



**MUNICIPALITY OF EAST FERRIS  
MUNICIPAL OFFICE PROJECT/TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2019 Meeting - 8:00 a.m. at the Corbeil Park Hall**

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS:** Mayor Pauline Rochefort  
Antoine Boucher, Municipal Engineer  
Jason Trottier, CAO/Treasurer  
Paul Gervais, Chief Building Official  
Frank Loeffen, Fire Chief  
Greg Kirton, Manager of Planning & Economic Development  
Monica Hawkins, Clerk  
Michel Champagne, Appointed Resident  
Traven Reed, Appointed Resident

**EXCUSED ABSENT:** Michel Voyer, Deputy Mayor

1. The Committee opened the meeting at 8:10 a.m.

The purpose of this meeting was to review the proposals received for RFP – Architectural Services for the New East Ferris Municipal Office, Fire Hall and Community Infrastructure as a Committee and make a recommendation to Council for which architect should be awarded the work.

The RFP submission deadline was October 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2019. After submissions were received, Committee members were provided with copies of Envelope “A” and “C” for all proponents and were required to review the information and score the proposals based on pre-determined criteria in advance of the October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2019 meeting.

Envelope “B” of each proposal (Pricing Form) was only distributed after the scoring of the proposals (Envelopes “A” & “C”).

We received six (6) proposals:

1. Bertrand Wheeler Architecture Inc.
2. J.L. Richards & Associates Limited
3. Mitchell Jensen Architects
4. Larocque Elder Architects, Architectes Inc.
5. Yallowega Belanger Salach Architecture
6. 3<sup>rd</sup> Line Studio

Round table discussion took place with every Committee member having the opportunity to discuss the proposals and advising the Committee of their evaluation outcome. Overall,

Committee members reached consensus and every member played a vital role in selecting the successful bidder.

The following is a summary of the criteria used to rate each proposal.

## Rated Criteria

### 1. Summary of Rated Criteria

The following is a summary of the rated criteria and weightings for the evaluation of proposals. If a minimum threshold is identified, proponents who do not meet the minimum threshold score will not proceed to the next stage of the evaluation process.

| CRITERIA  | Weighting % | Points (0-10) | Weighted Points |
|---|-------------|---------------|-----------------|
| <b>1. PROPOSAL (envelope - A)</b>   |             |               |                 |
| <b>Project Manager &amp; Senior Staff (15%)</b>   |             |               |                 |
| • Qualifications specific to project  | 5%          |               |                 |
| • Past experience on similar projects   | 10%         |               |                 |
| <b>Technical Support (15%)</b><br>(including sub consultants)                           |             |               |                 |
| • Qualifications specific to project  | 6%          |               |                 |
| • Past experience on similar projects   | 6%          |               |                 |
| • Availability and knowledge of Region  | 3%          |               |                 |
| <b>Experience and Past Performance Record on Regional and/or Similar Projects (20%)</b> |             |               |                 |
| • Scope, Budget (Engineering Fees / Construction Cost), & Schedule Variances            | 5%          |               |                 |
| • Responsiveness to Project Related Requests  | 5%          |               |                 |
| • Liaison with Public Stakeholders, Approval Agencies, Contractor, and Region           | 5%          |               |                 |
| • Availability of Lead Consultant   | 5%          |               |                 |
| <b>Understanding of Project (35%)</b>   |             |               |                 |
| • Approach and methodology  | 5%          |               |                 |
| • Innovation  | 5%          |               |                 |
| • Compliance with Terms of Reference  | 5%          |               |                 |
| • Concepts/Options/Alternatives considered  | 5%          |               |                 |
| • QA/QC policy  | 5%          |               |                 |
| • Schedule and Detailed Work Plan   | 10%         |               |                 |
| <b>SUBTOTAL – Technical Proposal</b>  | 85%         |               |                 |
| <b>2. FEE PROPOSAL (envelope - B)</b>   | 15%         |               |                 |

|              |      |  |  |
|--------------|------|--|--|
| <b>TOTAL</b> | 100% |  |  |
|--------------|------|--|--|

## Evaluation and Ranking Method

The ranking of proponents will be based on the total score calculated by adding the pricing points to the total points for rated criteria.

$$\text{proponent's total score} = \text{total points for rated criteria} + \text{pricing points}$$

Pricing is worth **15%** points. The proponent's price is determined by **SUB TOTAL FOR ALL PHASES**. The pricing points for each proponent will be determined based on a relative pricing formula:

$$\text{lowest price} \div \text{proponent's price} \times \text{weighting} = \text{proponent's pricing points}$$

| Scoring Category | Description  | Numeric Score |
|------------------|--|---------------|
| Fail             | Requirement is not met or is not acceptable.   | 0             |
| Poor             | Minimally addresses the component, but one or more major considerations of the component are not addressed.                        | 1 - 2         |
| Fair             | The response addresses some aspects of the component, but minor considerations may not be addressed.                               | 3 - 4         |
| Good             | The response addresses the component and provides a reasonably good quality solution.  | 5 - 6         |
| Very Good        | There is a high degree of confidence in the proponent's response as a proposed solution to address the component.                  | 7 - 8         |
| Exceptional      | The proposed solution goes above and beyond the requirements as well as provides a high degree of confidence in its effectiveness. | 9 - 10        |

Once the proposals were rated on the information provided in Envelope "A", the Committee members were provided with information contained in Envelope "B" – Pricing Form. The scoring for the pricing was determined based on the pre-determined formula and added to the scoring results for Proposal A to determine the final result.

The Committee approved of three recommendations to go to the Council Meeting of October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2019:

1. Resolution to retain the services of Bertrand Wheeler Architecture Inc.;
2. Resolution to hire the services of Englobe for the Geotechnical Engineer;
3. Resolution to give the Technical Advisory Committee the approval to hire a Project Manager.

Meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m.