



**Trillium Line Extension
OLRT Bid Evaluation Steering Committee (BESC)
October 3 2018**

Meeting Minutes

Place	NRF Offices (Ottawa)
Date	October 3, 2018
Time	1:00-5:00PM
Invited	<p><u>BESC Members:</u> Geoffrey Gilbert (Lead) [GG] Simon Dupuis [SD] Remo Bucci [RB]</p> <p><u>Technical Evaluation Team:</u> Peter Schwartzenruber (Technical Evaluation Lead) [PS]</p> <p><u>Support:</u> Emily Marshall-Daigneault (Evaluation Manager) [EMD] Raquel Gold (Technical Procurement Lead) [RG] Martin Masse (Legal SME) [MGM] Oliver Grant (Fairness) [OG] Mike Harvey (Evaluation Coordinator) [MWH]</p>
Regrets	

Notes:

	Description	Lead
1.	Introduction, Opening Remarks	EMD, OG
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluations were a five week process • Consensus was achieved by the Technical Evaluation Team on all sections and notes in worksheets • Fairness provided introduction and overview from Fairness perspective 	
2.	Technical Ranking Presentation	PS
	<p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction to Proponents, TEA, TLINK, TNEXT • Evaluation process – consulted the RFP criteria, including the Technical Submission Requirements, and the Evaluation Framework • Individual evaluations followed by consensus meetings • Evaluated each sub-section based on a grade translated into a percentage, using the grade-to-score matrix provided in the Evaluation Framework • Considered the language in the Evaluation Framework that states “Evaluators should note that a finding by the Technical Conformance Team that a Proponent’s design is conformant, which will be vetted by the OLRT Bid Evaluation Steering Committee, a Proponent has attained a presumptive design score of 70%. The Technical Evaluation Team may nonetheless assess a score of more or less than 70%, at its discretion.” 	

	Description	Lead
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The grading process followed the Evaluation Framework language in respect to “In assigning scores based on grades, evaluators should generally assign the middle score for that grade; however, higher or lower scores may be assigned where appropriate.” • Overview of Rankings, confirmed that the Framework requires two-decimal points. • Green highlights in the worksheets identify discussion items that could be referenced during FNP period. • Consistency check was performed at the end of the Evaluation process to ensure that the scoring was fair and not dependant on order of first Evaluation Consensus. • Submissions were evaluated on an individual basis, not by comparison between them. <p><u>TLINK</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Leitrim Station Design non-conformance was considered in scoring, still maintained a score of 88%, as it was only one grade separation of 14 in the project. - For clarity, to score 88% means that it is better than Mid, but not quite High in the Good category - Score for each section is a total of all sub-sections (weighted). - Presented negotiation items suggested for FNP as well as exceedances. <p><u>TEA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluation of items such as self-supplied construction materials were evaluated based on response within their submission only, rather than external knowledge that Tomlinson owns a concrete company, for example. - Presented negotiation items suggested for FNP as well as exceedances. <p><u>TNEXT</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation to BESC began with review of evaluation findings at a high-level in order to understand the breadth of identified issues with the TNEXT Technical submission. - Individual detailed notes were then presented to BESC. - The RFP Technical Submission Requirements (Schedule 3, Part 1) were the basis for requirements. - Vehicle SME should be consulted in respect to the outstanding Alstom information mentioned in the TNext submission. - Agreed that the temporary tent structures comment should be removed from presentation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - BESC: Failure would mean that their solution did not conform to the RFP requirements and a perfect solution should be the equivalent of 100%. - BESC: Concern that there was an instructional issue. Need to review each instance in which the evaluation grade was below 70% to ensure we have specifically asked for the information. If we have not, then that should not be the reason they received a failing grade on that section. - BESC: If the solution is conformant with PSOS, then there is a strong rationale that the section should be scored 70% grade and a higher grade should be as a result of a better solution or better quality of submission - BESC: If there is a score below 70%, then there is a positive obligation on the evaluators to point to specific deficiencies in the submission/solution as it relates to the RFP requirements. 	
3.	Questions	BESC
	<p><u>TLINK:</u> Q: Did grade separation issue at Leitrim affect other components of their submission? PS: No, it only affected Section 2.1.</p> <p><u>TEA:</u> Q: What was the impact of lack of weather-proofing on evaluation scoring, since it was across all locations and not just one? PS: TNext scored a 69% on that section and did not pass.</p>	

