

# MTO/ACEC-ON ENGINEERING SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

**Date:** May 8, 2024

**Time:** 10:00am to 2:00pm

**Location:** Hybrid - MTO's Centre for Excellence in Transportation (CETI) 'Innovation' Boardroom, 95 Arrow Road, North York, ON & MS Teams

ATTENDEE	ORGANIZATION	ATTENDEE	ORGANIZATION
Tanya Cross	Dillon	Rebecca Li	MTO CMO
Steve Pilgrim	Egis	Rina Kulathinal	MTO Program Del
Gregg Cooke	Stantec	Norm Meyers	MTO Project Del
Michael Collins	GHD	Joanna Long	MTO Asset Mgmt
Douglas DeRabbie	ACEC-ON	Michael Pearsall	MTO Hwy Design
Sunil Kothari	AtkinsRéalis	Seyed Tabib	MTO CMO
Heather Templeton	HDR	Erika Varga	MTO CMO
Tim Sorochinsky	AECOM	Christine Costa	MTO Maj. Plan&CI
Michael Murray	CIMA	Guest: Andrea Bulanda	MTO I.R.& Env.Pol
Bernard James	Parsons	Guest: Daniel Prelipcean	MTO Hwy.Op.Mgmt
Magdy Samaan	EXP	Guest: William Lei	MTO CMO
Douglas Raby	Jacobs		
Guest: Gord Firth	WSP		

## INTRODUCTION / ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Everyone in attendance, from MTO, ACEC and member firms, introduced themselves.

NEW ITEMS		ACTION BY
<p><b>05-2024</b> <b>Item 2a</b></p>	<p><b>AGENDA ITEM – OPTIONS TO ACCELERATE MEGA ASSIGNMENT PROCUREMENT</b></p> <p><i>Description:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This item was assigned from the Executive Committee for discussion.</li> </ul> <p><i>Discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To discuss and brainstorm new ways of communicating and accelerating procurement of these projects to the industry and public.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Could issue a request for interest (RFI) for assignments with Stage 1 approval.</li> <li>○ Interview firms to perform a market sounding</li> <li>○ Issue a 'true' Expression of Interest (EOI), similar to the Construction Administration version, where the RFP can be prepared during the EOI period.</li> <li>○ Keep a short-listing phase to limit the firms submitting proposals and provide a clear short-listing process (e.g. the EOI could be focussed on key staff roles and firm capacity only)</li> <li>○ Issue an 'open call' to all qualified firms (no short-listing phase)</li> <li>○ Provide enough time, if possible given the urgency of these projects, to allow the partnering aspect of bidding firms</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Ideas generated could be used across the highway program, and include non-urgent, non-major assignments.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Action – MTO to schedule a separate joint team meeting to further workshop ideas then report back to Executive Committee in the fall meeting.</i></b></p>	<p><b>MTO</b></p>



<p><b>05-2024 Item 3b</b></p>	<p><b>AGENDA ITEM – UPDATE ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL GUIDE FOR EARTH MANAGEMENT BEST PRACTICES</b></p> <p><i>Description:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MTO to provide an update on the MTO’s Interim Environmental Guide for Earth Management Best Practices</li> </ul> <p><i>Discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Andrea Bulanda provided an update to the subcommittee.</li> <li>• Current status: MTO is working on the best practices guide now through its Earth Working Group.</li> <li>• The guide will be sent to various MTO offices for review and approval, and will be submitted for management approval.</li> <li>• MTO will advise this subcommittee prior to the guide being posted to the Technical Consultation Portal (TCP)</li> <li>• Doug D asked if ACEC could be involved in consultation earlier than TCP. Andrea will look into this.</li> <li>• The target timeline is for the Guide to be ready by early June, then a period of consultation and then finalized, hopefully by this fall.</li> <li>• MECP is planning to update the regulation on an annual basis.</li> <li>• The Guide will include the April 2023 amendment to Reg 406.</li> <li>• ACEC described a scenario with issues in estimating the quantity of excess soil during design. The bidding firm needs to know the basis for bidding the design.</li> <li>• MTO advised we have both scenarios where the contractor finds an innovative way to reuse the soil or the other side, where additional excess soil is identified. Acknowledged the need to work internally to ensure RFP language is biddable and consistent across assignments.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action - MTO to advise ACEC if the guide can be shared with ACEC before the TCP posting. MTO to provide a webinar for ACEC once the guide is published. ACEC requested MTO add this item to the subcommittee agenda as a standing item.</b></p>	<p><b>MTO &amp; ACEC</b></p>
-----------------------------------	--	----------------------------------

