the two bridges were similar, the project must be conducted as two separate Class EAs, since they are a considerable distance from one another. This is the primary reason for the budget overage. Nevertheless, conducting Class EAs on the two bridges concurrently will allow the City to improve efficiency significantly, rather than awarding two separate Class EA projects to different consultants at different times. For example, stakeholders such as the Toronto Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) will have similar interests for both bridges. A single EA process will allow their comments for the two bridges to be received once, then address them concurrently. Most importantly, a single consultant's work plan for the two EAs can follow the same template and background information, avoiding the redundancy that would occur if two separate consultants were assigned a single Class EA project.

The evaluation committee reviewed and evaluated the proposals submitted based on the following:

- Project Understanding and Approach – 20%
- Work Plan and Project Management – 25%
- Firm Qualifications and Staff experience – 35%
- Engineering Fees – 20%

Aecom Canada Ltd. scored the highest number of points during evaluation. Based on staff's evaluation of the proposals, it is recommended that the proposal from Aecom Canada Ltd. be accepted for the completion of the Class EA and that an Engineering Agreement be executed.

The total estimated cost for the project which completion of the "Schedule B" Class EA and all applicable taxes (G.S.T. is 100% recoverable) is \$110,000.00 and is calculated as follows:

Aecom Canada Ltd. (excluding G.S.T.)	\$ 96,726.00
Contingency Allowance (10%)	<u>\$ 10,000.00</u>
Sub-Total	\$106,726.00
G.S.T. (5% amount is 100% recoverable)	\$ 5,336.30
Treasury Administration (3%)	<u>\$ 3,201.78</u>
Total	\$115,264.08
Less G.S.T. Recoverable	<u>\$(5,336.30)</u>
Total Cost	\$109,927.78
	ROUNDED \$110,000.00
Approved Budget	<u>(\$ 41,200.00)</u>
Additional Funds Required	\$ 68,800.00

Relationship to Vaughan Vision 2020/Strategic Plan

In consideration of the strategic priorities related to Vaughan Vision 2020, the recommendations of this report will assist in:

- Pursue Excellence in Service Delivery;
- Enhance and Ensure Community Safety, Health & Wellness;
- Lead and Promote Environmental Sustainability; and
- Preserve our Heritage and Support Diversity, Arts & Culture

This report is consistent with the priorities previously set by Council.

Regional Implications

Not applicable.

Conclusion

Staff have reviewed the proposal from Aecom Canada Ltd., and have determined that the costs are reasonable, and the specified scope of work is necessary to comply with the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. Therefore, staff recommend that this contract be awarded to Aecom Canada Ltd., in the amount of \$96,726.00, plus G.S.T.

Should Council concur with the additional funding request, this action would be considered as an amendment to the Capital Budget. Pursuant to the Municipal Act, before amending a budget, a municipality shall give notice of its intention to amend the budget at a Council meeting. Where a capital project has been subject to a public meeting during the adoption of the approved capital budget and where additional funding is required to complete the approved works, inclusion of the matter in a staff report requesting additional funding on a Public Committee or Council Agenda is deemed sufficient notice pursuant to Section 2(1)(c) of By-Law 394-2002.

Attachments

1. Location Map

Report prepared by:

Colin Cassar, C.E.T., Senior Engineering Assistant, ext. 3111
Tom Ungar, P. Eng., CHRP, Design Engineer, ext. 3110

Respectfully submitted,

Bill Robinson, P. Eng.
Commissioner of Engineering and Public Works

Jack Graziosi, P. Eng., M. Eng.
Director of Engineering Services

CC:mc

LOCATION MAP

