

If this information is required in an alternate accessible format, please contact the Accessibility Coordinator at 905-623-3379 ext. 2131.

---

|                         |  |                           |            |
|-------------------------|--|---------------------------|------------|
| <b>Report To:</b>       | <b>General Government Committee</b>  |                           |            |
| <b>Date of Meeting:</b> | June 2, 2025   | <b>Report Number:</b>     | FSD-021-25 |
| <b>Authored By:</b>     | Mandy Chong, Manager, Procurement  |                           |            |
| <b>Submitted By:</b>    | Trevor Pinn, Deputy CAO/Treasurer, Finance and Technology  |                           |            |
| <b>Reviewed By:</b>     | Mary-Anne Dempster, CAO  |                           |            |
| <b>By-law Number:</b>   |  | <b>Resolution Number:</b> |            |
| <b>File Number:</b>     | <b>RFP2025-8</b>   |                           |            |
| <b>Report Subject:</b>  | RFP2025-8 – Contract Administration and Inspection Services for George Street West and George Street East Reconstruction |                           |            |

---

### Recommendations:

1. That Report FSD-021-25, and any related delegations or communication items, be received;
2. That the proposal received from CIMA Canada Inc., being the highest scoring proponent meeting all terms, conditions and specifications of RFP2025-8 be awarded the contract for the provision of Engineering Services George Street West and George Street East Reconstruction;
3. That the funds required to complete this project be funded from the approved budget; and
4. That all interested parties listed in Report FSD-021-25, be advised of Council's decision.

## **Report Overview**

To request authorization to award RFP2025-8 – Contract Administration and Inspection Services for George Street West and George Street East Reconstruction.

### **1. Background**

- 1.1 The Municipality of Clarington requires the assistance of a qualified engineering consulting firm with the skills, resources, and experience necessary to provide construction inspection and contract administration services on behalf of the Municipality for the reconstruction of George Street West and East in Newcastle.
- 1.2 A Request for Proposal (RFP) was drafted to allow the Municipality to select a qualified Consultant to assist with the reconstruction of George Street West and George Street East, Newcastle.
- 1.3 RFP2025-8 was issued by the Procurement Services Division and advertised electronically on the Municipality's website. The RFP was structured on a two-envelope system with price being an evaluated factor.

### **2. Analysis**

- 2.1 The RFP closed April 29, 2025.
- 2.2 Twenty-two companies downloaded the request for proposal, and fourteen proposals were received (refer to Attachment 1) by the stipulated closing date and time. One proposal was deemed non-compliant. Thirteen proposals received were determined to have met the mandatory items as contained within the RFP. The thirteen compliant proposals were distributed to the evaluation committee for review, evaluation, and scoring.
- 2.3 The technical proposals were evaluated and scored independently by the members of the evaluation committee in accordance with the established criteria as outlined in the RFP. The evaluation committee was comprised of staff from the Planning and Infrastructure Services Department.
- 2.4 The RFP stipulated, among other things, that the proponents were to provide a description of the Firm/Consulting team, key qualifications, firm profile, highlights of past service and experience of team members with projects of similar size, nature and complexity, and demonstrate their understanding of the Municipality's requirements.

- 2.5 The evaluation committee met to review and agree upon the overall scores for each proposal. Some of the areas on which the proposals were evaluated were as follows:
- The Proponent's understanding of the Municipality's requirements.
  - Experience and qualifications of both the firm as well as the proposed team who would be working on the project.
  - That the proposed team had the expertise in the fields required such as Civil Engineering, Construction Inspection and Construction Management.
  - The qualifications and experience record of the Contract Administrator and Site Inspector to be utilized on the project.
  - The Proponents methodology and understanding of the requirements for the project.
  - A proposed work plan indicating the project method, schedule, Time-Task Matrix showing an estimated overall timeline of the project.
  - Measures, processes and procedures used by the Proponent to ensure that high quality services are being provided to the Municipality.
- 2.6 Upon completion of the evaluation, two proposals met the established passing threshold of 80 percent for Phase 2 - Technical Submission and moved to Phase 3 - Pricing. The evaluation committee determined that the optional presentation from the short-listed proponents would not be required.
- 2.7 The pricing envelopes for the short-listed proponents were opened and evaluated as stipulated in the RFP document.
- 2.8 Upon completion of the evaluation scoring, the recommendation is to award the contract for this work to the highest scoring proponent, CIMA Canada Inc.
- 2.9 CIMA Canada Inc. has completed work for the Municipality in the past and reference checks were completed and came back satisfactory.

### **3. Financial Considerations**

- 3.1 The funding required for this contract award is \$115,864.89 (Net HST Rebate). The project will be funded from the following accounts, which are in the approved 2025 budget:

| Description                       | Account Number        | Amount   |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------|
| George Street West Reconstruction | 110-50-330-83456-7401 | \$51,981 |

| Description  | Account Number        | Amount |
|--|-----------------------|--------|
| George Street East Reconstruction                                | 110-50-330-83473-7401 | 24,419 |
| George Street West Reconstruction<br>- Region of Durham Recovery | 110-50-330-83456-7402 | 21,122 |
| George Street East Reconstruction<br>- Region of Durham Recovery | 110-50-330-83473-7402 | 18,343 |

#### **4. Strategic Plan**

C.1.4: Proactively address traffic management, walkability, livability, and connectivity.

#### **5. Climate Change**

Not Applicable.

#### **6. Concurrence**

This report has been reviewed by the Deputy CAO, Planning and Infrastructure Services who concurs with the recommendations.

#### **7. Conclusion**

It is respectfully recommended that CIMA Canada Inc., being the highest scoring proponent meeting all terms, conditions and specifications of RFP2025-8 be awarded the contract for the provision of Engineering Services for the George Street West and George Street East Reconstruction.

---

Staff Contact: Mandy Chong, Manager, Procurement, 905-623-3379 Ext 2209 or mchong@clarington.net.

Attachments:

Attachment 1 – Summary of Proposal Received

Interested Parties:

List of Interested Parties available from Department.

Attachment 1 to Report FSD-021-25– Summary of Proposal Received

## Municipality of Clarington

### RFP2025-8– Contract Administration and Construction Inspection Services for George Street West and East Reconstruction

#### Summary of Proposals Received

| Bidder                                |
|---------------------------------------|
| Ainley Graham & Associates Ltd.       |
| Chisholm Fleming & Associates         |
| <b>CIMA Canada Inc.</b>               |
| ConceptDash Inc                       |
| D.G. Biddle & Associates Ltd.         |
| <b>D. M. Wills Associates Limited</b> |
| Egis                                  |
| EXP Services Inc.                     |
| Four Corners Engineering Inc.         |
| HiBridge Engineering Inc. *           |
| KiHL Construction Management          |
| LBMS Group Inc                        |
| Noveen Engineering Inc.               |
| Underground Consulting Incorporated   |

Note: Bidders **bolded** were shortlisted.

Bidders marked with “\*” were non-compliant