TRILLIUM LINE EXTENSION PROJECT

TECHNICAL EVALUATION | CONSENSUS WORKSHEET

PROPONENT:	TNext	**FINAL GRADE:**	63.61%	**REVISED/VALIDATED GRADE:**	67.27%
DATE:	Start: 27 Sep 2018, 2:10pm End: 01 October 2018 9:45am	**FINAL SCORE:**	318.05	**REVISED/VALIDATED SCORE**	336.35

		Maximum Points	Consensus Grade	Positive and Negative attributes
1.0	**General Technical Submission**			
1.1	**Project Management Plan (maximum of 30 pages, excluding curriculum vitae)**			
1.1.1	General Approach – Project Management Plan	**15**	70%	
				Positive attributes Proposed Design Architect and Safety and Security Manager are strong key individuals with relevant experience. **Negative attributes** M&R Director has no previous experience in projects of similar scope and complexity (no previous experience working on a maintenance site). PA Schedule 9 requires a minimum of 15 years' experience in the maintenance of vehicles, systems and/or infrastructure. Design Manager's resume does not demonstrate that his role in the described projects was similar in scope and complexity to the Trillium Line. Systems Integration Manager has significant industry experience but none in the proposed role. PA Schedule 9 requires "*minimum of 15 years' experience in systems design, requirements traceability, interface capture and management, integration management plan development, systems test plan and procedure development, test program management and systems commissioning."* The Communications and Stakeholder Engagement Director does not have the 10 years' experience required in Schedule 9 (only seven years overall experience). PA Schedule 9 requires "*minimum 10 years' experience leading*

TRILLIUM LINE EXTENSION PROJECT

TECHNICAL EVALUATION | CONSENSUS WORKSHEET

PROPONENT:	TNext	**FINAL GRADE:**	63.61%	**REVISED/VALIDATED GRADE:**	67.27%
DATE:	Start: 27 Sep 2018, 2:10pm End: 01 October 2018 9:45am	**FINAL SCORE:**	318.05	**REVISED/VALIDATED SCORE**	336.35

		Maximum Points	Consensus Grade	Positive and Negative attributes
				communications and stakeholder engagement on transit or transportation construction projects of similar scope and complexity". City involvement in the change management process is unobservable under section 1.1.1 (5) (a), i.e. the submission makes reference to the Proponent's Design Team but there is no reference to the Sponsor's involvement. Consensus: 70% (revised)
1.2	**Integrated Management System (maximum of 30 pages)**	**20**	75%	
				Positive attributes Demonstrates overall understanding of the requirements. Well established corporate IMS system (SNC) has been implemented in the Champlain Bridge Project. **Negative attributes** DMP has no observable feedback loop for City comments. The narrative is overall generic and lacks project-specific details. Consensus: 75% (validated)
1.3	**Environmental Management Plan (maximum of 20 pages, excluding (1)(l))**	**15**	77%	
				Positive attributes: Good list of Environmental Component Management Plans. Good breakdown of monitoring and reporting obligations, EA commitments, PLAAs, and stakeholder consultations. Describes use of ArcGIS data management system, and RAC (Regulatory Approval and Compliance system) for PLAAs status tracking. Individual proposed as Environmental Manager has good local experience.

TRILLIUM LINE EXTENSION PROJECT

TECHNICAL EVALUATION | CONSENSUS WORKSHEET

PROPONENT:	TNext	**FINAL GRADE:**	63.61%	**REVISED/VALIDATED GRADE:**	67.27%
DATE:	Start: 27 Sep 2018, 2:10pm End: 01 October 2018 9:45am	**FINAL SCORE:**	318.05	**REVISED/VALIDATED SCORE**	336.35

		Maximum Points	Consensus Grade	Positive and Negative attributes
				Negative attributes: Includes identification of resources but the number of staff and the resource loading is unobservable. No observable list of sensitive receivers described in the narrative. The strategy for existing contamination has limited project-specific information. Consensus: 77% (validated)
1.4	**Construction Communications and Stakeholder Engagement (maximum of 10 pages)**	**5**	65%	
				Positive attribute: Good content in supporting stakeholder events and outreach meetings. **Negative attributes:** Airport, NRC, CN and VIA are not mentioned in the list of stakeholders. Not listing key project stakeholders reflects the Proponent failure to demonstrate understanding of RFP Schedule 3 Part 1, Section A. (1) which states "*The Proponent is advised to prepare its Technical Submission, which shall demonstrate the Proponent's understanding of the scope of the Works and the Proponent's ability to carry out the Works in accordance with the Project Agreement*." and RFP Schedule 3 Part 1, Section A. 3. (e) which states "*The drawings, technical reports, plans and other information submitted as part of the Proponent's Technical Submission must address the scope of the Works and demonstrate that the Proponent (…) understands the Project risks to be borne by Project Co and has a plan to address such risks.*" No reference to communications strategy during the maintenance period as per RFP Schedule 3 Part 1 Section 1.4 (4) (a) (ii), which states "*A description of how the Proponent team will interface with the Sponsor team, as well as internal and external stakeholders, at various stages of the Project, including design, construction, testing & commissioning, and maintenance*". Guiding principles provided for content, but no relevant examples of similar projects as per RFP Schedule 3-1 Article 1.4 (d).

