

**Trillium Line Extension  
OLRT Bid Evaluation Steering Committee (BESC)  
September 12 2018**

Meeting Minutes

<b>Place</b>	NRF Offices (Ottawa, Toronto)
<b>Date</b>	September 12, 2018
<b>Time</b>	9:30AM-12:30PM
<b>Invited</b>	<p><u>BESC Members:</u> Geoffrey Gilbert(Lead) [Toronto] [GG] Simon Dupuis [Ottawa] [SD] Remo Bucci [Ottawa] [RB]</p> <p><u>Conformance Sub-Committee:</u> Colin Sandler (Lead) [Toronto] [CS] Emily Marshall-Daigneault [Ottawa] [EMD] Raquel Gold [Ottawa] [RG] Mike Harvey [Ottawa] [MWH]</p> <p><u>Technical Advisor Team:</u> Scott Bowers [Toronto] [SB] Mark Hodgson [Toronto] [MH]</p> <p><u>Support:</u> Martin Masse [Ottawa] [MGM]</p>
<b>Regrets</b>	

**Notes:**

	Description	Lead	Minutes
0.	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>EMD</b>	
1.	<b>Technical Conformance Consensus Process</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Step-by-step overview of Conformance and Consensus process</li> </ul>	<b>CS, MWH</b>	<p>Question: potential challenges associated with the PSOS as there were similar number of unobservable events among all three submissions?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, common PSOS occurrences - several (4) items</li> <li>In the future, will review and manage in the FNP stage. TA to review PSOS to confirm that those items are actually non-conformant rather than conformant with less prescribed PSOS language. OC Transpo to understand their position prior to negotiations.</li> </ul>
2.	<b>Technical Conformance Overview by Proponent</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TNext, TLink, TEA</li> </ul>	<b>CS, MWH</b>	<p>Provided overview of each Proponent by number of events and common occurrences.</p> <p>Presented areas within the Proposals, generally, which more / less conformance events.</p>

	Description	Lead	Minutes
3.	<p><b>TNext Conformance Events Deep Dive</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Event TN-NC001 to TE-U003</li> </ul> <p><b>TLink Conformance Events Deep Dive</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Event TL-NC001 to TL-CWC001</li> </ul> <p><b>TEA Conformance Events Deep Dive</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Event TE-NC001 to TE-U003</li> </ul>	CS, MWH	<p><b>TNext</b></p> <p><b>TN-NC001: Agreed NC, To be flagged and reviewed by TA team against PSOS language as it noted on two Proponent proposals</b> No involvement of IQAF, required as part of Schedule 11 (have not captured the essence)</p> <p><b>TN-NC002: Agreed NC</b> No 48 hours' notice given prior to test to the City, required so they may witness it (Hold Point)</p> <p><b>TN-NC003: To be flagged and reviewed by TA team against PSOS language as it noted on all three Proponent proposals</b> No freight loading.</p> <p><b>TN-NC004:</b> Spur track connection (200m)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmed that it can be fixed within FNP process</li> </ul> <p><b>TN-NC005:</b> Via Rail Grade Separation MUP Connection not shown on elevation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addition to elevation to make conformant</li> </ul> <p><b>TN-U001: To be flagged and reviewed by TA team against PSOS language as it noted on all three proponent proposals</b> Bird Friendly glazing at a number of locations.</p> <p><b>TN-NC006:</b> 6m wide crossing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be noted that the structure to be included and not a future build. Confirmed non-conformance.</li> </ul> <p><b>TN-NC007: TAs to give non-subjective view on this Conformance Event (agreed by BESC Team)</b> Upland two-track station:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PSOS Schedule 15-2 requires two tracks, but not two revenue tracks.</li> <li>SME request n014 to be updated if it is actually conformant based on TA review.</li> <li>Notice to evaluators that this subject is under review (noted from the BESC team has requested that this matter has been reviewed)</li> </ul> <p><b>TN-U002: To be flagged and reviewed by TA team against PSOS language as it noted on all three Proponent proposals</b> MOW MSF Site.</p> <p><b>TN-NC008:</b> MSF Operator Crossing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Non-conformant, agreed BESC.</li> </ul>

	Description	Lead	Minutes
			<p><b>TN-NC009: To be flagged and reviewed by TA team against PSOS language as it noted on all three Proponent proposals</b> Generator Capacity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Redesign emergency power system to have 25% capacity for future growth</li> <li>• Simple redesign</li> <li>• Cost implications, determined that the fix will not have material cost deviations</li> </ul> <p><b>TN-E001: Pedestrian Detours</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They are temporary, not an item for extraction, therefore remove.</li> </ul> <p><b>TN-NC010 Staging Drawings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staging Drawings not included,</li> <li>• If left to subjectivity that they could have provided all the required drawings, then they would be conformant, required further review (go back to Lead for further information)</li> <li>• BESC recommend to make that change to unobservable</li> </ul> <p><b>TN-E002: M&amp;R Construction Management Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not a good example of exceedance, the solution is required to be integrated. BESC recommends removal.</li> </ul> <p><b>TN-CWC001: FTEs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not a conformance issue, BESC recommends removal.</li> </ul> <p><b>TN-E003: Obsolescence Management Plan:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not a conformance issue, BESC recommends removal.</li> </ul> <p><b>TN-NC0011: Rating Condition of Assets</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BESC agrees, it is a non-conformance</li> </ul> <p><b>TN-E004: Carleton Works:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not a conformance issue, BESC recommends removal.</li> </ul> <p><b>TE-U003: To be flagged and reviewed by TA team against PSOS language as it noted on all three Proponent proposals</b> Revenue vehicles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flag to see what this issue is in PSOS, present in all three</li> <li>• It is a non-conformance</li> </ul> <p><b>TLink</b>  <b>TL-NC001: Guardrail:</b></p>

