

RFP SCHEDULE 3

STEP 2 PROCESS

SECTION A - OVERVIEW

A1. Schedule 3 Definitions

A1.1 In this Schedule 3, unless the context indicates a contrary intention, terms which are defined in the RFP (and not otherwise defined in this Schedule 3) shall have meanings given to them in the Request for Proposals and the following terms shall have the following meanings:

- (a) **“Business Day”** means any Calendar Day, other than a Saturday, Sunday, or a statutory or civic holiday observed by the City;
- (b) **“Calendar Day”** means the period from one midnight to the following midnight on every day of the year;
- (c) **“Cash Allowance Amount”** is defined in Appendix C – Financial Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria;
- (d) **“CCM Guidelines”** is defined in Section A3.1;
- (e) **“Certificate of Authorization”** means the certificate issued by Engineers Geoscientists Manitoba (EGM) that authorizes a Person to perform engineering and geoscience work in the Province of Manitoba;
- (f) **“Certificate of Recognition (COR)”** means the Manitoba (COR) certificate and Letter of Good Standing as issued under the COR program administered by the Construction Safety Association of Manitoba (CSAM) or by the Manitoba Heavy Construction Association (MHCA), WORKSAFETY™, COR™ program;
- (g) **“Construction Team”** means the Proponent Team Member(s) who will plan and perform construction activities for the Project;
- (h) **“Construction Team Lead(s)”** means the Proponent Team Member(s) that will lead and be responsible for the Construction Team and the construction of the Project;
- (i) **“Design Team”** means the Proponent Team Member(s) who will perform the professional engineering and design role(s) for the Project, and will perform compliance certification of their work;
- (j) **“Design Team Lead(s)”** means the Proponent Team Member(s) that will lead the Design Team and be principally responsible for the engineering and design of the Project;
- (k) **“DPA Subcontractor”** means a member of the Proponent Team that is not part of the Primary Team;

- (l) **“Evaluation Categories”** is defined in Section E1.1;
- (m) **“Evaluation Criteria”** means the evaluation criteria set out in Appendix B – Proposal Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria in respect of the Proposal Submission, in Appendix C – Financial Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria in respect of the Financial Submission, and in Appendix E – Scenario-based Interview Guidelines in respect of the Scenario-based Interview;
- (n) **“Final Score”** is defined in Section D6.1;
- (o) **“Financial Score”** is defined in Appendix F – Fee Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Methodology;
- (p) **“Financial Submission”** means the component of the Step 2 Submission submitted in response to the requirements set out in Appendix C – Financial Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria;
- (q) **“First Negotiations Proponent”** is defined in Section F1.1(b);
- (r) **“Indigenous Peoples and Under-Represented Groups”** means indigenous peoples, racialized peoples, newcomers; Persons with Disabilities; Women; people facing Poverty; Veterans, and 2SLGBTQQIA+ (Two-spirit, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Questioning, Intersex, Asexual, Plus) peoples;
- (s) **“Initialization Payment”** is defined in Appendix C – Financial Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria;
- (t) **“Interview Facilitator”** means P3 Advisors Incorporated;
- (u) **“Interview Guidelines”** is defined in Section A4.1;
- (v) **“Milestone Payment”** is defined in Appendix C – Financial Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria;
- (w) **“Monthly Payment”** is defined in Appendix C – Financial Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria;
- (x) **“Negotiations Proponents”** is defined in Section F1.1(b);
- (y) **“Officer”** means an individual authorized by a Person to represent their interests and bind the Person;
- (z) **“Primary Team”** is defined in Appendix C – Financial Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria, Section B1.1
- (aa) **“Project Management Team”** means the Proponent and / or Proponent Team Member(s) who will perform the project management roles during the Project;
- (bb) **“Project Management Team Lead”** means the Proponent Team Member that will lead the Project Management Team, and be principally responsible for the Proponent’s overall project management for the Project;

