

Ottawa LRT Stage-2
Trillium Line Extension Project

**Evaluation Results to Executive
Steering Committee**





Conflict Declaration



Timelines



Dates	Milestone
July 2017	Pre-Qualification of Trillium Line Proponents
August 10, 2018	Three technical submissions received
August 20 – August 31, 2018	Technical Conformance Review
August 20 – September 24, 2018	Individual Technical Evaluation
September 15	Conformance Report Provided to Technical Evaluators
September 21, 2018	Three financial submissions received
September 25 – October 30, 2018	Individual Financial Evaluation
October 3, 2018	First Technical Presentation to BESC
October 9, 2018	Written direction from BESC
October 10 – October 22, 2018	Reconvened Technical Consensus
October 23, 2018	Second Technical Evaluation Presentation to BESC
October 26, 2018	ESC Direction regarding Technical Evaluation
October 31, 2018	Financial Consensus
November 1, 2018	Presentation to BESC with Financial results and final rankings



Proponent teams include the following team members:

Trillium NEXT	Trillium LINK	Trillium Extension Alliance
Equity Investor	Equity Investor	Equity Investor
SNC Capital	Acciona, Fengate, CAF	Plenary*, Colas, Tomlinson <i>(Note: Plenary's equity funded █% from Plenary Fund and █% from Plenary Canada)</i>
Constructor	Constructor	Constructor
SNC Lavalin Constructors (Pacific) Inc	Acciona Concessions S.L	Tomlinson, Colas GP
Maintainer	Maintainer	Maintainer
SNC Lavalin Operations and Maintenance Inc	Acciona Concesiones S.L, Caf Investment Projects	Colas Rail SAS (█%), Bouygues Energies & Service Canada Limited (█%)

- The submission evaluations are scored out of 1000 points (500 Technical and 500 Financial).
- The evaluation of the submissions is sequential with Technical consensus completed before financial so the financial outcome cannot impact the technical score.
- This presentation will provide an overview of the technical evaluation process and score, then the financial process and score.



Technical Evaluation



Technical Evaluation Team



Technical Evaluation Team:

- Peter Schwartzenruber, Lead Evaluator – CTP2
- Colleen Connelly, City of Ottawa
- Jack D’Andrea, CTP2
- Russ Hoas, City of Ottawa
- Michael Morgan, City of Ottawa

Support Team:

- Consensus Facilitator: Emily Marshall-Daigneault, City of Ottawa
- Consensus Note Taker: Raquel Gold, Boxfish Infrastructure Group
- Fairness Commissioner: Oliver Grant, P3 Advisors
- Evaluation Coordinator: Mike Harvey, Deloitte



Technical Evaluation Categories (RFP)

Evaluation Categories	Maximum Potential Points
B1.0 General Technical Submission	105
B2.0 Design Submission	165
B3.0 Construction Submission	105
B4.0 Maintenance and Rehabilitation Submission	125
Total Maximum Points available:	500



Technical Evaluation Subcategories



Sub Categories (RFP)

Evaluation Categories	Maximum Points	Page Count	Minimum Score
B. TECHNICAL SUBMISSION	500		--
1.0 GENERAL TECHNICAL SUBMISSION	105	140	70%
1.1 Project Management Plan	15	30	N/A
1.2 Integrated Management System	20	30	N/A
1.3 Environmental Management Plan	15	20	N/A
1.4 Construction Communications and Stakeholder Engagement	5	10	N/A
1.5 Works Schedule PBS-1	30	10	70%
1.6 Risk Management Plan	5	10	N/A
1.7 Systems Integration Management Plan (SIMP)	15	30	N/A
1.8 Early Works Agreement (optional)	Not Scored	No Limit	N/A
2.0 DESIGN SUBMISSION	165	250	70%
2.1 Civil and Guideway Design Submission	25	50	N/A
2.2 Utilities, Geotechnical, Drainage and Stormwater Management, Urban Design, Landscape Architecture	25	45	N/A
2.3 Systems Design Submission	25	40	N/A
2.4 Stations Design Submission	30	40	N/A
2.5 New Walkley Yard Design Submission	20	30	N/A
2.6 New Vehicle Fleet Design Submission	20	30	N/A
2.7 Airport Link	0	N/A	N/A
2.8 System Safety and Security Construction	10	15	N/A

Evaluation Categories	Maximum Points	Page Count	Minimum Score
2.9 Dows Lake Tunnel Design Submission	10	10	
3.0 CONSTRUCTION SUBMISSION	105	130	70%
3.1 Emergency Response Plan	10	20	N/A
3.2 Traffic and Transit Management Plan and Construction Access Management Plan	25	40	N/A
3.3 Construction Management Plan	40	40	N/A
3.4 Testing and Commissioning Plan	25	25	N/A
3.5 Health and Safety Certification	NOT SCORED	No Limit	N/A
3.6 Mobility Matters Lanes	5	5	N/A
4.0 MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION SUBMISSION	125	90	70%
4.1 Maintenance and Rehabilitation Approach to Part 1 of Schedule 15-3 of the Project Agreement;	40	30	N/A
4.2 Maintenance and Rehabilitation: Approach to Appendix A of Schedule 15-3 of the Project Agreement;	40	30	N/A
4.3 Maintenance and Rehabilitation: Approach to Appendix B of Schedule 15-3 of the Project Agreement; and	35	25	N/A
4.4 Maintenance and Rehabilitation: Approach to Appendix C of Schedule 15-3 of the Project Agreement and Schedule 23 of the Project Agreement.	10	5	N/A

Requirement	TLink	TEA	TNext
1.0 General Technical Requirements	84.57%	84.57%	70.71%
2.0 Design Submission	88.96%	80.72%	63.58%
3.0 Construction Submission	83.14%	90.19%	71.86%
4.0 Maintenance and Rehabilitation	84.80%	86.28%	65.40%
Total	85.78%	84.91%	67.27%
TOTAL Technical Score	428.90	424.55	336.35

* ESC on BESC's recommendation carried forward TNext into the next stage of the evaluations.



