

Trillium Line Extension

RFQ Evaluation
Presentation to PDC
11th July 2017

← STAGE
ETAPE ↓ ② →



Schedule

Event	Key Dates
RFQ Submission Date	June 20, 2017
Completeness and Compliance Review	June 21-23, 2017
Individual Evaluations	June 26 – July 6 2017
Financial Evaluation Team consensus scoring	July 10, 2017 (1 day)
Technical Evaluation Team consensus scoring	July 7 – July 11, 2017 (3 days)
PDC Approval Meeting	July 11, 2017
Executive Steering Committee Approval Meeting	July 13, 2017
Targeted notification of Prequalified Parties	TBD
RFP Release Date	July 17, 2017

Evaluation Team

Evaluation Coordinators

Emily Marshall-Daigneault

Sarah Teasdale

Evelyn Danilko

Amanda Greene

David Weeks

Fairness Commissioner

Oliver Grant

Stephanie Braithwaite

Benoit Raymond

Conflict Review Team

Martin Masse

Evelyn Danilko

Completeness and Compliance

Stephen Natrass

Emily Marshall-Daigneault

Sarah Teasdale

Technical Evaluation Team

Peter Schwartzentruber

Dominique Quesnel

Rich Piloseno

Colleen Connelly

Michael Morgan

Financial Evaluation Team

Isabelle Jasmin

Matt Hlynsky

Ash Hashim

Jeff Sward

Subject Matter Experts

Hrishikesh Sheth

Paul Beede

Harrell Thomas

Larry Gaul

Martin Masse

Stephen Natrass



Completeness and Compliance

- Five submissions received on June 20 2017, all of which were received before the 3:00pm EST deadline.
 - Skyline Transit Group
 - Trillium Link
 - TransitNEXT
 - Trillium Extension Alliance
 - Capital Link Partners
- The following submissions had excess pages. RFCs were sent to Applicants, who confirmed which pages were to be removed from the evaluators packages.
 - Trillium Extension Alliance
 - Trillium Link
 - Skyline Transit Group



Completeness and Compliance

- Smaller than 10 point font was utilized in organizational charts and diagrams in every submission. RFQ noted a 10pt font size.
- Trillium Extension Alliance was missing WSIB and Health and Safety Certification forms from one of the Prime Team Members. After consultation with PDC, decision was made to allow Applicant to continue onto the evaluation process.

Reference Checks

- Applicant Teams were asked to submit:
 - Up to three reference project examples for experience in DB/DBF Delivery;
 - Up to five reference project examples for experience in design; and,
 - Up to three reference project examples in construction.
- Up to five attempts were made to contact each client reference with five pointed questions for them to respond to.
- Request for Clarifications (RFC) were sent to each Applicant team identifying the references who had not yet responded or who had provided incorrect client information. The RFC requested confirmation of contact information or the opportunity to provide an alternate client reference.
- After RFCs, there remained missing client references for the 4 of the 5 Applicant teams:
 - Trillium Extension Alliance (1 missing reference)
 - Trillium Link (1 missing reference)
 - TransitNEXT (1 missing reference)
 - Capital Link Partners (6 missing references)

Conflict Review

- Completed by Martin Masse and Evelyn Danilko
- Applicants and Team Members cleared based on information provided
- Results of Review:
 - Items flagged for PDC
 - TransitNext
 - Disclosed certain bribery offenses; none constitute a Prohibited Act as defined in the RFQ. Sponsor retains the residual right to DQ for potential reputational reasons
 - Identified access to confidential information as part of work on Stage 2 RTG MOU; if proponent is prequalified, Sponsor will need to ensure proper disclosure of any relevant Confidential Information
 - Skyline
 - Disclosed perceived conflict due to current contracts on Trillium Line; if proponent is prequalified, any information received should be shared with all prequalified parties
 - Request for Clarifications
 - Sent to three Proponents regarding clarification of relationships with ineligible persons
 - No further action required to date; process remains open
- Conflict Review Report for the RFQ Evaluations will be circulated

Fairness Commissioner

- P3 Advisors certifies that overall and to the extent that P3 Advisors have been involved in the RFQ Process the principles of openness, fairness, consistency and transparency have been properly established and maintained throughout the Request for Prequalification's stages completed to date. Furthermore, P3 Advisors was not made aware of any issues that emerged during the process that would impair the fairness of this initiative.
- As Fairness Commissioner, P3 Advisors observed the RFQ evaluation consensus meetings, and confirmed that each technical score was correctly recorded in the record spreadsheet.

