 Committee Report

# Addendum to Report TR-CW-09-17

**To**: Warden Barfoot and Members of Grey County Council

**From**: Pat Hoy, Director of Transportation Services

**Meeting Date:** July 13, 2017

**Subject: Request for Proposal for a Quarry Study**

**Status**: Recommendation adopted by Committee as presented per Resolution CW138-17; Endorsed by County Council July 27, 2017 per Resolution CC41-17;

## Recommendation

1. **That Addendum to Report TR-CW-09-17 be received and that staff release RFP-TS-16-17 Request for Proposal for the Provision of Consultant Services Relating to a Viability Study of the Grey County Quarry**.

## Background

This report is an addendum to Report TR-CW-09-17 and provides the proposed Terms of Reference and selection criteria portion of the County Quarry RFP for Council review and approval prior to its release.

Transportation Services has drafted the scope of work to build upon the 2016 Golder Associates analysis of the quarry material. The only additional site work to be undertaken will be testing the depth of the overburden to ensure that the average assumed 2m depth is accurate. This will be done by Grey County staff.

Since the quarry material has been tested, the focus of this project will be the determination of cost/benefit of the various options.

The following sections of RFP-TS-16-17 Request for Proposal for the Provision of Consultant Services Relating to a Viability Study of the Grey County Quarry are attached:

* Section 3 - Terms of Reference
* Section 4 - Respondent Selection Procedure

## Financial/Staffing/Legal/Information Technology Considerations

As per resolution CW-41-17, Grey County will utilize an additional $30,000 from the Transportation General Reserve to establish a budget of $60,000 for the Quarry study.

## Link to Strategic Goals/Priorities

The Values Statement of the approved Corporate Strategic Plan includes Fiscal Responsibility.

## Attachments

[TR-CW-09-17 Request for Proposal for a Quarry Study](https://docs.grey.ca/share/s/WEd0Fdz_QkCMermh7XC2hA)

Section 3 and Section 4 of RFP-TS-16-17 Request for Proposal for the Provision of Consultant Services Relating to a Viability Study of the Grey County Quarry

Respectfully submitted by,

Patrick Hoy
Director of Transportation Services

### Section 3 – *Terms of Reference*

1. **Background**

In 1995 Grey County purchased a 100 acre property (Part Lot 28, concession 7 Former Township of Euphrasia - [Link to Location Map](https://docs.grey.ca/share/s/y6MRcE56R1ugKf51w40XhA)). The property was converted into a quarry.

Approximately 50 of the acres of this property were licensed for quarry usage. A portion of the land could not be utilized for quarry purposes because of ground water concerns. The license only permits extraction above the water table. The licensed portion of the property contained approximately 2,650,000 tonnes of material that could be excavated. Approximately 1,200,000 tonnes has been extracted with approximately 1,450,000 tonnes remaining.

Although the quarry has been somewhat inactive for the past five years, previously, Grey County operated the quarry and manufactured approximately 80,000 tonnes annually for its own use. All the work with the exception of the crushing was completed by Grey County Staff.

1. **Scope of Work**

The County of Grey is seeking the services of a consultant to complete a study of its quarry and has budgeted $60,000 for completion of the project.

The study shall determine the future of the quarry in order to maximize its asset return. The proponent will investigate a variety of options and will include:

* a cost/benefit analysis of each option (such as approval abilities and costs, future market trends, future availability of aggregate)
* a review of the indirect impacts of each option (such as environmental, residential, employment)

Each option will be assessed and a recommendation will be presented suggesting a preferred option.

The options will include but are not limited to the following:

1. Status quo, Grey County staff operate the Quarry;
2. Grey County maintains ownership and outsource some or all of the operation;
3. Grey County expand the operation by acquiring land and/or excavating below the water table to maximize material output and/or sale value;
4. Grey County lease the quarry, and receive royalty payments;
5. Grey County sell the quarry.

Background information and data available will be supplied to the successful proponent. Golder Associates has previously completed a review of the quality of aggregate in the Quarry.

