



**Trillium Line Extension  
OLRT Bid Evaluation Steering Committee (BESC)  
November 1, 2018**

Meeting Minutes

<b>Place</b>	NRF Offices (Ottawa)
<b>Date</b>	November 1, 2018
<b>Time</b>	2:00-5:00PM
<b>Invited</b>	<u>BESC Members:</u> Geoffrey Gilbert (Lead) Simon Dupuis Remo Bucci (via conference call)  <u>Financial Evaluation Sub-Committee:</u> Mohammed Mehany (Lead) Isabelle Jasmin  <u>Support:</u> Martin Masse (Legal) Oliver Grant (Fairness) Emily Marshall-Daigneault (Evaluation Manager) Raquel Gold Cathy Burden
<b>Regrets</b>	

**Notes:**

	Description	Lead
1.	<b>Introduction, Opening Remarks</b>	<b>EMD/OG</b>
2.	<b>Financial Ranking Presentation</b>	<b>MM</b>
	<u>Overall</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One day completeness was undertaken</li> <li>• Financial Consensus was held on October 31, 2018</li> <li>• Introduction to Proponents, TEA, TLINK, TNEXT</li> <li>• Affordability determination – one bid affordable, two bids were not affordable</li> <li>• Scoring was based on the total submission price and the quality of the financing plan</li> <li>• No bonds</li> <li>• All submissions elected for held pricing facility although, base rate will most likely go higher</li> <li>• No early completion bonus was given as all submissions opted for as late a date as possible</li> <li>• All bids achieved a minimum of 70%</li> <li>• All teams picked the base option for vehicles</li> <li>• Construction schedules reviewed</li> <li>• RFCs were issued and answered</li> <li>• Price based on four service levels <b>City to determine which level of service to use</b></li> <li>• MM to distribute presentation to BESC</li> </ul>	

	Description	Lead
	<p><b>TNEXT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Only team to meet the affordability criteria</li> <li>- High front loading of life cycle payments</li> <li>- MM provided an overview of strengths and challenges</li> <li>- Lack of clarity in various parts of the submission</li> <li>- RFC issued to ask for clarity and to determine ownership of SPV</li> <li>- Issues of concern were highlighted</li> <li>- Conditions on term sheet interfering/contradicting, difficult to determine what would take precedence if an issue arose</li> </ul> <p><b>TLINK</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- MM provided an overview of strengths and challenges</li> <li>- Noted lack of clarity on cost breakdown</li> </ul> <p><b>TEA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Submitted detailed Financial plan</li> <li>- Noted that vehicle maintainer would be acquired at a later date</li> </ul>	
2.1	<b>Questions</b>	<b>BESC</b>
	<p><b>TNEXT:</b></p> <p><b>Overall</b></p> <p><b>Q: How is equity loan invested? Who controls the account, since the funds needs to be fully available?</b> BESC: Will review.</p> <p><b>Q: BESC to determine if anti-corruption rating can be considered? Credit rating was specifically mentioned.</b> BESC: Will review.</p> <p><b>Q: BESC to take comments and obtain legal advice regarding submissions. Additional information needed to obtain clarity to determine FNP.</b> BESC: Will review</p> <p><b>Q: OG inquired about Early Works.</b> MM: No funds were provided for in the Financial bid for Early Works, or were funded elsewhere. BESC will need to assess the Early Works against the Technical Submission.</p>	
3.	<b>First Negotiations Proponent Ranking</b>	<b>RG/EMD</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- EMD provided an overview of the steps for determination of ranking</li> <li>- EMD to obtain term sheet partnership agreement for GG to review language and determine if score holds</li> <li>- Final score zeros should be included, which may impact final score</li> <li>- Also need to review ranking of second and third proponents</li> <li>- No recommendation of PP at this time</li> <li>- GG to prepare report and follow up with BESC for approval</li> <li>- GG to determine structure of template for appendix to FNP letter</li> <li>- GG to follow up with Ash Hashim regarding price form</li> </ul>	
3.1	<b>Questions</b>	<b>BESC</b>
	<p><b>Q: BESC to determine if from an affordability perspective if changes could be made in advance of FNP or requested after decision on FNP.</b> BESC: Will review.</p>	

	Description	Lead
	<p><b>Q: Proponent submitted an RFI on October 30, 2018 inquiring about a status update.</b>            BESC: Will discuss and determine how to respond</p>	
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>Next Steps</b></p>	<p><b>BESC</b></p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Compile a team to review and determine strategy for FNP</li> <li>- Change of ownership language in the PA and PSOS to be reviewed</li> <li>- Compile list of strengths and weaknesses for negotiations</li> <li>- Need good analysis and debatable points</li> <li>- Ensure due diligence is undertaken</li> </ul>	

Adjournment: *The foregoing represents the writer's understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or actions recommended. 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: Catherine Burden