-- Technical Evaluation --



Background

- Timeline
 - Individual RFQ Evaluations: June 26 – July 6, 2017
 - Team Consensus: July 7-11
- Individual Evaluators
 - Peter Schwartzentruher
 - Dominique Quesnel
 - Rich Piloseno
 - Colleen Connelly
 - Michael Morgan



Scoring Mechanism

- Each evaluator completed their own comment sheet and scored submissions individually prior to consensus

Grade	Description	Weight (%)		
		Low	Mid	High
Very Poor	Demonstrates an extremely limited understanding of Project needs and objectives; and/or demonstrates no evidence of the ability to deliver the Project in a way which satisfies Project needs and objectives, based on the Applicant's past experience and track record.	0	12	24
Poor	Demonstrates a limited understanding of Project needs and objectives; and/or demonstrates very little evidence of the ability to deliver the Project in a way which satisfies Project needs and objectives, based on the Applicant's past experience and track record.	25	37	49
Not Satisfactory	Demonstrates an understanding of Project needs and objectives which does not meet expectations; and/or fails to demonstrate evidence of the ability to deliver the Project in a way which satisfies Project needs and objectives, based on the Applicant's past experience and track record.	50	55	59
Good	Demonstrates an understanding of Project needs and objectives which meets expectations; and/or demonstrates convincing evidence of the ability to deliver the Project in a way which satisfies Project needs and objectives, based on the Applicant's past experience and track record.	60	67	75
Very Good	Demonstrates an understanding of Project needs and objectives which exceeds expectations; and/or demonstrates strong evidence of the ability to deliver the Project in a way which meets and exceeds Project needs and objectives, based on the Applicant's depth of past experience and a strong track record.	76	82	89
Excellent	Demonstrates a virtually perfect understanding of Project needs and objectives; and/or demonstrates very strong evidence of the ability to deliver the Project in a way which meets and exceeds Project needs and objectives, based on the Applicant's depth of highly relevant past experience and a strong track record of highly relevant projects.	90	95	100

Proponent Submissions

- 5 RFQ Submissions received and reviewed
 - **Trillium Link** (Acciona, Fengate, CAF, CIMA+, Momentum, Thomas Cavanagh, Cobalt Architects, GRC Architects)
 - **Trillium Extension Alliance** (Plenary, Colas, R.W. Tomlinson, Plan Group, WSP, Bird Construction, Mass Electric)
 - **Capital Link Partners** (Sacyr, Amber, Cruickshank, TYPASA, Canarail, Associated Engineering)
 - **TransitNEXT** (SNC Lavalin)
 - **Skyline Transit Group** (ACS Infrastructure, EllisDon, TIAA Infrastructure, Dragados, Hatch, IBI Group, Rail Term)
- Evaluators reviewed submissions to ensure they all met minimum qualifications to advance to RFP Stage

Proponent Ranking

Rank	Applicant Team	Score
1	TransitNEXT	83.21
2	Trillium Link	73.09
3	Trillium Extension Alliance	72.85
4	Skyline Transit Group	70.61
5	Capital Link Partners	66.70

TransitNext

- One company, one approach. 40% of KI available from Confederation Stage 1

Trillium Link

- Acciona / CAF is strong concessionaire / vehicle maintainer team.