- (cc) **“Proponent Additional Visit”** means a visit to the Site and NEWPCC Facility separate from any of the Scheduled Visits set out in the RFP Data Sheet and in accordance with Section B3;
- (dd) **“Proponent Representative Contact Individual”** means the individual who shall be responsible for all of the Proponent’s communications with the City with respect to this RFP and the Step 2 Process, and shall be identified as such in all communications with the City during the Step 2 Process;
- (ee) **“Proponent Team”** means all team members that join the Proponent in the Step 2 Process as a Shortlisted Proponent;
- (ff) **“Proponent Team Lead(s)”** means the team member(s) that will lead and be principally responsible for each of the following: the Project Management Team, Design Team and Construction Team;
- (gg) **“Proposal Score”** is defined in Appendix B – Proposal Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria;
- (hh) **“Proposal Submission”** means the component of the Step 2 Submission submitted in response to the requirements set out in Appendix B – Proposal Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria;
- (ii) **“Proposal Submission Information”** means the information contained in the Shortlisted Proponent’s Proposal Submission;
- (jj) **“Scheduled Visits”** is defined in Section B1.1;
- (kk) **“Second Negotiations Proponent”** is defined in Section F1.1(b);
- (ll) **“Skilled Labour”** means workers certified for an occupation by a regulatory authority, which includes being classified under the ten (10) Heavy Construction job classifications (Source: [Employment Standards | Employment Standards | Heavy Construction and Wage Schedule \(gov.mb.ca\)](#)) or classified under any of the following ICI categories: Journeyperson, Skilled Tradesperson, Trainee, and Construction Worker (Source: *Province of Manitoba*) as outlined in the Province of Manitoba’s *Construction Industry Wages Act and The Employment Standards Code* (Source: [Employment Standards | Employment Standards | ICI Construction and Wage Schedule \(gov.mb.ca\)](#)); [Employment Standards | Employment Standards | Heavy Construction and Wage Schedule \(gov.mb.ca\)](#));
- (mm) **“Technical Requirements”** means Schedule 18 of the draft Design Build Agreement including all appendices; and
- (nn) **“Work”** or **“Works”** means, depending on context, at least one of: (i) the design, engineering, construction, installation, training, commissioning, testing and completion of the Project, including correction and rectification of any items on the deficiency list, preparation of project closeout documents, Warranty work, all other work and activities necessary to fulfill the requirements of the Development Phase Agreement and Design Build Agreement; and (ii) the infrastructure and

other deliverables resulting from the foregoing activities or otherwise created pursuant to the Project.

A2. Introduction

A2.1 Subject to Section C5 of the RFP, only those Shortlisted Proponents that were identified through the Step 1 Process that preceded this Step 2 Process are eligible to participate in the Step 2 Process. The Shortlisted Proponents are listed in the RFP Data Sheet.

A3. Commercially Confidential Meetings

A3.1 All Proponents are strongly advised to review and abide by the CCM guidelines as set out as Appendix D – Commercially Confidential Meeting Guidelines with respect to the various rules and requirements for the conduct of Commercially Confidential Meetings (the “**CCM Guidelines**”). The City intends to follow the CCM Guidelines and expects the Shortlisted Proponents to do so, except in exceptional circumstances.

A3.2 Although strongly encouraged, attendance to the CCMs are not mandatory.

A4. Scenario-based Interview

A4.1 All Proponents are strongly advised to review and abide by the interview guidelines as set out as Appendix E – Scenario-based Interview Guidelines with respect to the various rules and requirements for the conduct during the Scenario-based Interview (the “**Interview Guidelines**”). The City intends to follow the Interview Guidelines and expects the Shortlisted Proponents to do so, except in exceptional circumstances.

A4.2 Attendance to the Scenario-based Interview is mandatory and failure to attend may result in disqualification of the Proponent’s Step 2 Submission.

SECTION B SITE VISITS

B1. Scheduled Visits

B1.1 In the RFP Data Sheet, the City has established scheduled dates and times for visits to see the NEWPCC Facility (“**Scheduled Visits**”) for all Shortlisted Proponents, Proponent Team Members and their respective representatives and Advisors. For clarity, Scheduled Visits do not include any Proponent Additional Visits scheduled in accordance with Section B3.

B1.2 The provisions of Section B2 shall apply to Scheduled Visits and Proponent Additional Visits.

B1.3 Neither Scheduled Visits nor Proponent Additional Visits are mandatory.