NEW ITEMS		ACTION BY
<p><b>05-2024 Item 3c</b></p>	<p><b>AGENDA ITEM – STANDING ITEM – DISCUSSION ON CPR PAUSE POST IMPLEMENTATION APRIL 17, 2023</b></p> <p><i>Description:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update the subcommittee on the CPR pause, and items on the CPR workplan</li> </ul> <p><i>Discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MTO is currently using the CPR as a minimum requirement to bid.</li> <li>More time is required for CPR workplan activities.</li> <li>MTO staff continue to issue appraisals. MTO has committed to the Provincial Auditor to issue appraisals.</li> <li>Internal MTO working group has been meeting once a month to make progress on the workplan. The group recently discussed how do we know when we are ready to re-introduce CPR and what are potential criteria to indicate an appropriate time to resume CPR.</li> <li>MTO is going to deliver RFP training for Project Delivery staff starting in June.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action – MTO to share regular updates from CPR internal working group</b></p>	<p><b>MTO</b></p>
<p><b>05-2024 Item 3d</b></p>	<p><b>AGENDA ITEM – GENERIC ASSIGNMENT DOCUMENT UPDATES – SPRING 2024</b></p> <p><i>Description:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To update the subcommittee on the next round of generic document updates</li> </ul> <p><i>Discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ACEC suggested MTO review RFP bid inquiries to track repetitive questions (like regarding page limits, paper size, exhibits, 2-sided pages, references to paper documents versus today’s electronic tendering and resume disclosure) so that the assignment generic language could be clarified.</li> <li>MTO acknowledged there are many new project managers who are new to preparing RFPs and need some time to socialize them the process. MTO mentioned upcoming June RFP training for project managers.</li> <li>MTO is seeking feedback from ACEC on the current Request for Proposal document that will be considered as the revised RFP language is being prepared.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action – MTO sent a PDF version of current RFP document to Doug DeRabbie for ACEC comments.</b></p>	<p><b>ACEC</b></p>

NEW ITEMS		ACTION BY
<p>05-2024 Item 3e</p>	<p><b>AGENDA ITEM – CONTRACT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (CMS) FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES</b></p> <p><i>Description:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update the committee on the CMS for Engineering, which launched on May 1, 2024</li> </ul> <p><i>Discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MTO has scheduled ESP user training for May 8 (day of this meeting) and May 15. Spaces are available for registration. The 'What's New in RAQS' website has an information posting and the link to training registration.</li> <li>Doug DeRabbie confirmed that the ACEC member firms have been informed of the upcoming CMS implementation.</li> <li>Concern from ACEC that bidding firms were advised, starting in early April, that CMS would apply to an assignment, however they were not yet familiar or trained to use CMS, and therefore felt they were not familiar enough to prepare an appropriate bid.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action – ACEC member firms encouraged to attend CMS Engineering training sessions.</b></p>	<p>ACEC</p>
<p>05-2024 Item 4a</p>	<p><b>AGENDA ITEM – PROJECT PIPELINE</b></p> <p><i>Description:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An update on the project pipeline list from Asset Management Branch</li> </ul> <p><i>Discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The MTO/ACEC executive committee agreed to include 'delivery model' in the pipeline. ACEC is concerned with accuracy and provided an example where a known delivery model, a DB, was not provided on the pipeline (at Cedar Creek).</li> <li>MTO described the steps to prepare the pipeline data, involving each regional Program Delivery office. DBs are on the list. MTO will review the Cedar Creek situation. MTO intends to provide accurate data.</li> <li>ACEC asked if more restrictions will be coming where design firms assisting with a DB will be prohibited from bidding the related DB Ready assignment? ACEC is seeking clarity to allow them to select what to participate on. ACEC seeking to know the extent of the restriction (just during procurement or during the design and construction phase). This might be opportunity for succession management and training. It is not MTO's intent to restrict bidding firms in all cases.</li> <li>ACEC asked how MTO scores and determines the winner when three assignments are bundled together into one retainer assignment. West is procuring three small value retainers however only #2 and #3 are advertised.</li> <li>ACEC suggested MTO utilize more 'Owner's Engineering' model.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action – MTO to review DB and related DBR bidding restrictions for design firms. MTO to review the concerns noted with the retainer.</b></p>	<p>MTO</p>

