



**Trillium Line Extension
OLRT Bid Evaluation Steering Committee (BESC)
October 23 2018**

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Place | Conference Call |
| Date | October 23, 2018 |
| Time | 2:00-5:00pm |
| Invited | BESC: Geoff Gilbert, Simon Dupuis, Remo Bucci Emily Marshall-Daigneault, Raquel Gold, Oliver Grant, Peter Schwartzentruber |
| Regrets | |

Notes:

| | Description | Action By |
|----------|---|------------------|
| 1 | <p>Technical Presentation Written direction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification on overall approach of evaluation: outlined process undertaken before and after written direction and demonstrated tools that assisted in the grading process. • Process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Individual assessment: review submission for strengths and weaknesses, as per framework each individual assigned a preliminary grading, review conformance report – then arrive at a score. Mostly starting at middle of grade within a bracket and moving up or down depending on attributes which would impact score ○ Group consensus: identify each score, varying degrees discussed strengths and weaknesses, achieved consensus on attributes before agreeing on a score, narrow down by agreeing on a range then narrow down to actual number and score. Evaluators then performed consistency check across all Proponents to ensure scoring consistency. • After written direction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reviewed and addressed questions in context of revised direction. Took direction and implications of answering questions, re-evaluated and reviewed all the scores for each Proponent and re-scored as necessary. Some scores changed, some did not, and additional consistency check was then conducted. Evaluators scored subcomponents not individual attributes for holistic approach. • Key Individuals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Review of Key Individuals previously approved by the City. BESC has concerns with the submissions given a failing grade due to the Key Individuals that were previously accepted as part of the Changes to Identified Proponent Parties. <p>Questions to Technical Evaluation Team: <u>TransitNext</u> Section 1.0 – Project Management</p> | PS |

| | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Question 1 – 3: Project Management Plan:</u> three questions reviewed and subsequently re-evaluated. Across all consensus worksheets, attributes comments were reviewed, analyzed and re-written • <u>Question IMS:</u> validated score and negative attribute as the City was not mentioned in the submission. • <u>Question Communications & Stakeholder:</u> As per section A(i) of the RFP, Proponent must demonstrate understanding of the Project which evaluators believe they did not address in this section – did not address major stakeholders of the project, no project specific references which were RFP requirements. No reference to communications strategy during maintenance period as per RFP requirement 1.4 (4) (a) (iii) • <u>Questions Works Schedule:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Critical path to substantial completion: score revised although submission did not comprehensively address nor explain the critical path in the narrative. PBS – 1 does have critical path which led to rescoring. - Early works: rescored and agreed with the BESC direction - Design package: fully coordinated packages are project requirement – Proponent does not fully understand the requirements in RFP Schedule 3 Part 1. • <u>Question Risk Management:</u> still consider this a negative attribute, evaluation team score of 73 validated. • <u>Question System Integration Management Plan:</u> Technical team agrees with BESC direction that a high level description should not include inaccurate descriptions and information nor should it omit critical City tasks as integration of fare control equipment at the stations <p><u>Section 2.0 – Design Submission</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Question 11 Snow storage:</u> wording revised to better match RFP language. Snow and ice removal were not addressed for guideway although it is a technical submission requirement. • <u>Question 12 noise and vibration:</u> BESC raised 4 questions related to civil and guideway, following written direction, Technical team had shift in methodology, prompting re-analysis of the complexity of individual scores, consensus on the revised score with revised worksheet attributes • <u>Question 13 Rideau River Bridge:</u> In reference to Section 2.1 (m) there was no proposed approach for lifecycle and maintenance in the submission. Remains a negative attribute for this section. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Non-Conformant Brookfield siding. RFP requires demonstration how to future double track, only provided for the structures. ○ NRC runoff not built which is also a non-conformance. ○ Inconsistencies in track design and narrative on Walkley. Ellwood narrative refers to future freight but drawings not supported. ○ Earl Armstrong, Lester, Leitrim are not designed to E-80 loading which was identified as non-conformance in the Conformance Report. • <u>Question 13 Systems:</u> Section 3.1 asks for a technology solution, not an approach. Proponent's lack of solution did impact scoring of this category. • <u>Question 15 New Walkley Yard:</u> Section was re-scored at 60 based on the attributes | |
|--|--|

