Award of Contracts for the Provision of Public Transportation Services for Persons with Disabilities - RFP 892-2001
File TT-1.3 (Vol. 13)

1. The Standing Policy Committee on Public Works has been advised that Handi-Transit service began in 1977. Between 1977 and 1988 all Handi-Transit service was delivered by Winnipeg Transit bus operators, utilizing Winnipeg Transit Handi-Transit vans. In 1988, Winnipeg Transit began to accommodate the increasing demand for Handi-Transit service by contracting out the increasing service requirement to private contractors.

In 1996, Council approved contracting out 100% of Handi-Transit service delivery. Contracts were awarded in 1996 for a five-year period covering approximately 85% of the work. A further Request For Proposals was issued in 1997 and a five-year contract issued for the remainder of the work.

In 2001, an RFP was issued to replace the contracts expiring on June 30, 2001. Eight different contracts, covering approximately 73% of the total service requirement were awarded for a period of five years, expiring June 30, 2006.

On February 20, 2002, RFP 892-2001 was issued for the provision of public transportation services for persons with disabilities for approximately 20% of the total contracted service (the remaining 7% of the work is contained in a contract with Blue Ribbon Transit). The RFP closed on March 13, 2002.

RFP 892-2001 allowed offerers to respond with proposals on portions or all of 2 types of work which were defined as follows:

Item 1: Hourly Service - Wheelchair Accessible Vehicles
Item 2: Hourly Service - Ambulatory Passenger Vehicles

Responsive proposals were received from the various companies, as outlined in Attachment “A”.

Winnipeg Transit is satisfied that the Offerers providing the proposals considered to be most advantageous to the City have the necessary resources to perform all the work in accordance with the requirements of the specifications based on the evaluation criteria is outlined on Attachment “B”. Offerers have satisfactorily carried out previous work of a similar nature.

Materials Management and Legal Services have advised that proposal submissions from the following offerers should be deemed to be non-responsive due to their failure to complete and sign the RFP cover page. The completion of the cover page is a mandatory requirement. It contains the formal offer to perform the work, incorporates the RFP into the proposal and makes the proposal irrevocable for a specified period of time. Those terms and conditions are fundamental to the eventual contract.

- We Care Transit
- London Limos

A summary, by section, of the evaluations on each offer received is outlined on Attachment “C”. The proposals recommended are considered to be most advantageous to the City, meeting all the requirements of the specifications.

The unit prices submitted by the successful bidders to this RFP are very advantageous to the City. They are lower than the current prices being paid under the expiring contract, lower than the prices bid last year by the successful bidders, and lower than the assumptions contained in the 2002 budget and the 2003 and 2004 administrative budget. This presents an opportunity for the Transit Department to meet expected Handi-Transit service demand that was not accommodated in the budget.

Bids are open for acceptance until June 15, 2002, however it is very important that this contract be authorized for award at the April meeting of City Council in order to provide the successful contractors with sufficient time to order and receive delivery of vehicles, and for Handi-Transit to train the contractor's drivers prior to the June 15, 2002 start up date.

Council approval is required for the award of multi-year contracts.

The Financial Impact Statement is outlined on Attachment "D".

The Standing Policy Committee on Public Works recommends:

I. That the offers received from London Limos and We Care Transit be determined as non-responsive.

II. That contracts for the provision of public transportation services for persons with disabilities as outlined in RFP 892-2001, for the period of June 15, 2002 to June 30, 2007, be awarded based on the unit prices submitted, to those Offerers providing the proposals considered to be most advantageous to the City of Winnipeg, in the following approximate amounts:

Offerer	**Item 1: Hourly Service Wheelchair Accessible Vehicles**	**Item 2: Hourly Service Ambulatory Passenger Vehicles**	**Total Contract Price**
Gull Wing Transit Services Ltd.	$831,024	$929,511	$1,760,535
Assiniboine Handy-Transit and Taxi Inc.	$374,994		$374,994
Duffy's Taxi (1996) Ltd.	$374,994		$374,994
Super Transit Ltd.		$934,836	$934,836
Mona Transit Services Ltd.	$725,892		$725,892
			$4,171,251

III. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to effect the intent of the foregoing, including the execution of any documents related thereto.

Attachment “A” referred to in Clause 1 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated April 2, 2002

Attachment “A”

Responsive proposals were received from the following companies:

Item 1
Hourly Service
Wheelchair Accessible Vehicles

- AB Transit
- Advance Transit
- Assiniboine Handy-Transit & Taxi Inc.
- Blue Ribbon
- Dependable Dispatch Service
- Duffy's Taxi
- Gull Wing Transit Services Ltd.
- Gurinder Jit Singh
- Handi-Helper Transit
- Kingsway Transit Ltd.
- Mona Transit Services Ltd.
- Safe Transit
- Super Transit Ltd.
- Unicity Taxi Ltd.