Description	Lead
<p>Q: How much did the exceedances affect scoring and procedure? PS: They would score higher for events that were exceedances, but it was not a pre-determined value, such as 100.</p> <p>Q: Was an exceedance necessary to score 100? PS: Exceedances were not necessary to score 100. A score of 100 was a level of understanding to fully satisfy the expected requirements.</p> <p><u>BESC questions on the TNEXT Evaluation requiring follow-up:</u></p> <p><u>Overall</u> Q: How does the philosophy impact the scoring? If the submission meets the RFP requirements, then there is a strong rationale for the proponent to get a passing grade. Q: If a Key Individual resource was presented and approved as part of RFQ process then how can they fail? They should not, will have to review what was presented as part of RFQ, and through the RFI process.</p> <p><u>Section 1</u> Q: When discussing Project Risks, the Risk Management Plan should include relevant ProjectCo risks and not focus on external risks for the City, but we did not ask for that specifically? Q: Did not provide adequate level of detail for the SIMP and the intent would be to <u>extract the SIMP</u>, where did we ask for that? Q: What does it mean that the Critical Path does not have clear link to Substantial Completion? Q: No Rideau River Bridge maintenance is set up for capital investment into the bridge spans? There was also no link to maintenance plan, but why does it matter?</p> <p><u>Section 2</u> Q: Did not provide any detail about train control system other than saying they intend to meet PSOS? What were the details provided in the second signalling solution? If they committed to building a signalling solution that met the output specifications why is that a failed response? Q: What does it mean that they are waiting for more Alstom information in order to progress the design? Please confirm that our vehicle SME confirms that the information they indicate was not provided was provided and when and where. Q: If there are temporary structures, do the technical submission requirements require details on lifecycle and durability? If this is not a requirement then they should not be penalized for it. Q: Did the RFP state that we could not use double-slip switches? Q: One of the weaknesses identified for the MSF solution is the number of fueling stations, specifically that the proponent does not outline their plan for contamination control. If this is not a requirement then they should not be penalized for it. Q: Review comments on Brookfield Siding. Q: Review comments on New Walkley Yard layout</p> <p><u>Section 3</u> Q: The haul route map, where does it say that it was recommended?</p>	

	Description	Lead
	<p>Q: Section 3 – does not include their project-specific training requirements, where do we ask for that specifically?</p> <p>Q: What did they not provide in their testing and commissioning narrative specifically? Does not illustrate testing and commissioning interfaces?</p> <p>Section 4</p> <p>Q: What is the concern raised that they will mobilize M&R team in May 2021. Construction team will could potentially run M&R in the meantime. Do they need to tell us?</p> <p>Q: No detail provided on Work Safety Programs, was that a requirement?</p> <p>Q: Where do we ask specifically for KPIs? If they are held to the paymech schedule, then is it recommended?</p> <p>Q: LRV Maintenance didn't differentiate between Alstom and Stadler? Where in the Technical Requirements did we require them to differentiate?</p> <p>Q: They said they were extending the useful life for VFM purposes, (but they did not say how they would do it?</p> <p>Q: Limited detail regarding the interface with stakeholders?</p> <p>FNP:</p> <p>Q: Did we pass 4 key individuals already in RFQ? Cannot necessary fail them? If approved during RFQ phase, then they must pass again in RFP.</p>	
4.	Next Steps	BESC/EMD
	<p>BESC believes there are inconsistencies with the evaluation methodology and believes they need to provide better direction to the Technical Evaluation Team</p> <p>BESC will provide better direction and the Technical Evaluation Team is recommended to reconvene Consensus.</p> <p>If a score is below 70%, they must be very clearly not able to meet specifications laid out in the PA.</p> <p>Next steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evaluation Manager to direct the Financial Evaluation Team to put the financial evaluation on hold. 2. BESC will provide clear direction and instructions to the Technical Evaluation team in the form of a memo, with reference to RFP criteria, through the Evaluation Manager, further to review by Fairness. MH to provide questions from this meeting. 3. Martin Masse will be available as Legal SME during Technical Evaluation Consensus. 4. Recommend reconvening Technical Evaluation Consensus. 	

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: Mike Harvey