TRILLIUM LINE EXTENSION PROJECT

TECHNICAL EVALUATION | CONSENSUS WORKSHEET

PROPONENT:	TNext	**FINAL GRADE:**	63.61%	**REVISED/VALIDATED GRADE:**	67.27%
DATE:	Start: 27 Sep 2018, 2:10pm End: 01 October 2018 9:45am	**FINAL SCORE:**	318.05	**REVISED/VALIDATED SCORE**	336.35

		Maximum Points	Consensus Grade	Positive and Negative attributes
				Consensus: 65% (validated)
1.5	**Works Schedule PBS-1 (maximum of 10 pages excluding PBS-1)**	**30**	70%	
				Positive attributes Proposed durations were provided for City permits. **Negative attributes** The submission does address critical path and near critical path activities, and lists certain activities in the schedule (3rd party utility interface, permitting, design, segments 1 and 5) that are part of the critical path, but those do not constitute the entirety of the critical path shown in the Proponent's PBS-1. Describing "Utilities, permits and design" does not describe the path to substantial completion. The definition of Critical Path in Schedule 12 states: "Critical Path(s)" means the longest sequence, in terms of time, of logically connected Activities from start to finish on the Current PBS ending with (…) the relevant Scheduled Substantial Completion Date, where the total duration is longer than any other sequence of activities in respect of such relevant Scheduled Substantial Completion Date/ Scheduled Final Completion Date." DMP is being prepared concurrently with major elements of the design, which is non conformant with PA Schedule 11, Section 2.5 (f) that states "Design and Construction Activities shall not be started on any component until after the DMP and CMP have been prepared and submitted to the City in accordance with Schedule 10 – Review Procedure". Narrative implies that Project Co will need the City to relax the requirements for fully coordinated design packages, which demonstrates that Proponent does not fully understand the Project scope of work and the PA requirements. RFP Schedule 3 Part 1, Section A. (1) states "The Proponent is advised to prepare its Technical Submission, which shall demonstrate the Proponent's understanding of the scope of the Works and the Proponent's ability to carry out the Works in accordance with the Project Agreement.").

TRILLIUM LINE EXTENSION PROJECT

TECHNICAL EVALUATION | CONSENSUS WORKSHEET

PROPONENT:	TNext	**FINAL GRADE:**	63.61%	**REVISED/VALIDATED GRADE:**	67.27%
DATE:	Start: 27 Sep 2018, 2:10pm End: 01 October 2018 9:45am	**FINAL SCORE:**	318.05	**REVISED/VALIDATED SCORE**	336.35

		Maximum Points	Consensus Grade	Positive and Negative attributes
				Fare control delivery date is incorrectly stated as being throughout 2019, which demonstrates that Proponent does not fully understand the Project scope of work and the PA requirements (RFP Schedule 3 Part 1, Section A. (1)). Schedule 15-2 Part 1, Section 5.4 (l) (ii) A i. states “Installation by OC Transpo requires one month notice prior to the installation and one week per Station for the actual installation. Access is to be staggered so that installation can be performed one Station at a time. The installation shall be scheduled to begin no more than four months prior to Trial Running.” The delivery of fare control equipment proposed in 2019 is well in advance of the timeline defined in PSOS. Segments 1 and 5 are not coordinated between the narrative and PBS-1 (segment 1 in the PBS-1 includes Limebank, but Limebank is not included in segment 1 in the narrative) Basis of Design reports are not considered in the PBS-1, which is non conformant with the requirements in Schedule 10, section 1.4 (a) (i). Consensus: 70% (revised)
1.6	**Risk Management Plan (maximum of 10 pages – excluding Risk Register)**	**5**	73%	
				Positive attributes: Describes management accountability of risks. Describes risk management software however does not provide a sample/extraction. **Negative attributes:** The risk management approach focuses mostly on risks that are the responsibility of the City and 3rd parties, rather than Project Co risks. Generic statements with limited project-specific information and limited detail. Did not reference previous project where the risk management tools were used, or how the mentioned tools will be used to mitigate risks.

TRILLIUM LINE EXTENSION PROJECT

TECHNICAL EVALUATION | CONSENSUS WORKSHEET

PROPONENT:	TNext	**FINAL GRADE:**	63.61%	**REVISED/VALIDATED GRADE:**	67.27%
DATE:	Start: 27 Sep 2018, 2:10pm End: 01 October 2018 9:45am	**FINAL SCORE:**	318.05	**REVISED/VALIDATED SCORE**	336.35

		Maximum Points	Consensus Grade	Positive and Negative attributes
				Risk register was provided but the list of mitigations is limited and risks are generally addressed by monitoring rather than mitigating. The list of M&R risks is not comprehensive. Design Manager is not referenced in the integration of the risk management process with the team members. Emphasis in the narrative of "risk mitigation through the segmentation of the project" seems misplaced (project requirements impose segmentation of the line into Existing line/New line/Airport link for all proponents). Consensus: 73% (validated)
1.7	**Systems Integration Management Plan (SIMP) (maximum of 30 pages)**	**15**	62%	
				Positive attributes N/A **Negative attributes** The RFP requires a high-level description of the SIMP, but this should not include inaccurate information, such as references to elements that do not form part of the Project scope of work, e.g. a catenary system, Traction Power Substations, free-issued equipment, and no connection between the TVS and the Stage 1 head-end, nor should it omit critical City tasks such as the integration of fare control equipment in the stations. This demonstrates that the Proponent lacks understanding of the scope of Works. RFP Schedule 3 Part 1, Section A. (1) states "The Proponent is advised to prepare its Technical Submission, which shall demonstrate the Proponent's understanding of the scope of the Works and the Proponent's ability to carry out the Works in accordance with the Project Agreement." Schedule 15-2 Part 1, Section 11.2 (g) (iii) states that "The SIMP shall, as a minimum, define (…) The functional, performance, Reliability, Maintainability, and Safety requirements of the individual elements forming the integration or interface." The high-level SIMP submission does not provide any information on RAMs.