Item 2
Hourly Service
Ambulatory Passenger Vehicles

- 4522291 Manitoba Ltd.
- 4523785 Manitoba Ltd.
- AB Transit
- Advance Transit
- Agam Bhagria
- Assiniboine Handy-Transit & Taxi Inc.
- Blue Ribbon
- Dependable Dispatch Service
- Duffy's Taxi
- Gull Wing Transit Services Ltd.
- Gurinder Jit Singh
- Handi-Helper Transit
- Jasbir Chahal
- Kingsway Transit Ltd.
- Mona Transit Services Ltd.
- North Star Transportation
- Raghbir Kambo
- Safe Transit
- Seven Oaks Transit
- SP Transit
- Super Transit Ltd.
- Surinder Sidhu
- Tarsem Singh Cheema
- Towns Transit
- Unicity Taxi Ltd.

Attachment “B” referred to in Clause 1 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated April 2, 2002

Attachment “B”

Evaluation of Offers

Bids were evaluated based on the following evaluation criteria as defined in SC: 12 of the RFP:

(a) Conformance of the Offerer's Bid Submission with the requirements of the RFP ..... **pass/fail;**

(b) Qualifications of the Offerer ..... **pass/fail;**

- All responsive bid submissions conformed with the requirements of the RFP as well as met the qualifications defined in BI:9.

(c) Industry experience of key personnel **10%**

- Evaluation of industry experience of key personnel was based on the amount of experience with full points being received for the most experience, and others being pro-rated.

- All proposals contained qualified key personnel with significant industry experience.

(d) Present value of the total contract price per unit.....**70%**

- Present value of the contract price was evaluated on unit price, based on a per vehicle hour basis. Present value was determined using a discount rate of six (6) per cent per year. The lowest bid received the most points, with higher priced bids pro-rated accordingly.

- Attached as Appendix “B” is a summary of the proposal prices by section, the present value of each contract proposal, and the financial points assigned for evaluation purposes.

(e) Business Plan **5%**

- Offerers were required to submit a business plan, which would outline “start up” plans if appropriate, operational plans, etc. Business plan evaluation was based on completeness.

- All proposals contained a fully acceptable business plan.

Attachment “B” referred to in Clause 1 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated April 2, 2002

(f) References **15%**

- The Offerer was required to submit the names of three (3) industry related references. Reference checks were not restricted to only those submitted by the contractor, and included organizations representing persons with disabilities, Handi-Transit advisory committees, companies or individuals known to have done business with the Offerer.

- A standard format of questions was used in the reference check process. Areas such as driver behaviour, cleanliness of vehicles, safe operation of vehicles, demonstrated sensitivity to persons with disabilities was discussed. Organizations representing persons with disabilities, as well as Handi-Transit’s Policy Advisory Committee and Operations Advisory Committee were consulted during this process as well.

Attachment "C" referred to in Clause 1 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated April 2, 2002

Attachment "C"

The following is a summary, by section, of the evaluations on each offer received.

ITEM 1: **Hourly Rate Service** **Wheelchair Accessible Vehicles**							**EVALUATION**
Offerer	***Conformance of Bid Submission***	***Qualifications of Offerer (BI:09)***	***Present value of total Contract Price per unit***	***Industry Experience of Key Personnel***	***References***	***Business Plan***	***Total***
	pass/fail	***pass/fail***	***70%***	***10%***	***15%***	***5%***	***100%***
Gull Wing Transit Services Ltd.	**pass**	**pass**	**70**	**10**	**15**	**5**	**100**
Assiniboine Handy Transit	**pass**	**pass**	**65**	**10**	**15**	**5**	**95**
Duffy's Taxi	**pass**	**pass**	**65**	**10**	**15**	**5**	**95**
Mona Transit Services Ltd.	**pass**	**pass**	**67**	**10**	**13**	**5**	**95**
AB Transit	**pass**	**pass**	**64**	**10**	**15***	**5**	**94**
Blue Ribbon	**pass**	**pass**	**64**	**10**	**15***	**5**	**94**
Dependable Dispatch Service	**pass**	**pass**	**63**	**10**	**15***	**5**	**93**
Super Transit	**pass**	**pass**	**63**	**10**	**15***	**5**	**93**
Advance Transit	**pass**	**pass**	**62**	**10**	**15***	**5**	**92**
Kingsway Transit Ltd.	**pass**	**pass**	**64**	**8**	**15***	**5**	**92**
Unicity Taxi Ltd.	**pass**	**pass**	**62**	**10**	**15***	**5**	**92**
Safe Transit	**pass**	**pass**	**63**	**8**	**15***	**5**	**91**
Handi-Helper Transit	**pass**	**pass**	**60**	**10**	**15***	**5**	**90**
Gurinder Jit Singh	**pass**	**pass**	**60**	**8**	**15***	**5**	**88**

***Note**: References provided by the Offerer were not checked, as even a perfect rating as illustrated, would not have altered the recommendations for award of contract.