NEW ITEMS	ACTION BY
<p><b>05-2024 Item 4b</b> <b>AGENDA ITEM – PROPOSAL / AWARD DELAYS</b></p> <p><i>Description:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ACEC describe concerns regarding proposal and award delays that impact significantly on their work.</li> </ul> <p><i>Discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MTO’s RAQS assignment data shows the average number of days between RFP Phase II closing and award is 47 days for 2024 (data from 11 RFPs). The average number of days for RFPs awarded 2019-2023 was 43 days</li> <li>• ACEC asked MTO to provide data on how many days are between award and notifying the unsuccessful firms?</li> <li>• ACEC commented that the list of bidding firms is not always published in RAQS. If only one bidder, MTO should indicate ‘only one bidder’. ACEC is seeking bidders list for both Phase I and Phase II. MTO will review.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action – MTO will follow up on the comments noted by ACEC.</b></p>	<p><b>MTO</b></p>
<p><b>05-2024 Item 4c</b> <b>AGENDA ITEM – SUCCESSION WORKING GROUP</b></p> <p><i>Description:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An update on the progress of the succession management working group since January 2024. ACEC provided the update.</li> </ul> <p><i>Discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One RFP Phase I assignment in Eastern Region, with succession management provisions recently closed. MTO is seeking ACEC feedback.</li> <li>• Team discussed language on the role of Project Manager (PM) and Program Director (PD). PD is the mentor or coach. It is beneficial to pair junior staff with more experienced staff. One assignment with succession management provisions is advertised from Northwestern region.</li> <li>• Team discussed concerns about whether a firm wants to do succession planning or not, there must be compelling reason for not doing it.</li> <li>• Team discussed a workshop in the fall, following the TAC workshop to discuss: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How can we drive this differently/better?</li> <li>○ How to measure the outcome from these assignments?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Michael is working to prepare notes from the last two team meetings, and these notes will include problem statement, early actions, objective and ideas for the workshop.</li> <li>• Sunil and the team asked about a copy of the MTO’s Staffing Matrix. MTO will confirm if the document could be shared. ACEC had questions on how the matrix was developed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action – ACEC to draft workshop meeting notes and share with subcommittee members. MTO to confirm the sharing of the staffing matrix.</b></p>	<p><b>MTO &amp; ACEC</b></p>

<b>NEW ITEMS</b>		<b>ACTION BY</b>
<p><b>05-2024 Item 4d</b></p>	<p><b>AGENDA ITEM – ELECTRONIC NATIVE FORMATS WORKING GROUP</b></p> <p><i>Description:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An update to the subcommittee on the progress of the electronic native formats working group since the January 2024 subcommittee meeting. ACEC provided the update from the April 16 2024 working group meeting.</li> </ul> <p><i>Discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current Engineering RFP has language on OpenRoads data to be supplied which needs to be identical to the contract package.</li> <li>• MTO has an SSP which speaks to ACAD’s availability to contractor and that MTO does not warrant the accuracy.</li> <li>• Next steps: to develop problem statement.</li> <li>• Next meeting of the working group is scheduled for May 28, 2024</li> </ul> <p><b>Action – Joint working group (ACEC and MTO) to meet again on May 28</b></p>	<p><b>MTO &amp; ACEC</b></p>
<p><b>05-2024 Item 4e</b></p>	<p><b>AGENDA ITEM – RFP STANDARD LIST OF DELIVERABLES</b></p> <p><i>Description:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ACEC has questions about the RFP list of deliverables and its use for CMS.</li> </ul> <p><i>Discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ACEC asked if the RFP list of deliverables will be used as a ‘check list’ of deliverables in CMS.</li> <li>• ACEC has noticed that the MTO staff member preparing the RFP requirements may not have knowledge of what deliverables are needed. In the past, for a small job, a constructability report was required or traffic queuing analysis for a road closure was required. Sometimes deliverables for a detailed design assignment is copy/pasted for a preliminary design. Service Providers will be bidding based on the list of deliverables.</li> <li>• MTO team agreed that education and scoping meetings are needed, there are a lot of new staff. Also MTO encouraged the bidding firms to submit requests for clarification during bidding to inquire regarding the deliverables.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action - ACEC to compile examples of these and send to MTO for review and considerations.</b></p>	<p><b>ACEC</b></p>