TRILLIUM LINE EXTENSION PROJECT

TECHNICAL EVALUATION | CONSENSUS WORKSHEET

PROPONENT:	TNext	**FINAL GRADE:**	63.61%	**REVISED/VALIDATED GRADE:**	67.27%
DATE:	Start: 27 Sep 2018, 2:10pm End: 01 October 2018 9:45am	**FINAL SCORE:**	318.05	**REVISED/VALIDATED SCORE**	336.35

		Maximum Points	Consensus Grade	Positive and Negative attributes
				Section 1.7 (b) of RFP Schedule 3 Part 1 requires the SIMP to include "A preliminary schedule of normal Systems Integration activity including high-level dependency task durations of City Parties where work done is being done by others.". The dependencies were not included in the Proponent's submission. Consensus: 62% (validated)
1.8	**Early Works Agreement**	**NOT SCORED**		

		Maximum Points	Consensus Grade	Positive and Negative attributes
2.0 DESIGN SUBMISSION				
2.1	**Civil and Guideway Design Submission (maximum of 50 pages)**	**25**	**52%**	
				Positive attributes: Municipal roadway restoration and alteration drawings are good. **Negative attributes:** Double tracking (RFP Schedule 3 Part 1, Section 2.1 (1) (g)) is acknowledged, but the response does not address how the alignment is being designed to protect for it (double-tracking is only mentioned on structures). As mentioned in the SME request N.031, the Brookfield siding is non conformant with Schedule 15-2 Part 2, Section 1.2 (a) (ii) C. Shortening of the Brookfield siding will result in a non-conformant passing siding and will affect the VIA grade separation. Further, the TNext network model indicates

TRILLIUM LINE EXTENSION PROJECT

TECHNICAL EVALUATION | CONSENSUS WORKSHEET

PROPONENT:	TNext	**FINAL GRADE:**	63.61%	**REVISED/VALIDATED GRADE:**	67.27%
DATE:	Start: 27 Sep 2018, 2:10pm End: 01 October 2018 9:45am	**FINAL SCORE:**	318.05	**REVISED/VALIDATED SCORE**	336.35

		Maximum Points	Consensus Grade	Positive and Negative attributes
				Brookfield siding as a pinch point (see section 3.4-17, which states that minor delays will be caused by single track usage "particularly at Brookfield"), which has unacceptable operational impacts. RFP Schedule 3 Part 1 Section 2.1 (m) states "*Provide a structural approach describing how the existing structures will be upgraded and maintained to conform to the Output Specifications. The approach shall include a narrative on each Existing Structure and the Proponent's proposed approach to upgrades, lifecycle and maintenance*". The submission does not propose an approach to lifecycle and maintenance for Rideau River Bridge. While considering no rehabilitation of the bridge is a possible solution, it needs to be substantiated with lifecycle and maintenance considerations as requested in RFP Schedule 3 Part 1 Section 2.1 (m). The Rideau River Bridge narrative states that the requirement for an E-80 live load will be addressed solely by applying a speed restriction, which does not meet the intent of the Output Specifications, as mentioned in RFP Schedule 3 Part 1, Section A. 3. (c) states "*drawings, technical reports, plans and other information submitted as part of the Proponent's Technical Submission must address the scope of the Works and demonstrate that the Proponent will deliver the Works in accordance with the intent of the reference concept design drawings provided in the Background Information and Output Specifications*" The Rideau River Bridge requires a pedestrian barrier/railing system on each side of the structure, which was not provided and is a non-conformance with PSOS Schedule 15-2 Part 2 Section 4.8 (c) (xxii) C. As stated in the Conformance Report, the NRC 200m run-off is not provided, which has operational impacts and is non-conformant with PSOS Schedule 15-2 Part 2 1.2 (b) (i) G.

PROPONENT:	TNext	**FINAL GRADE:**	63.61%	**REVISED/VALIDATED GRADE:**	67.27%
DATE:	Start: 27 Sep 2018, 2:10pm End: 01 October 2018 9:45am	**FINAL SCORE:**	318.05	**REVISED/VALIDATED SCORE**	336.35