B2. NEWPCC Facility Visit Requirements

B2.1 The following shall apply to all NEWPCC Facility visits:

- (a) all Shortlisted Proponent and Proponent Team Member representatives upon arrival at the NEWPCC Facility shall report to the Main Administration Building at the NEWPCC Facility and sign in as required by the NEWPCC Facility;
- (b) the Shortlisted Proponents will meet with the assigned City representatives who will be present and guide the Shortlisted Proponents for the visit. The Shortlisted Proponents will not be permitted to visit the NEWPCC Facility without the presence of the City's representatives for the purposes of this RFP;
- (c) all Shortlisted Proponent and Proponent Team Member representatives shall strictly obey all instructions from the City's representatives during the visit and other requirements;
- (d) all Shortlisted Proponent and Proponent Team Member representatives shall have and wear, as applicable, Canadian Standards Association compliant personal protection equipment including but not limited to, hard hats, protective footwear, safety glasses, and high visibility vests (hearing protection can be provided by the City if required); and
- (e) the Shortlisted Proponent and Proponent Team Member representatives shall visit only those specific areas of the NEWPCC Facility to which the Shortlisted Proponent has been granted access in the Contact Person's confirmation.

B2.2 The Shortlisted Proponent acknowledges that because the NEWPCC Facility is in use, unforeseen circumstances can arise at the NEWPCC Facility and the City may, in its sole discretion, cancel or reschedule the visit, change the areas of access or otherwise change the visit on short notice or no notice to the Shortlisted Proponent and Proponent Team Members or their representatives.

B3. Proponent Additional Visits

B3.1 A Shortlisted Proponent that wishes to arrange a Proponent Additional Visit shall submit a request via Commercially Confidential RFI at least five Business Days prior to the Shortlisted Proponent's proposed date and time for the Proponent Additional Visit. The request shall set out the:

- (i) proposed date and time, and alternate date and time, of the proposed Proponent Additional Visit;
- (ii) purpose of the Proponent Additional Visit;
- (iii) areas of the NEWPCC Facility for which access is requested; and
- (iv) names, titles and contact information of the Shortlisted Proponent's representatives who will be attending the Proponent Additional Visit.

SECTION C – STEP 2 SUBMISSION FORMAT AND EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS

C1. Step 2 Submission Contents

C1.1 Shortlisted Proponents shall prepare their Step 2 Submissions by completing and submitting the information and forms required by the following Appendices in accordance with the instructions set out in this RFP Schedule 3:

- (a) Appendix A – Step 2 Submission Forms;
- (b) Appendix B – Proposal Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria;
- (c) Appendix C – Financial Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria;
- (d) Appendix D – Commercially Confidential Meeting Guidelines;
- (e) Appendix E – Scenario-based Interview Guidelines;
- (f) Appendix F – Fee Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Methodology;
- (g) Appendix G – Financial Submission Form; and
- (h) Appendix H – Form of Surety's Consent.

C2. Step 2 Submission Format and Content

C2.1 Proponents shall submit Step 2 Submissions organized in accordance with and in the format set out in Appendices A to C.

C2.2 Proponents shall submit Step 2 Submissions in two parts as follows:

- (a) The Proposal Submission consisting of:
 - (i) Section A – Step 2 Submission Forms;
 - (ii) Section B – Key Individuals Qualifications and Experience; and
 - (iii) Section C – Project Management Methodology;
- (b) Financial Submission consisting of Proponent's submission in response to the requirements set out in Appendix C – Financial Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria, provided that all individual documents are organized in a logical manner and are clearly labelled with reference to headings and numbering system in Appendix C – Financial Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria.

C2.3 The Step 2 Submission shall be submitted in the following format:

- (a) Submit Proposal Submission in a single searchable and printable PDF file;
- (b) Submit Financial Submission in a single searchable and printable PDF file;

- (c) Submit Appendix G – Financial Submission Form from the Financial Submission in a Microsoft Excel file.

C2.4 The Proponent should comply with the following with respect to Section C2.3:

- (a) maximum page counts for the Step 2 Submission are as follows:
 - (i) Section A: no page limit;
 - (ii) Section B: 6 pages per Form; and
 - (iii) Section C: 20 pages;
- (b) all parts of the Step 2 Submission shall use font sizes and line spacing to promote legibility;
- (c) all parts of the Step 2 Submission should have numbered pages; and
- (d) PDF files shall be printable on 8 ½ x 11 inch paper or 11 x 17 inch paper, as applicable.

C2.5 If there are page limits set out in C2.4(a), the Proponent should limit its Step 2 Submission, or each component of the Step 2 Submission, to the maximum pages indicated in C2.4(a). Proponents are cautioned that the City will not review or score pages or other materials submitted in excess of the page limits. For greater clarity, any page limit set out in the RFP Documents shall apply to all materials submitted by the Proponent in response to the item that is the subject of such limit, whether submitted in the text of the Step 2 Submission or included as an appendix, schedule or other attachment to the Step 2 Submission. A single cover page (or a tab) stating only “Section Title” in the Step 2 Submission to introduce parts will not be included in the page limit.