Trillium Extension Alliance

- Colas / WSP Design and Construction Experience

-- Financial Evaluation --



Scoring Summary

Grade	Weight (%)		
	Low	Mid	High
Very Poor	0	12	24
Poor	25	37	49
Not Satisfactory	50	55	59
Good	60	67	75
Very Good	76	82	89
Excellent	90	95	100



Scoring Summary

The table below presents a summary of the evaluation scoring results:

Financial Evaluation Criteria	Max. Score	Scores (% of Maximum)				
		Trillium Link	Transit Next	TEA	STG	CLP
6.1 Financial Strength of the Prime Team Members	25.00	75	72	75	76	62
6.2 Risk Allocation and Approach to Securing Performance	25.00	75	75	67	75	67
6.3 Approach to Financing Structure	25.00	75	80	72	77	67
6.4 Past Experience – Projects and Team Experience	25.00	67	72	75	80	62
Total:	100.00	73	74.75	72.25	77.00	64.50
Minimum Score (60%) Threshold Met?		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

6.1 Financial Strength of PTM

Summary

- Respondents generally provided all support letters and demonstrated sufficient financial capacity when all responds combined.
- Elements of responses which increased marks:
 - Stable operating statistics with respect to profitability, leverage of balance sheet, coverage of capital requirements; liquidity
- Elements of response which decreased marks:
 - Eroding operating statistics, general negative trends.
 - Proposal could be strong in aggregate but if individual member showed risk (i.e., unfavourable support letters, leveraged balance sheet) some marks deducted

6.2 Risk Allocation and Approach to Securing Performance

- Respondents generally provided good understanding and allocations of risks, and demonstrated understanding of performance security packages relevant to the project. All demonstrated bonding capacity that was deemed sufficient for a project of this size and scope.
- Elements of responses which increased marks:
 - Demonstrated enhanced teaming (e.g., formalized agreements such as interface agreements, MOU, or partnership/JV agreement)
 - Enhanced detail on risk allocation deemed a positive
 - In instances where bonding limits were multiples of the project requirement additional points were allotted
- Elements of response which decreased marks:
 - Limited detail on risk allocation and approach to assembling performance security for the project

6.3 Approach to Financing Structure

- Responses generally demonstrated a sound understanding and approach to securing bid pursuit costs and raising the requisite short term and long term financing for the projects.
- Elements of responses which increased marks:
 - Thorough discussion of benefits and risks to various forms of capital relevant to this project
 - Clear identification of relevant innovations, backed by experience
 - Clear identification of the roles and responsibilities of an FA
- Elements of response which decreased marks:
 - Limited details on innovations, role of the financial advisor, and sources of capital to fund project

6.4 Past Experience - Projects & Team Experience

- Respondents generally provide project experience that demonstrated successful bid side pursuits and financings of P3 project across a range of asset classes. Elements of responses which increased marks:
 - Projects were deemed most relevant in “nature and scope” if the evidenced experience in rail procurements, large scale (e.g., over \$600M) financings, and recent.
 - Teaming (multiple members of the proposal having worked together in the past)
 - Evidence of individuals proposed have experience in similar or comparable role on projects submitted.
- Elements of response which decreased marks:
 - Proposed resources not included on all projects submitted.
 - Proposed resources lack seniority or qualifications for proposed role.
 - Proposed team lacks depth beyond key individuals (lack of redundancy in delivery team).

Applicant	Technical Evaluation		Financial Evaluation		Ranking
	Technical Weighted Score	Met 60% threshold? (Yes / No)	Financial Weighted Score	Met 60% threshold? (Yes / No)	
TransitNEXT	83.21	1.0: Yes 2.0: Yes 3.0: Yes 4.0: Yes	74.75	Yes	1
Trillium Link	73.09	1.0: Yes 2.0: Yes 3.0: Yes 4.0: Yes	73.00	Yes	2
Trillium Extension Alliance	72.85	1.0: Yes 2.0: Yes 3.0: Yes 4.0: Yes	72.25	Yes	3
Skyline Transit Group	70.61	1.0: Yes 2.0: Yes 3.0: Yes 4.0: Yes	77.00	Yes	4
Capital Link Partners	66.70	1.0: Yes 2.0: Yes 3.0: Yes 4.0: Yes	64.50	Yes	5