	Description	Lead	Minutes
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modify the description of this conformance event. Recommend that the real non-conformance is that for the guardrail and the structural loading is unobservable.</li> </ul> <p><b>TL-U001: To be flagged and reviewed by TA team against PSOS language as it noted on all three Proponent proposals Bird Friendly:</b></p> <p><b>TL-U002: To be flagged and reviewed by TA team against PSOS language as it noted on all three Proponent proposals MOW:</b></p> <p><b>TL-NC002: To be flagged and reviewed by TA team against PSOS language M&amp;A Drop-Off:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommend Unobservable only</li> <li>Too much interpretation to bear on the drawings portion</li> <li>Addition of PSOS number in event description</li> </ul> <p><b>TL-U003: To be flagged and reviewed by TA team against PSOS language as it noted on all three Proponent proposals Revenue Vehicle Approach</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More information required, recommend to make it Unobservable</li> <li>Need more information regarding conformance, for example; the requirement was X, they provided Y. Z aspects were not included.</li> </ul> <p><b>TE-U004: To be flagged and reviewed by TA team against PSOS language as it noted on all three Proponent proposals New Vehicle Fleet:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommend Unobservable only</li> </ul> <p><b>TL-CWC001: Lifecycle Schedule Misalignment:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conformance Team will need to determine if any required activities are included after their contractually obligated period and if it does, or does not align with the spec.</li> </ul> <p><b>TEA</b></p> <p><b>TE-NC001: To be flagged and reviewed by TA team against PSOS language as it noted on two Proponent proposals RFC TEA-006</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommend, Remove Quality Control Manager as it is not a conformance exercise</li> <li>Flag IQAF for further TA review</li> <li>Recommend since IQAF not present is a non-observable</li> </ul>

	Description	Lead	Minutes
			<p><b>TE-NC002:</b> Civil and Guideway</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Break out into multiple events</li> <li>• Agreed, (2) is not a non-conformance</li> <li>• Agreed, (5) should be a non-conformance</li> </ul> <p><b>TE-NC003:</b> Station Weather Protection, Roofing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-conformance, understood</li> <li>• From a financial perspective, agreed it would not affect ability to review bid</li> </ul> <p><b>TE-NC004:</b> Airport Future Expansion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-conformant</li> <li>• Agreed by BESC that is design-work only to fix and not recommended material</li> </ul> <p><b>TE-U001: To be flagged and reviewed by TA team against PSOS language as it noted on two Proponent proposals</b> MOW</p> <p><b>TE-U002: To be flagged and reviewed by TA team against PSOS language as it noted on two Proponent proposals</b> Bird Friendly Glazing</p> <p><b>TE-NC005: To be flagged and reviewed by TA team against PSOS language as it noted on two Proponent proposals</b> Generator Capacity</p> <p><b>TE-NC006:</b> New Vehicle Fleet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommend Conformant with Comment, they've used the incorrect drawing</li> <li>• The vehicle is being supplied by city</li> </ul> <p><b>TE-NC007:</b> M&amp;R Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommend updating description - 60 days required to be updated to 90 days in order to be conformance</li> </ul> <p><b>TE-U003: To be flagged and reviewed by TA team against PSOS language as it noted on two Proponent proposals</b> New Vehicle Fleet</p>
4.	<p><b>Technical Advisor Comments and Report Overview</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments in addition to those not already discussed, overview of findings</li> </ul>	SB, MH	<p>When TA is required to perform a further review, they will take all events where there were the same non-conformance across all teams, the TA team should provide comment if there is PSOS weakness (for negotiations purposes and to know if it is weak, how easily to get FNP to agree to the terms)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1: Deep-dive into PSOS.</li> <li>2: Are they conformant? If they are, then negotiate the get that back in the contract.</li> </ol>



	Description	Lead	Minutes
			<p>3: Amend conformance report that it is conformant, and track those for negotiations purposes.</p> <p>Items for TA Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- IQAF (TN-NC001, TE-NC001)</li> <li>- Bird Friendly Glazing (TN-U001, TL-U001, TE-U002)</li> <li>- MOW MSF Site (TN-U002, TL-U002, TE-U001)</li> <li>- Generator Capacity (TN-NC009, TE-NC005)</li> <li>- Revenue Vehicles (TE-U003, TL-U003, TE-U003)</li> <li>- Bridge Freight Loading (TN-NC003)</li> <li>- Uplands Station (TN-NC007)</li> <li>- M&amp;A Drop-Off (TL-NC002)</li> </ul> <p>TEA, TLINK identified many non-conformances with structural elements - multiple bridges with structural elements that show up multiple times within the Conformance Review as non-conformances. Noted as part of TA report for Technical Evaluators.</p>
5.	<b>BESC Technical Conformance Sign-Off &amp; Next Steps</b>	<b>EMD</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Evaluation Manager to follow-up with Conformance Leads regarding recommendations</li> <li>2. Evaluation Manager to coordinate TA review</li> <li>3. Evaluation Manager to make changes to Report and re-confirm consensus prior to issuing Report to Evaluators on Friday, September 14 (without the information that the TA team will be reviewing, as that will be provided by Friday, September 21 in an appended report).</li> </ol>

Adjournment: *The foregoing represents the writer's understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or actions required. Any errors, omissions, or concerns regarding the minutes captured should be brought to the attention of the undersigned individual within 48 hours of receiving these minutes.* Prepared By: Mike Harvey