<p>05-2024 Item 4f</p>	<p><b>AGENDA ITEM – REQUEST MTO UPDATES ON</b></p> <p>I. <i>Description:</i> Update on the subcommittee workplan items</p> <p><i>Discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Debriefing after Phase I. ACEC asked why the unsuccessful firms are not informed after the short-listing is complete. And why debriefs are not available sooner, when the evaluation is fresh in Project Manager (PM)’s memory. MTO advised that they can request a debrief after the procurement is over.</li> <li>• Late addendums. ACEC explained the impact of late addendums or late responses to bid inquiries, where sometimes bidding firms do not have adequate time to adjust their bid and meet the submission deadline. MTO staff are instructed to provide addendums and bid inquiry responses at least one week prior to closing, and to consider extensions to the bid submission due date. ACEC asked if MTO could re-open the bid inquiry period after a late addendum. MTO typically can’t do this due to project timeline. ACEC asked if MTO could provide a ‘guaranteed response date’. MTO will review.</li> <li>• Granulated Scoring breakdowns, scoring 0-4-7-10 and RFP quality concerns. ACEC asked if MTO is scoring based on RFP requirement? MTO will review..</li> <li>• Streamlined Appraisal for Engineering (functional specialties). MTO has captured the Foundation section’s appraisal approach. There are additional program areas to consult Next he is going to other Structures section, then to other specialty offices (structures, geotechnical, traffic, etc.)</li> </ul> <p><b>Action – MTO to review ACEC requests as outlined above.</b></p> <p>II. <i>Description:</i> Update from MTO on Invitation Only assignments– Next Steps</p> <p><i>Discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No update from MTO on this item</li> </ul> <p><b>Action - None</b></p> <p>III. <i>Description:</i> Pile Load Testing</p> <p><i>Discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MTO and ACEC members held two meetings with members from MTO foundations group. Some preferred options were identified and discussed, for use by MTO in the future. The group agreed on the options.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action – MTO to refer to the options listed when procuring Pile Load Testing services.</b></p> <p>IV. <i>Description:</i> Progressive Design Builds</p> <p><i>Discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progressive DB: MTO has previously noted consultation with ACEC. ACEC is seeking an update.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action – MTO to provide an update at the fall subcommittee meeting.</b></p> <p>V. <i>Description:</i> RAQS Replacement Update</p>	<p>MTO</p> <p>MTO</p> <p>MTO</p>
----------------------------	---	----------------------------------