Financial Evaluation





Financial Evaluation Team:

- Mohammed Mehanny, Lead Evaluator – Deloitte
- Denise Lamoreaux, City of Ottawa
- Isabelle Jasmin, City of Ottawa
- Ash Hashim, Deloitte
- Jeff Sward, Consultant

Support Team:

- Evaluation Manager: Emily Marshall-Daigneault, City of Ottawa
- Subject Matter Experts: Abhinav Chauhan, Douglas He, Devin O’Brian (Deloitte)
- Fairness Commissioner: Oliver Grant, P3 Advisors





Below is summary of the RFP evaluation criteria for Financial Submissions:

Criteria	Weighting	Scoring Methodology
Total Submission Price	450.00	The lowest Total Submission Price will be awarded the maximum points available for Total Submission Price (450 points) and the Sponsor will deduct 30 points from the maximum points available for Total Submission Price (450 points) for every percentage point by which the Proponent's Total Submission Price exceeds the lowest Total Submission Price
Quality of Proposed Financing Plan	50.00	The Proponent will receive a score related to the quality of its proposed financing plan up to 50 points. The Proponent should note that a minimum score of at least seventy percent of available points must be achieved for the Quality of Proposed Financing Plan category of the Financial Submission.
Total:	500.00	

Affordability Determination



- As on Stage 1 the Stage 2 RFP included affordability caps (one on capital and one aggregate– capital + maintenance payments);
- As per the RFP if only one submission is affordable then the other two proposals are scored 0 on their financial score, however the RFP gives discretion to the Sponsor to continue to evaluate for the purpose of determining the second ranked proponent;
- After opening the financial submission, the financial evaluation team advised the BESC that there was only one affordable proponents at which point the BESC gave direction to continue to evaluate and score for the purposes of identifying the second ranked proponent.



The following is a breakdown of scoring for three Proponents' Financial Submissions:

Criteria	Maximum Score	T-NEXT	T-LINK	TEA
Total Submission Price	450.00	450.00	169.82	53.39
Quality of Proposed Financing Plan (<i>min 70% / 35pts</i>)	50.00	35.00 (70%)	42.50 (85%)	40.00 (80%)
Financial Submission	500.00	485.00	212.32	93.39

Total Submission Price	T-NEXT	T-LINK	TEA
NPV of Construction Period Payments	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]
NPV of Substantial Completion Payment	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]
NPV of Payments for Early Works	---	\$ [REDACTED]	---
NPV of Revenue Vehicle Contract Costs	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]
NPV of Annual Service Payments - Capital Portion	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]
NPV of Annual Service Payments - Service Portion	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]
NPV of Lifecycle Payments	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]
NPV of Aggregate Target Lane Closure Costs	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]
NPV of Utility Costs	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]
Total NPV Payments / Total Submission Price	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]
<i>Delta to Lowest</i>		[REDACTED] %	[REDACTED] %

The following is a summary of results of the affordability determination process:

	Payments Summary	T-NEXT	T-LINK	TEA	
Construction Period	Payments for Early Works	---	\$ [REDACTED]	---	
	Revenue Vehicle Contract Costs	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]	
	Construction Period Payments	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]	
	Substantial Completion Payments	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]	
	Subtotal	\$663,050,000	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]	
	Capital Cost Affordability Cap Compliance	Yes	No	No	Capital Cap \$663,100,000
Maintenance Period	Annual Service Payment – Capital Portion	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]	
	Annual Service Payment – Service Portion	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]	
	Lifecycle Payments	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]	
	Total Payments	\$1,615,333,583	\$ [REDACTED]	\$ [REDACTED]	
	Aggregate Cost Affordability Cap	Yes	Yes	No	Aggregate Cap \$1,733,200,000

Proponent	Technical Submission Score	Financial Submission Score	Final Proposal Score (Technical Submission Score + Financial Submission Score)	Ranking
TransitNEXT	336.35	485.00	821.35	1
Trillium Link	428.90	212.32	641.22	2
Trillium Extension Alliance	424.55	93.39	517.94	3

Proponent	Technical Submission Score	Financial Submission Score	Final Proposal Score (Technical Submission Score + Financial Submission Score)	Ranking
TransitNEXT	336.35	485.00	821.35	1
Trillium Link	428.90	0	428.90	2
Trillium Extension Alliance	424.55	0	424.55	3

Decision



BESC requests that ESC approve the results of the evaluation process and the selection of TransitNEXT as the First Negotiations Proponent.



Next Steps



- Work with the Technical Evaluation Team and the Conformance leads to compile the non-conformances;
- The letter advising TransitNEXT that they are the First Negotiations Proponent will include a list of these non-conformances;
- Negotiations on resolving the non-conformances will begin shortly after letter is sent.
- ESC will be apprised of the outcome of the negotiations with BESC recommending moving the FNP to PP or to move to second ranked proponent depending on how the non-conformances are resolved.