C2.6 The City may reject a Step 2 Submission as being non-responsive if the Step 2 Submission is incomplete, obscure or conditional, or contains additions, deletions, alterations or other irregularities. The City may reject all or any part of any Step 2 Submission, or waive technical qualification requirements or minor informalities or irregularities if the interests of the City so require.

SECTION D PARTS OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS

D1. Part 1 – Completeness and Legal Review

D1.1 In Part 1 of the evaluation process, the City will open each Step 2 Submission and review the contents of the Step 2 Submission to assess whether it is substantially complete. The substantial completeness review will assess whether the required information and forms have been substantially completed and included in the Step 2 Submission. A Shortlisted Proponent’s failure to provide a substantially complete Step 2 Submission will result in the Step 2 Submission not being evaluated. For the purposes of this Step 2 Process, “substantially complete” means that all documents have been submitted as required by these RFP Documents and have been completed without any major gaps in the information. For clarity, “substantially complete” is not a test of “absolute completeness”.

- D1.2 If, in the sole discretion of the City, a Step 2 Submission is not substantially complete, the City may, in its sole discretion, without liability, cost or penalty, elect not to proceed with the evaluation of the Step 2 Submission and the Step 2 Submission shall not be given any further consideration. For clarity, if the City determines that a Shortlisted Proponent's Proposal Submission is not substantially complete pursuant to Section D1.1, the City may, in its sole discretion, elect not to proceed with the evaluation of that Shortlisted Proponent's Financial Submission.
- D1.3 Unless the RFP Documents explicitly state that a Shortlisted Proponent will or may be disqualified for a particular failure to comply with the requirements of the RFP Documents, Shortlisted Proponents will not be disqualified for failing to comply with the requirements for the format or substance of their Step 2 Submissions. However, Shortlisted Proponents are likely to be penalized (i.e. receive lower scores) in the evaluation of their Step 2 Submissions if they fail to comply with the requirements of the RFP Documents.
- D1.4 For clarity, the use of the terms "shall" or "must" in the RFP Documents does not supersede the approach to compliance set out in this Section D1.3 and is not intended to indicate that a failure to comply with the applicable requirement will result in disqualification.
- D1.5 An omission or error in connection with the requirements of the Step 2 Process will not lead to the automatic rejection of the Step 2 Submission concerned, provided that, if requested by the City, the Shortlisted Proponent remedies the error or omission to the City's satisfaction within the time determined by the City, which must be at least three Business Days following the date on which the Shortlisted Proponent receives a written request to that effect from the Contact Person. For clarity, the City shall be entitled to request a Shortlisted Proponent to remedy any error or omission including in relation to any pass/fail requirements.

D2. Part 2 – Review of the Step 2 Submission Form

- D2.1 In Part 2 of the evaluation process, the City shall review the Step 2 Submission Forms to:
- (a) ensure that all forms has been properly completed and signed;
 - (b) ensure that there have been no changes to the Shortlisted Proponent or Proponent Team Members from their Step 1 Submissions, except for changes that have been approved by the City in accordance with Section C5 of the RFP; and
 - (c) assess the Conflict of Interest and Confidential Information section of the Step 2 Submission Form.

D3. Part 3 – Review and Scoring of the Proposal Submission

- D3.1 In Part 3 of the evaluation process, the Evaluation Team or, as applicable, a sub-team of the Evaluation Team will evaluate and score the Proposal Submission and determine whether the Proposal Submission has achieved a minimum score in accordance with Section E2 and Appendix B – Proposal Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria. Only those Shortlisted Proponents that achieve a "pass" on their Proposal Submissions will be considered in Part 5 of the evaluation process.

D4. Part 4 – Review and Scoring of the Scenario-based Interview

- D4.1 The City intends to conduct a scenario-based interview (the "**Scenario-based Interview**") to assess how a Proponent demonstrates the behaviours required to implement effective collaborative working. The process for the Scenario-based Interview is set out in Appendix E – Scenario-based Interview Guidelines. The results of the Scenario-based Interview will be evaluated and scored in accordance with Appendix E – Scenario-based Interview Guidelines.
- D4.2 The Scenario-based Interview will be comprised of an interactive, collaborative and behavioural assessment workshop. The approximate date of the Scenario-based Interview is set out in the Timetable.