[Link to Aggregate Resources Study](https://docs.grey.ca/share/s/npbmFY5iTxmwhdLIOQ2Rdg)

Grey County staff will be digging some test pits to confirm overburden depths in the summer of 2017.

1. **Deliverables**
2. Start-up conference call.
3. Draft of options presented to Transportation staff working group for accuracy review and discussion with potential for changes, prior to approval of final report.
4. Options for consideration inclusive of a cost benefit analysis, indirect impacts and preliminary business plan for the preferred option.
5. Presentation to Committee/Council of recommendation(s) within final report.
6. **Disclaimer**

The successful respondent or its subconsultants/partners shall not have any pecuniary interest in the Grey County Quarry or shall not be involved financially or otherwise in the future use of the Grey County Quarry in any capacity.

1. **Timelines**

A draft of the final report shall be completed for review by December 1, 2017.

A bi-weekly summary shall be emailed to the Project Lead identifying:

* Project progress to date
* Current amount of progress on the proposal schedule
* Outstanding issues
* Any input required from the County that may affect the timely completion of the project

### Section 4 – Respondent Selection Procedure

1. **Schedule**

The following schedule is proposed for the selection of the successful Respondent for this assignment.

| **Milestone** | **Completion Date** |
| --- | --- |
| Request for Proposal Issued. | July 27, 2017 |
| Request for Proposal Closed. | August 24, 2017 |
| Selection of Successful Respondent | Within 60 days of proposal submission. |

Note: although every attempt will be made to meet all dates, the Corporation reserves the right to modify any or all dates at its sole discretion.

1. **Selection Process**

Proposals will be assessed on the basis of information provided by the Respondent at the time of submission. The evaluation of Proposals will be conducted by an evaluation team comprised of staff members from the Corporation.

Each Proposal shall demonstrate a thorough understanding of the Scope of Work and be organized so as to follow all of the Evaluation Criteria within section 4.2.

1. **Evaluation Criteria**

Proposals will be assessed against the following criteria. The Corporation reserves the right to shortlist firms for further evaluation and interviews which may alter the final scoring results. Proposals will be scored based on meeting or exceeding the expectations of the established evaluation criteria.

|  | **Evaluation Criteria** | **Weight Factor** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **Qualifications and Experience**Experience and credentials of firm.Experience and qualifications of personnel assigned to the project, including experience relating to quarry operations and the ability to complete a cost benefit analysis relating to each option available.References indicating the competence and track record of the Respondent in the marketplace with regard to the specific services required by the County. | 35 |
| 2 | **Methodology** Project schedule/work plan.Description of consulting services.Description of detailed work plan for assessing the current operations.How the options will be developed and analysed.How the cost analysis will be undertaken.How the most appropriate alternative will be selected. | 35 |
| 3 | **Price**Overall submitted price for consulting services – approach to cost.*Included but not evaluated shall be per diems and hourly rates for additional review services, should they be required* | 30 |
|  | Total | 100 |

The Corporation reserves the right to reject any or all proposals. The Corporation also reserves the right to not proceed with the project without stating reason thereof.

Selection of a proposal(s) will be based on all the above criteria and any other relevant information provided by the Respondent(s).

All proposals are to be submitted with the understanding that the selection of a proposal for discussion by the Evaluation Committee shall not thereby result in the formation of a contract. Nor shall it create any obligation on the County to enter into further discussions.

Evaluation of the project manager and project support staff will include an assessment of the firm’s overall ability to provide multi-disciplinary capabilities and resources to this project and the Project Manager’s past experience on similar projects.

The assessment of past project experience will include evaluation of the Consultant’s success with previous experience of this nature, the previous experience of proposed staff for this project and the stability and reputation of the firm.

Respondents shall include in their proposal a minimum of three (3) project references demonstrating these attributes, preferably in projects of a similar magnitude and design to that specified herein.

The project will be awarded to the respondent who, in the sole judgment of the Corporation, provides the best overall value. The Corporation will not be obligated to select the lowest cost or any proposal. The Corporation reserves the right to conduct references on the Respondents, the results of which may affect the award decision.