		Maximum Points	Consensus Grade	Positive and Negative attributes
				No information provided on “how system elements will be accommodated within the guideway” as required in RFP Schedule 3 Part 1, Section 2.1 (1) (f). The submission contains several inconsistencies, e.g. -track design described in the narrative (figure 8 on page 2.5-12) is not consistent with the drawings: specifically the Walkley interlocking track layout is inconsistent between the narrative and the trackwork drawing package and doesn’t reflect the actual conditions in the field; - As described in SME requests n.018, the Ellwood diamond is mentioned to be retained for future freight but the drawings do not support this statement, These demonstrate a lack of understanding of the scope of Project (RFP Schedule 3 Part 1, Section A. 3. (a) states “*The drawings, technical reports, plans and other information submitted as part of the Proponent’s Technical Submission must address the scope of the Works and demonstrate that the Proponent (…) understands the scope of the Project)* RFP Schedule 3 Part 1, Section 2.1 (1) (d) states “The Proponent shall address the guideway design as set out in or otherwise referenced in Schedule 15-2 of the Project Agreement, and shall provide a narrative statement describing the alignment design that includes (…) A description of how the track and guideway will be designed to remain free of snow, ice build-up and vegetation that could impact operation of the system.” The submission only addresses snow and ice on the switches and does not address how the guideway or other trackwork will be designed to remain free of snow and ice-buildup. The submission does not address how the track and guideway will be designed to remain free of vegetation. Earl Armstrong, Lester, and Leitrim are not designed to E80 loading, which does not conform with the PSOS intent, specifically with Schedule 15-2 Part 2, 1.1 (c) which states “*The entire Expanded Trillium Line, which falls within*

TRILLIUM LINE EXTENSION PROJECT

TECHNICAL EVALUATION | CONSENSUS WORKSHEET

PROPONENT:	TNext	**FINAL GRADE:**	63.61%	**REVISED/VALIDATED GRADE:**	67.27%
DATE:	Start: 27 Sep 2018, 2:10pm End: 01 October 2018 9:45am	**FINAL SCORE:**	318.05	**REVISED/VALIDATED SCORE**	336.35

		Maximum Points	Consensus Grade	Positive and Negative attributes
				the existing rail corridor, is subject to be designed to accommodate freight. Project Co shall provide a continuous single-Track freight route, with the following exceptions (…)" and with Schedule 15-2 Part 2 Appendix C. Additionally, Lester Road is part of an active freight corridor, which further demonstrates lack of understanding of the Project scope. Consensus: 52% (validated)
2.2	**Utilities, Geotechnical, Drainage and Stormwater Management, Urban Design and Landscape Architecture (maximum of 45 pages)**	**25**	**80%**	
				Positive attributes: Geotechnical Describes clear geotechnical monitoring points, located logically by adjacent structures. Stratigraphic profile drawings are comprehensive and clear. Detailed description of proposed monitoring program and typical instrumentation. Detailed description of further geotechnical investigations to be performed. Good interpretation of the current conditions; noted the Leda clay concerns. Utilities State that no relocation is required for the Hydro One crossings (however proof of design is unobservable). Rail over road in Leitrim avoids significant portion of utility work. Novatech (subcontractor) has good local experience and demonstrated project understanding. **Negative attributes:** No detail provided on integration of public art. Limited project-specific detail on geo-environmental contamination.

PROPONENT:	TNext	**FINAL GRADE:**	63.61%	**REVISED/VALIDATED GRADE:**	67.27%
DATE:	Start: 27 Sep 2018, 2:10pm End: 01 October 2018 9:45am	**FINAL SCORE:**	318.05	**REVISED/VALIDATED SCORE**	336.35

		Maximum Points	Consensus Grade	Positive and Negative attributes
				Stormwater Management narrative is unclear as to the intent, referring to "may" and "might" in several instances. Consensus: 80% (validated)
2.3	**Systems Design Submission (maximum of 40 pages)**	**25**	**52%**	
				Positive attributes N/A **Negative attributes** RFP Schedule 3 Part 1, Section 2.3 (1) (c) (i) states "*A narrative of the proposed Signalling and Train Control Solution and how the it addresses Schedule 15-2, Part 3, section 10*". While the Proponent is not required to provide a vendor/supplier-specific product, the proposed S&TC solution is required to demonstrate that the Proponent can fulfil this requirement. Any number of existing technology solutions could have been selected and proposed as a solution, e.g. Wi-fi, Positive Train Control, Track Circuits, etc. in order to meet the submission requirements and enable the evaluation of the solution. TNext submission states "At the time of the technical submission we are still finalizing the option selection process", which does not meet the requirements in RFP Schedule 3 Part 1, Section A. 3. which states: "*The drawings, technical reports, plans and other information submitted as part of the Proponent's Technical Submission must address the scope of the Works and demonstrate that the Proponent: (a) understands the scope of the Project; (b) has the ability (…) to deliver the Works in accordance with the Project Agreement*"

TRILLIUM LINE EXTENSION PROJECT

TECHNICAL EVALUATION | CONSENSUS WORKSHEET

PROPONENT:	TNext	**FINAL GRADE:**	63.61%	**REVISED/VALIDATED GRADE:**	67.27%
DATE:	Start: 27 Sep 2018, 2:10pm End: 01 October 2018 9:45am	**FINAL SCORE:**	318.05	**REVISED/VALIDATED SCORE**	336.35