| | | |
|---|---|----|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Question 16 tents</u>: Technical team amended attributes to better reflect scoring • <u>Question 17 fueling stations</u>: Technical team agreed with BESC comment, revised attributes language and scoring re: multiple fueling stations • <u>Question 18 vehicle fleet</u>: Section was re-scored <p><u>Section 3.0 – Construction Submission</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Questions Testing and Commissioning</u>: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Comment did not impact holistic scoring, scoring was adjusted to 60. Scope and type of minor deficiencies not provided as per requirements in section 3.4 (i)(e). ○ Simulation does not model dwell times and system delays which was a requirements. Did not consider dwell times ○ No analysis on Airport Link to substantiate 12 min headways or how single platform at Uplands would work operationally – have significantly changed how Airport Link functions. PSOS to be reviewed for FNP negotiations. ○ Brookfield siding pinch point: still reduced siding length while acknowledging the pinch point <p><u>Section 4.0 – Maintenance Submission</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Question 23 mobilization</u>: validated scoring. Problems, solutions on past experience not provided, did not provide details on service providers <p><u>Trillium Link</u></p> <p><u>Section 1.0</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Question 27 Work schedule</u>: Attributes reviewed and score validated. <p><u>Section 2.0</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Question 28</u>: Validated score and revised the attributes in the consensus worksheets • <u>Question 29</u>: Validated score • <u>Question 30</u>: Negative attribute was revised accordingly as it was a typographical error <p><u>Trillium Extension Alliance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Question 31 IMS</u>: Technical team confirmed that no cross reference required, rescored category to 85% • <u>Question 32</u>: reviewed and revised attributes and validated score • <u>Question 33</u>: added PSOS clause to attributes language • <u>Question 34</u>: validated score | |
| 2 | <p>Questions</p> <p><u>Methodology</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual scoring: Started at middle score for respective grade range then assigned a specific score up or down based on attributes • Where was approach changed from before and after BESC written direction? Technical team changed methodology to a presumptive 70%, when dealing with failing component the team specifically tied weaknesses to RFP and PA. | PS |

| | | |
|---|--|-----|
| | <p>TransitNext</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comms and Stakeholder: BESC indicated a need to link back to project requirements. The BESC believes the negative attributes are not related to the technical submission requirements. • SIMP: The BESC questioned if the submission spoke about reliability? Technical Submission Requirements asked for reliability and maintainability specifically: Proponent’s submission did not address requirements for reliability, maintainability. RFP requires SIMP to include normal schedule for high level dependency tasks which were not included in submission. <p>Section 2.0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BESC indicated concern with comment “not considered a major deficiency”, as this could not have meant that the comment did not affect the score, it likely did impact the scoring of that item. Why did it impact score the first time but not the second? • BESC discussed concerns with the slip switch language ambiguity and reference RFI 84 indicating the City will accept switches as long as they did not impact the geometry, Lands, etc. • Vehicles: Concern with potential insight by other teams. Did the City give sufficient information to allow Proponents to do those assessments? BESC discussion to be had whether a Proponent can fail section 2.6 when the City is pushing the vehicle fleet on the Proponents. <p>Section 4.0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Related to Question 25, BESC noted concerns with Maintenance and Rehabilitation Services used as defined terms. <p>Trillium Extension Alliance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Section 2.6 New Vehicle Design</u>: Question on what brought the submission down to 80%. Reviewed comments and BESC was satisfied with response. | |
| 3 | <p>Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical team has identified numerous non conformances, missing scope and station deficiencies within the TransitNEXT submission • NRF still preparing revisions to prior meeting minutes from Oct 3 2018 meeting. • ESC meeting scheduled for Friday Oct 26, pre-meeting with Manconi Oct 25. • BESC recommendation to Oct 26th ESC: the City exercise its’ discretion to continue to consider the TransitNEXT proposal in the overall evaluation. While not imposing scoring, BESC advises it is in the best interest of the City to continue to consider the submission with the revised technical score. • Rationale for recommendation: BESC direction to send evaluators back to reconvene consensus and re-evaluate. The Technical team was able to improve scores in some categories, elevating the overall Technical submission score | All |

| | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BESC believes there continues to be an over reliance by the Technical Team on the “motherhood statements” in RFP Schedule 3 Part 1 without a link to specific submission requirements • NRF will additionally prepare a Legal memo analyzing risk of an action or challenge by a proponent • Oct 26 ESC meeting: the BESC will make no mention of Financial Affordability, nor identify any Proponent and a Fairness representative should be present at the meeting • NRF to prepare Legal Memo in advance of financial consensus discussion – the Technical and Financial are separate processes. • BESC advises that the financial evaluation is to reconvene individual evaluation in advance of ESC meeting to proceed to consensus. • Financial evaluators cannot have any discussion with any others • BESC will reconvene on a strategy on Proponent debriefing | |
|---|--|

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: Emily Marshall-Daigneault