Attachment "C" referred to in Clause 1 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated April 2, 2002

ITEM 2: **Hourly Rate Service** **Ambulatory Passenger Vehicles**							**EVALUATION**
Offerer	***Conformance of Bid Submission***	***Qualifications of Offerer (BI:09)***	***Present value of total Contract Price per unit***	***Industry Experience of Key Personnel***	***References***	***Business Plan***	***Total***
	pass/fail	***pass/fail***	***70%***	***10%***	***15%***	***5%***	***100%***
Gull Wing Transit Services Ltd.	**pass**	**pass**	**69**	**10**	**15**	**5**	**99**
Super Transit	**pass**	**pass**	**69**	**10**	**15**	**5**	**99**
Mona Transit Services Ltd.	**pass**	**pass**	**70**	**10**	**13**	**5**	**98**
Jasbir Chahal	**pass**	**pass**	**70**	**8**	**15***	**5**	**98**
4522291 Manitoba Ltd.	**pass**	**pass**	**70**	**8**	**15***	**5**	**98**
Safe Transit	**pass**	**pass**	**69**	**8**	**15***	**5**	**97**
4523785 Manitoba Ltd.	**pass**	**pass**	**68**	**8**	**15***	**5**	**96**
Assiniboine Handy Transit	**pass**	**pass**	**65**	**10**	**15***	**5**	**95**
Dependable Dispatch Service	**pass**	**pass**	**64**	**10**	**15***	**5**	**94**
Agam Bhagria	**pass**	**pass**	**68**	**8**	**15***	**3**	**94**
Towns Transit	**pass**	**pass**	**64**	**8**	**15***	**5**	**92**
Tarsem Singh Cheema	**pass**	**pass**	**63**	**8**	**15***	**5**	**91**
Blue Ribbon	**pass**	**pass**	**61**	**10**	**15***	**5**	**91**
Unicity Taxi Ltd.	**pass**	**pass**	**61**	**10**	**15***	**5**	**91**
North Star Transportation	**pass**	**pass**	**62**	**10**	**15***	**5**	**92**
Raghbir Kambo	**pass**	**pass**	**62**	**10**	**15***	**5**	**92**
Surinder Sidhu	**pass**	**pass**	**62**	**10**	**15***	**5**	**92**
Advance Transit	**pass**	**pass**	**60**	**10**	**15***	**5**	**90**
Duffy's Taxi	**pass**	**pass**	**60**	**10**	**15***	**5**	**90**
AB Transit	**pass**	**pass**	**58**	**10**	**15***	**5**	**88**
Handi-Helper Transit	**pass**	**pass**	**58**	**10**	**15***	**5**	**88**
SP Transit	**pass**	**pass**	**58**	**10**	**15***	**5**	**88**
Gurinder Jit Singh	**pass**	**pass**	**57**	**10**	**15***	**5**	**87**
Kingsway Transit Ltd.	**pass**	**pass**	**57**	**10**	**15***	**5**	**87**
Seven Oaks Transit	**pass**	**pass**	**50**	**10**	**15***	**5**	**80**

***Note**: References provided by the Offerer were not checked, as even a perfect rating as illustrated, would not have altered the recommendations for award of contract.

Attachment "D" referred to in Clause 1 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated April 2, 2002

Financial Impact

Financial Impact Statement **Date:** March 21, 2002

Project Name: Award of Contracts for the Provision of Public Transportation Services for Persons with Disabilities - RFP 892-2001

First Year of Program **2002**

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Capital					
Capital Expenditures Required					
Less: Existing Budgeted Costs					
Additional Capital Budget Required	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Funding Sources:					
Debt - Internal					
Debt - External					
Grants (Enter Description Here)					
Reserves, Equity, Surplus					
Other - Enter Description Here					
Total Funding	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Total Additional Capital Budget Required	$ -				
Total Additional Debt Required	$ -				
Current Expenditures/Revenues					
Direct Costs	$ 394,288	$ 799,593	$ 821,626	$ 844,412	$ 869,711
Less: Incremental Revenue/Recovery	-	-	-	-	-
Net Cost/(Benefit)	$ 394,288	$ 799,593	$ 821,626	$ 844,412	$ 869,711
Less: Existing Budget Amounts	491,750	1,003,170	1,023,233	n/a	n/a
Net Budget Adjustment Required	$ (97,462)	$ (203,577)	$ (201,607)	n/a	n/a

Additional Comments: The hourly rates under the contracts proposed for award provide for a significant reduction from that presently paid and budgeted. This presents an opportunity to the department to meet expected handi-transit service demand. The adopted 2002 current estimates and 2003 and 2004 administrative budget do not provide sufficient funding to meet expected demand.

Manager of Finance & Administration

This Report Submitted By:
The Transit Department
Handi Transit Division
Prepared by: Nancy Dirks, Manager of Handi Transit
March 21, 2002