		Maximum Points	Consensus Grade	Positive and Negative attributes
				Note that this is the only section of the RFP submission requirements that requires a proposed “solution”, as opposed to a proposed “approach”. Consensus: 52% (validated)
2.4	**Station Design Submission (maximum of 40 pages)**	**30**	**62%**	
				Positive attributes: Extensive use of glazing for weather protection. Airport Station structure is designed to accommodate expansion for a double track platform. New Stations include fully enclosed Communications rooms. **Negative attributes:** Station design includes access to Stations through lengthy ramps (no stairs provided) which are non-conformant with PSOS Schedule 15-2 Part 4 Section 1.2 (f), in what concerns CPTED requirements and passenger transfer effort. This was raised as a non-conformance in the Conformance Report. Uplands Station single platform configuration translates into costumer service impacts and erodes operational flexibility, demonstrating limited understanding of project needs and lack of understanding of RFP Schedule 3 Part 1, Section A. 3. (c) which states “*The drawings, technical reports, plans and other information submitted as part of the Proponent’s Technical Submission must address the scope of the Works and demonstrate that the Proponent (…) will deliver the Works in accordance with the intent of the reference concept design drawings provided in the Background Information and Output Specifications*”. Additionally this was raised as a Conformance Event (TN-NC011: Uplands Station). While the vehicle information was provided by the City, and proponents had access to the vehicle, the narrative mentions the need to “obtain further

PROPONENT:	TNext	**FINAL GRADE:**	63.61%	**REVISED/VALIDATED GRADE:**	67.27%
DATE:	Start: 27 Sep 2018, 2:10pm End: 01 October 2018 9:45am	**FINAL SCORE:**	318.05	**REVISED/VALIDATED SCORE**	336.35

		Maximum Points	Consensus Grade	Positive and Negative attributes
				information on the vehicle metrics to confirm the vertical gap can be met at the Alstom LINT door threshold", which demonstrates lack of understanding of the requirements in RFP Schedule 3 Part 1, Section A. 3. (b), which states "*The drawings, technical reports, plans and other information submitted as part of the Proponent's Technical Submission must address the scope of the Works and demonstrate that the Proponent (…) has the ability, resources and approach to deliver the Works in accordance with the Project Agreement".* Consensus: 65% (validated)
2.5	**New Walkley Yard Design Submission (maximum of 30 pages)**	**20**	**60%**	
				Positive attributes: N/A **Negative attributes:** Schedule 15-2 Part 5, section 1.5 – Yard Operations (b) requires "The switches within the New Walkley Yard shall be of the same type (dual control with hand or powered operation available) as used elsewhere on the Expanded Trillium Line and as specified herein". The proposed design includes double slip switches which are not proposed on the main line, and therefore this is a non-conformance. In addressing the requirement for no single points of failure (no redundancy leaving the yard) in Schedule 15-2 Part 5, Section 1.1 (c) (iii) the design considers a turn out and connection trough the adjacent freight CN yard. This solution is outside the Lands and therefore non conformant with Schedule 33. Furthermore it demonstrates lack of understanding of the regulatory environment, and of the track conditions in the CN yard, potentially compromises the Stadler warrantee, would rely on a new commercial

PROPONENT:	TNext	**FINAL GRADE:**	63.61%	**REVISED/VALIDATED GRADE:**	67.27%
DATE:	Start: 27 Sep 2018, 2:10pm End: 01 October 2018 9:45am	**FINAL SCORE:**	318.05	**REVISED/VALIDATED SCORE**	336.35

		Maximum Points	Consensus Grade	Positive and Negative attributes
				agreement with CN, and requires approval requirements from Transport Canada (which have not been discussed in the submission). This demonstrates lack of understanding of the requirement in RFP Schedule 3 Part 1, Section A. 3. which states "*The drawings, technical reports, plans and other information submitted as part of the Proponent's Technical Submission must address the scope of the Works and demonstrate that the Proponent: (a) understands the scope of the Project*" The design addresses the requirement in Schedule 15-2 Part 5, Section 1.2 (a) (vi) "The City areas include but are not limited to (…) washrooms with a minimum of two shower rooms. Shower rooms may be unisex and do not need to be accessed directly from washrooms" by providing one universal shower room with two shower stalls, which is non conformant. The tent structures provided for the MSF were not considered in the response to RFP Schedule 3 Part 1 Section 2.5 (f) (v) which states "*The Proponent shall address the New Walkley Yard design as set out in or otherwise referenced in Project Agreement Schedule 15-2, and shall include the following (…) Life Cycle Analysis: A written narrative describing life cycle approach to all building components, systems and major pieces of equipment including but not limited to:* *(A) Building envelope and exterior finishes;* *(B) Interior finishes;* *(C) Mechanical & electrical equipment; and* *(D) Industrial equipment.*" The submission response is non conformant with Schedule 15-2 Part 1, section 4.3 (a) (i) and Schedule 15-2 Part 5 Section 1.1 (c) (viii) which require specific Design Life for the MSF buildings. This was identified in the Conformance Review. The Conformance Review identified a non-conformance with Schedule 15-2 Part 5 Section 6.4 (e) (i) which states "*Redundant back-up generators*

PROPONENT:	TNext	**FINAL GRADE:**	63.61%	**REVISED/VALIDATED GRADE:**	67.27%
DATE:	Start: 27 Sep 2018, 2:10pm End: 01 October 2018 9:45am	**FINAL SCORE:**	318.05	**REVISED/VALIDATED SCORE**	336.35