NEW ITEMS	ACTION BY
<p><i>Discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MTO has extended the agreement with MERX to provide both RAQS ESP and RAQS construction hosting services until October 2027.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action - none</b></p> <p>VI. <i>Description:</i> MTO Position on R.V. Greater Sudbury Update</p> <p><i>Discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Instead of Greater Sudbury item, the committee discussed health and safety.</li> <li>MTO advised that owner has to demonstrate due diligence in OH&amp;S matters. MTO is reviewing their process to ensure due diligence is being met. No change as of now for process. .</li> </ul> <p><b>Action – MTO will add item will be added to the September 2024 subcommittee meeting</b></p>	<p>MTO</p>
<p><b>05-2024 Item 4f</b></p> <p>VII. <i>Description:</i> Highway Corridor Management Manual (HCMM) Chapter 3 Revisions. Daniel Prelipcean attended to provide the update.</p> <p><i>Discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MTO is in the process of updating Chapter 3 of the Highway Corridor Management Manual (encroachments and utilities) and it is almost finalized.</li> <li>CIMA+ and 4Sight Utility Engineers are also working on updating the Utility Relocation Guidelines (Appendix 3B of Chapter 3) There was a workshop in February to discuss changes to these Guidelines.</li> <li>There will be several rounds of drafts and the expected completion is in Spring 2025.</li> <li>ACEC requested a copy of the working draft document. MTO agreed.</li> <li>ACEC commented that utility relocations are a major issue during design prior to construction.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action – MTO to share with ACEC a working draft of the revised Chapter 3.</b></p> <p>VIII. <i>Description:</i> CCTV Flushing (with additional background provided to MTO consideration)</p> <p><i>Discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ACEC provided some cost estimates for CCTV services for MTO information and reference.</li> <li>MTO found this information helpful, and it has been added to the ‘notes to designer’ document for the Engineering RFP.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action - none</b></p>	<p>MTO</p>

NEW ITEMS		ACTION BY
05-2024 Item 5	<p><b>AGENDA ITEM – JOINT MTO/ACEC ITEMS</b></p> <p><i>Description:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Joint MTO/ACEC items</li> </ul> <p><i>Discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>none</li> </ul> <p><b>Action - none</b></p>	
05-2024 Item 6	<p><b>AGENDA ITEM – NEW ITEMS (TIME PERMITTING)</b></p> <p><i>Description:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New items for discussion</li> </ul> <p><i>Discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>none</li> </ul> <p><b>Action - none</b></p>	
05-2024 Item 7	<p><b>AGENDA ITEM – UPCOMING MEETINGS &amp; HOSTS</b></p> <p><i>Description:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmation of the next subcommittee meeting</li> </ul> <p><i>Discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On September 4, 2024, the Engineering subcommittee will meet at the Stantec Stoney Creek Office, from 10am – 2pm</li> </ul> <p><b>Action - none</b></p>	

<b>OPEN ITEMS</b>		<b>ACTION BY</b>
<b>SubComm workplan Item</b> <b>2022-ST-4a</b>	<p><b>AGENDA ITEM – SUBCOMMITTEE WORKPLAN</b></p> <p><i>Description:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Item 2022-ST-4a</li> <li>Update on the debriefing guide that was prepared by Engineering Policy section</li> </ul> <p><i>Discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MTO advised that the version that was posted on the TCP was adopted by the Broader Public Sector, but as an internal document. MTO advised that the debriefing guide is an internal MTO document.</li> <li>There is public procurement directive, for the broader public services, that contains debriefing information.</li> <li>Erika shared the link to the BPS procurement directive (<a href="https://www.ontario.ca/government/broader-public-sector-procurement-directive-april-1-2024">Broader Public Sector Procurement Directive April 1 2024 (ontario.ca)</a>).</li> </ul> <p><b>Action –</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MTO to respond to TCP posting and change the Notice Change.</li> </ul>	<b>MTO</b>

<b>INFORMATION SHARED FOR THIS MEETING</b>		
<b>Document Title</b>	<b>Shared By</b>	<b>Format</b>
MTO_ACEC-ON Eng Submte Work Plan 2024 05 06	Erika Varga	Excel document
CPR Pause WORK PLAN w ACEC-ON 2024 05 06	Erika Varga	Excel document
MTO ACEC Engineering Subcommittee Meeting May 8 2024 ITEM 4b (Award delays – RAQS ESP data)	Erika Varga	Email on May 8.
RE Item 3e - Weblink to training information for CMS for Engineering - <a href="https://www.merx.com">What's New in RAQS (merx.com)</a>	Erika Varga	Email on May 8.
RE Item 4b - Weblink to <a href="https://www.ontario.ca/government/broader-public-sector-procurement-directive-april-1-2024">Broader Public Sector Procurement Directive April 1 2024 (ontario.ca)</a>	Erika Varga	Email on May 8.

<b>NEXT MEETING</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>September 4, 2024, at the Stantec Stoney Creek Office, from 10:00am – 2:00pm</li> </ul>