March 17, 2022 VIA EMAIL

City of Port Colborne 1 Killaly Street West, Port Colborne, ON L3K 6H1

Attention: Gary Long, Manager of Strategic Initiatives, City of Port Colborne

Subject: Waterfront Centre Design Services Award Recommendation

Reference: RFP 2021-44 Architectural and Engineering Design Services for the City of Port Colborne Waterfront

Centre

Dear Sir:

The Request for Proposal "RFP 2021-44 Architectural and Engineering Design Services for the City of Port Colborne Waterfront Centre" was issued on Biddingo.com by the City of Port Colborne (City) on December 22, 2021, and closed February 4, 2022. The City received ten (10) proposals by the Tender closing date.

All proposals were reviewed and scored by a number of reviews from the City and a CIMA+ reviewer. Our Senior Project Manager and Subject Matter Expert, Hasan Alfarra, reviewed and scored each proposal according to the evaluation form developed by the City.

The City shortlisted two proponents JP Thomson Architects Ltd. and as the top ranked proponents after the initial review. CIMA+ further analysed financial proposals from both shortlisted proponents at the request of the City. Financials were compared to the scope outlined in the Request for Proposal for completeness and alignment with industry best practice. From this assessment CIMA+ recommends the City award the work to JP Thomson Architects Ltd. based on the following.

- 1. The scope of work outlined by both proponents in their respective technical packages are similar and reflect the request for proposal scope of work. On review it is not clear and apparent that JP Thomson Architects Ltd. overlooked scope, however, the pricing submitted by submitted by is 31% higher than JP Thomson Architects Ltd. (a difference of submitted by Information in the proposals is not sufficient to conclude that each proponent fully understands the scope of work. If required, conducting interviews can provide further certainty.
- 2. Both proponents developed a team with expertise in the different disciplines required to complete the project. Each proponent outlined subconsultants and cost consultants in their technical proposal.
- 3. We believe pricing of both proponents fall within the industry best practice pricing range for this work, however is very close to the upper threshold. Considering the anticipated capital costs of the work (CAPEX) is \$3,000,000, from industry best practice consultant fees for this type of a building are typically between 6-10% of CAPEX depending on the design scope and location of the building.
- 4. From industry best practices fee split between the scope of work outlined in Stage 1 and Stage 2 is typically around 20% to 80% respectively. The analysis in Appendix A shows that both proponents are within that range. This suggests that neither proponent front loaded their financial proposal.

5. From the analysis of the proponent's average hourly rates in Appendix A, JP Thomson Architects Ltd.'s rate is per hour lower than for the Stage 1 work (roughly 10%) and per hour lower for Stage 2 work (roughly 70%). The lower average hourly rates and larger number of hours required during Stage 2 suggest JP Thomson Architects Ltd. intend to utilize more junior staff during Stage 2. Lower rates can also be a product of the firm's location, as they are situated in Windsor, hourly rates are likely lower than the hourly rates in where is located.

In addition to the scope of work of the successful proponent the Waterfront Center business case should consider Contract Administration services and Technical Consultant Services during construction.

From our assessment we believe both proponents shortlisted by the City are capable of successfully delivering the Waterfront Center project. Based on the information both proponents provided in their submissions we can not find a sufficient reason to justify the pricing difference of about and therefore recommend the City award the work to JP Thomson Architects Ltd.

Sincerely,

CIMA Canada Inc.