		Maximum Points	Consensus Grade	Positive and Negative attributes
				connections shall be able to assume the entire load of the Facility during critical events including 25% spare capacity for future growth. Generator shall be size to assure no interruption to revenue service or to normal Revenue Vehicle servicing and administrative operations." Consensus: 60% (revised)
2.6	**Vehicle Fleet Design Submission (maximum of 30 pages)**	**20**	**60%**	
				Positive attributes Wabtec (subcontractor) has previous experience integrating systems into the Stadler vehicles. Past experience in the safety certification of Alstom LINT. **Negative attributes** TNext states that the City has yet to obtain Alstom information which TNext requires in order to progress the design and integration of on-board equipment (Sections 2.6-7 and 2.6-13 of the submission). This does not meet the requirements in RFP Schedule 3 Part 1, Section A. 3. (b) which states "*The drawings, technical reports, plans and other information submitted as part of the Proponent's Technical Submission must address the scope of the Works and demonstrate that the Proponent (…) (b) has the ability, resources and approach to deliver the Works in accordance with the Project Agreement*", particularly as is relates to the integration of the on-board systems (RFP Schedule 3 Part 1 section 2.6 (2) (a) (ii)). The submission response to section 2.6 (2) (a) (i) of RFP Schedule 3 Part 1 does not specifically address Project Co's experience in the integration of on-board systems in the existing vehicles. This also does not meet the requirements in RFP Schedule 3 Part 1, Section A. 3. (b) which states "*The drawings, technical reports, plans and other information submitted as part of*

PROPONENT:	TNext	**FINAL GRADE:**	63.61%	**REVISED/VALIDATED GRADE:**	67.27%
DATE:	Start: 27 Sep 2018, 2:10pm End: 01 October 2018 9:45am	**FINAL SCORE:**	318.05	**REVISED/VALIDATED SCORE**	336.35

		Maximum Points	Consensus Grade	Positive and Negative attributes
				the Proponent's Technical Submission must address the scope of the Works and demonstrate that the Proponent (…) (b) has the ability, resources and approach to deliver the Works in accordance with the Project Agreement". Consensus: 60% (revised)
2.7	**Airport Link (No limit)**	**NOT SCORED**		
2.8	**System Safety and Security Certification (Maximum Pages 15)**	**10**	**75%**	
				Positive attributes: Key individual is strong in relation to rail systems experience, and experience with rail system certification. Provided a comprehensive listing of key issues. Approach to re-certification, operation and maintenance hazards, and monitoring risks on an on-going basis is good. **Negative attributes:** Narrative is generic with limited project-specific information. Consensus: 75% (validated)
2.9	**Dow's Lake Tunnel Design Submission (maximum of 10 pages)**	**10**	**79%**	
				Positive attributes: Approach to the pumping system (proposing a five pump system) is unique. Significant enhancements proposed to the pump house building however lacking site plan.

TRILLIUM LINE EXTENSION PROJECT

TECHNICAL EVALUATION | CONSENSUS WORKSHEET

PROPONENT:	TNext	**FINAL GRADE:**	63.61%	**REVISED/VALIDATED GRADE:**	67.27%
DATE:	Start: 27 Sep 2018, 2:10pm End: 01 October 2018 9:45am	**FINAL SCORE:**	318.05	**REVISED/VALIDATED SCORE**	336.35

		Maximum Points	Consensus Grade	Positive and Negative attributes
				Negative attributes: Narrative is vague on crack repairs. Assumed design fire load of 33,6MW which may no longer be applicable. Consensus: 79% (validated)

		Maximum Points	Consensus Grade	Positive and Negative attributes
3.0	**CONSTRUCTION SUBMISSION**			
3.1	**Emergency Response Plan (maximum of 20 pages)**	**10**	**72%**	
				Positive attributes: Describes integration with IMS. Good outline of roles and responsibilities. Approach acknowledges the unique environment at the Airport and describes past experience working at the Airport. Provides example of a crisis team. **Negative attributes:** Very generic descriptions, lacking project-specific information. No description about responding to roadways adjacent to the Lands. Limited detail provided on potential railroad incidents (VIA, CN). Consensus: 72% (validated)
3.2	**Traffic and Transit Management Plan and Construction Access Management Plan (maximum of 40 pages)**	**25**	**79%**	
				Positive attributes:

PROPONENT:	TNext	**FINAL GRADE:**	63.61%	**REVISED/VALIDATED GRADE:**	67.27%
DATE:	Start: 27 Sep 2018, 2:10pm End: 01 October 2018 9:45am	**FINAL SCORE:**	318.05	**REVISED/VALIDATED SCORE**	336.35

		Maximum Points	Consensus Grade	Positive and Negative attributes
				Demonstrates past experience on Stage 1, and working with CN under CROR. Good understanding of third parties involved in the project, e.g. Carleton, CN, VIA, NRC. Commitment to keeping transit running at South Keys and Bayview during construction. Propose a temporary MUP bridge at Carleton, which is a good solution to maintain pedestrian access across the corridor. Design proposes rail over road structures which minimize traffic impact. **Negative attributes:** Limited detail on construction access management. Haul route map was of inappropriate scale, and limited detail, and there was no description provided as to how the haul operations will take place. Lacks detail on specific plans and schedules for some of the major impacts. Consensus: 79% (validated)
3.3	**Construction Plan (maximum of 40 pages, excludes staging drawings)**	**40**	**75%**	
				Positive attributes: Demonstrates good past experience, and provides lessons learned from Stage 1. Team members are currently working at the Airport. Approach to construction considers release of areas after construction. Airport staging drawings are comprehensive and address potential access/egress staging issues. **Negative attributes:** Staging drawings are only provided at select locations and lack details on the scope of work. Appears to misunderstand the schedule of the interim projects. Does not acknowledge the schedule constraints related to performing works on the existing line.

PROPONENT:	TNext	**FINAL GRADE:**	63.61%	**REVISED/VALIDATED GRADE:**	67.27%
DATE:	Start: 27 Sep 2018, 2:10pm End: 01 October 2018 9:45am	**FINAL SCORE:**	318.05	**REVISED/VALIDATED SCORE**	336.35

		Maximum Points	Consensus Grade	Positive and Negative attributes
				Consensus: 75% (revised)
3.4	**System Testing and Commissioning Plan (maximum of 25 pages)**	**25**	**60%**	
				Positive attributes Figure 1 provides a good interpretation of the layering of PA requirements, EN50126 and ISO15288 over the V-model. **Negative attributes** RFP Schedule 3 Part 1 section 3.4 (1) (e) requires Proponents to "*Identify the scope and type of Minor Deficiencies that may be deferred beyond Substantial Completion, and the process and timelines to expeditiously correct the identified deficiencies.*" Scope and type of Minor Deficiencies is not provided. The response did not follow the definition of Minor Deficiencies. The submission response to RFP Schedule 3 Part 1 section 3.4 (2) (g) provided insufficient demonstration of an understanding of the simulation requirements and specified parameters, including dwell times and application of sub optimal performance factors for realistic operations. Schedule 15-2 Part 1 section 3.6 (b) (i) B i which states "*The simulation shall reflect Project Co's final design including Track alignment, special Trackwork, curvature, grades, and Station Platform limits*" and section 3.6 (b) (i) E - Station Dwell Times provide requirements for the simulation. In their network model (TNext submission page 3.4-22) the Proponent indicates that delays due to dwell time variations and waiting at sidings for single track usage are not included in the simulation calculations. This demonstrates a clear misunderstanding of the requirement, which is to account for all system delays and use that information to inform the track alignment. RFP Schedule 3 Part 1 section 3.4 (2) (d) requires proponents to provide a "*narrative demonstrating an understanding of and compliance with the Project Agreement*" which will describe "*Capability to support a reliable 12 minute headway*": The submission does not provide the analysis to

PROPONENT:	TNext	**FINAL GRADE:**	63.61%	**REVISED/VALIDATED GRADE:**	67.27%
DATE:	Start: 27 Sep 2018, 2:10pm End: 01 October 2018 9:45am	**FINAL SCORE:**	318.05	**REVISED/VALIDATED SCORE**	336.35

		Maximum Points	Consensus Grade	Positive and Negative attributes
				substantiate that a 12 min headway can be supported on the Airport Link, including how a single platform approach at Uplands would work operationally. RFP Schedule 3 Part 1 section 3.4 (2) (d) requires proponents to provide a "*narrative demonstrating an understanding of and compliance with the Project Agreement"* which will to describe "*Capability to support a reliable 12 minute headway*": The TNext modelling articulates pinch points at the Brookfield siding. Despite this pinch point, TNext has chosen to reduce the length of the Brookfield siding. Consensus: 60% (revised)
3.5	**Health and Safety Certification (no page limit)**	**NOT SCORED**		
3.6	**Mobility Matters Lanes (maximum of 5 pages)**	**5**	**70%**	
				Positive attributes: N/A **Negative attributes:** N/A Consensus: 70% (revised)

		Maximum Points	Consensus Grade	Positive and Negative attributes
4.0	**MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION SUBMISSION**			
4.1	**Maintenance & Rehabilitation Approach to Part 1 of Schedule 15-3 of the Project Agreement (maximum of 30 pages)**	**40**	**60%**	
				Positive attributes

TRILLIUM LINE EXTENSION PROJECT

TECHNICAL EVALUATION | CONSENSUS WORKSHEET

PROPONENT:	TNext	**FINAL GRADE:**	63.61%	**REVISED/VALIDATED GRADE:**	67.27%
DATE:	Start: 27 Sep 2018, 2:10pm End: 01 October 2018 9:45am	**FINAL SCORE:**	318.05	**REVISED/VALIDATED SCORE**	336.35

		Maximum Points	Consensus Grade	Positive and Negative attributes
				N/A **Negative attributes** RFP Schedule 3 Part 1 section 4.1 (2) requires the Proponent to "*Provide a description of the approach of the Maintenance Director to problems encountered, solutions identified and strategies implemented, based on their experience on comparable transit projects*". Only generic strategies were provided (with no basis on previous experience on "*comparable transit projects*"). The submission response did not provide a description of the problems encountered, solutions identified or strategies implemented, based on their experience on comparable transit projects. RFP Schedule 3 Part 1 section 4.1 (1) (g) requires "*the approach to mobilization of the Maintenance and Rehabilitation Services for the System Infrastructure before the Revenue Service Commencement and for further certainty Existing System Infrastructure transferred after Financial Close, including details of the Proponent's approach to safety, quality and environmental compliance, communications, recruitment, training and addressing any other issues identified by the Proponent*." No mobilization of M&R services is indicated in the submission prior to May 2021. As of May 2020 Project Co maintenance services will be required for standby maintenance on the existing fleet and for maintenance of the Walkley interlocking. Mobilization of Project Co maintenance services does not appear to occur prior to May 2021. RFP Schedule 3 Part 1 section 4.1 (1) (f) (ii) requires "*details of the organizations and service providers involved in delivery of Maintenance and Rehabilitation Services, including, (…) (ii) approximate number of staff to be deployed – including differentiation between direct employees and sub-contractors required"*. The narrative does not provide details on service providers. RFP Schedule 3 Part 1 section 4.1 (2) (g) requires "*Provide a description of the approach of the Maintenance Director to problems encountered, solutions identified and strategies implemented, based on their experience on comparable transit projects, for: (…) (g) work safety programs*". The

PROPONENT:	TNext	**FINAL GRADE:**	63.61%	**REVISED/VALIDATED GRADE:**	67.27%
DATE:	Start: 27 Sep 2018, 2:10pm End: 01 October 2018 9:45am	**FINAL SCORE:**	318.05	**REVISED/VALIDATED SCORE**	336.35

		Maximum Points	Consensus Grade	Positive and Negative attributes
				narrative refers to a Safety Policy but no details regarding Work Safety Programs are provided. RFP Schedule 3 Part 1 section 4.1 (2) (j) requires "*Provide a description of the approach of the Maintenance Director to problems encountered, solutions identified and strategies implemented, based on their experience on comparable transit projects, for: (…) (j) maintenance-related emergency response protocol*". The narrative refers to a future Emergency Response Plan but no details of maintenance related emergency response protocols are provided. Consensus: 60% (validated)
4.2	**Maintenance & Rehabilitation Approach to Appendix A (Maintenance Performance Requirements) to Schedule 15-3 of the Project Agreement (maximum of 30 pages)**	**40**	**70%**	
				Positive attributes N/A **Negative attributes** Proponent's response does not address **how** the M&R mobilization will meet Project Co's obligations in Appendix A to Schedule 15-3, as required in RFP Schedule 3 Part 1, Section 4.2 (1) (c). Response to RFP Schedule 3 Part 1 4.2 (4) (b) does not include "*a detailed description of Project Co.'s understanding of the reporting requirements of federally controlled railroads*" (no description provided). Submission does not address mitigation of paymech deductions and KPIs., as required in RFP Schedule 3 Part 1, Section 4.2 (1) (d) (i) (E). Consensus: 70% (revised)

TRILLIUM LINE EXTENSION PROJECT

TECHNICAL EVALUATION | CONSENSUS WORKSHEET

PROPONENT:	TNext	**FINAL GRADE:**	63.61%	**REVISED/VALIDATED GRADE:**	67.27%
DATE:	Start: 27 Sep 2018, 2:10pm End: 01 October 2018 9:45am	**FINAL SCORE:**	318.05	**REVISED/VALIDATED SCORE**	336.35

		Maximum Points	Consensus Grade	Positive and Negative attributes
4.3	**Maintenance & Rehabilitation Approach to Appendix B (Asset Preservation) to Schedule 15-3 of the Project Agreement (maximum of 25 pages (excluding lifecycle work schedule))**	**35**	**65%**	
				Positive attributes The submission mentions the Capital Rail bridge safety management plan. **Negative attributes** RFP Schedule 3 Part 1 section 4.3 (1) (d) (iv) states "*the scope, activities, and processes associated with Records and the Asset Management Plan, including (…) the Proponent's approach to ensuring compliance with all regulatory testing and inspections*". No approach is provided regarding specific regulatory testing and inspections (track inspections, signal inspections), no reference made to the regulator (i.e. Transport Canada), and no reference made to vehicle regulatory inspection rules. This demonstrates lack of understanding of the requirement in RFP Schedule 3 Part 1, Section A. 3. which states "*The drawings, technical reports, plans and other information submitted as part of the Proponent's Technical Submission must address the scope of the Works and demonstrate that the Proponent: (a) understands the scope of the Project*" Conformance Review includes a non-conformance with section 5 (e) (ii) (error in the section reference, it should be 5 (i) (i)) of Schedule 15-3 Appendix B, related to the condition assessment and reporting on vehicles. The vehicle condition assessment and reporting is required annually. Proponent indicates 10, 15 and 22 year for minimum condition assessments in table 3 (TNext submission page 4.3-5) which is non conformant. Consensus: 65% (validated)

TRILLIUM LINE EXTENSION PROJECT

TECHNICAL EVALUATION | CONSENSUS WORKSHEET

PROPONENT:	TNext	**FINAL GRADE:**	63.61%	**REVISED/VALIDATED GRADE:**	67.27%
DATE:	Start: 27 Sep 2018, 2:10pm End: 01 October 2018 9:45am	**FINAL SCORE:**	318.05	**REVISED/VALIDATED SCORE**	336.35

		Maximum Points	Consensus Grade	Positive and Negative attributes
4.4	**Maintenance & Rehabilitation: Approach to Appendix C (Expiry Date Requirements) to Schedule 15-3 and Schedule 23 – Expiry Transition Procedure of the Project Agreement (maximum of 5 pages)**	**10**	**70%**	
				Positive attributes: N/A **Negative attributes:** N/A Consensus: 70% (validated)