D5. Part 5 – Review and Scoring of the Financial Submission

- D5.1 In Part 5 of the evaluation process, the Evaluation Team or, as applicable, a sub-team of the Evaluation Team will open, evaluate and score the Financial Submissions in accordance with Section E5 and Appendix C – Financial Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria to assess which Financial Submission presents the best value for the City.

D6. Part 6 – Ranking the Proponents

- D6.1 The Evaluation Team will rank the Shortlisted Proponents based on a sum of the Shortlisted Proponent's Proposal Score and Financial Score, (the "**Final Score**") as follows:
- (a) Proposal Score 700 pts;
 - (b) Scenario-based Interview 200 pts; and
 - (c) Financial Score 100 pts.
- D6.2 The Evaluation Team shall rank only those Shortlisted Proponents that have met all requirements in Parts 1 through 5.
- D6.3 In the event of a tie in the Final Scores between two Shortlisted Proponents, the City may, in its sole discretion, give the higher ranking to the Proponent with the higher Proposal Score.

SECTION E - STEP 2 PROCESS EVALUATION

E1. Evaluation Criteria

- E1.1 The contents of the Proposal Submission will be evaluated against the Evaluation Criteria set out in Appendix B – Proposal Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria and the contents of the Financial Submission will be evaluated against the financial Evaluation Criteria set out in Appendix C – Financial Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria. The submission requirements set out in Appendix B – Proposal Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria and Appendix C – Financial Submission

Requirements and Evaluation Criteria are organized into categories (the “**Evaluation Categories**”).

- E1.2 The Evaluation Categories are listed in Table 1 – Evaluation Categories below. The organization and structure of the Evaluation Categories correspond to the organization and structure of the submission requirements set out in Appendix B – Proposal Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria and Appendix C – Financial Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria. The evaluation and scoring process for the Proposal Submission and the Financial Submission will award points in each Evaluation Category. The number of points for each Evaluation Category will range from zero to the maximum number of points for each Evaluation Category set out in the Evaluation Categories table below.
- E1.3 Each Evaluation Category has been designated with a maximum number of points, and the designation of maximum points will apply to that Evaluation Category as a whole, and will not be subdivided among the individual Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria set out for that Evaluation Category unless specifically indicated.

Table 1 – Evaluation Categories

Evaluation Categories	Maximum Points
Proposal Submission	700
Section A. Step 2 Submission Forms	N/A
Section B. Qualifications and Experience of Key Individuals	400
Section C. Project Management Methodology	300
Scenario-based Interview	200
Financial Submission	100
Financial and Performance Security Information	Pass/Fail
Development Phase and Implementation Phase Pricing	100
Maximum Points Available	1000

E2. Evaluation of Proposal Submission

- E2.1 The Evaluation Team will evaluate each Shortlisted Proponent’s Proposal Submission based on the scoring system set out in Section E3 and the Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria in Appendix B – Proposal Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria to establish each Shortlisted Proponent’s Proposal Score.
- E2.2 Shortlisted Proponents must obtain a minimum score of 420 out of 700 points in order to be considered further in the Step 2 Process.

E3. Scoring of Proposal Submission

E3.1 A Step 2 Submission that has passed the substantial completeness review will be subjected to a scoring evaluation based on the Evaluation Criteria set out in Appendix B.

E3.2 Generally, scoring of the submission requirements of the Proposal Submission against the evaluation criteria will be done a 0 to 5 scale. The scoring criteria is as follows:

Score	Scoring Criteria
0	The component of the Proposal Submission has not been submitted.
1	The component of the Proposal Submission is incomplete or inadequate, not allowing for full evaluation. When evaluated against the evaluation criteria, the component does not meet the Proposal Submission requirements in Appendix B – Proposal Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria. Material deficiencies noted.
2	The component of the Proposal Submission is complete. When evaluated against the evaluation criteria, the component does not meet, or can only partially meet, the Proposal Submission requirements in Appendix B – Proposal Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria. Material deficiencies noted.
3	The component of the Proposal Submission is complete. When evaluated against the evaluation criteria, the component can mostly meet the Proposal Submission requirements in Appendix B – Proposal Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria. Only non-material deficiencies noted.
4	The component of the Proposal Submission is complete. When evaluated against the evaluation criteria, the component fully meets the Proposal Submission requirements in Appendix B – Proposal Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria. No deficiencies noted.
5	The component of the Proposal Submission is complete. When evaluated against the evaluation criteria, the component exceeds the Proposal Submission requirements in Appendix B – Proposal Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria and may provide additional benefit to the City. No deficiencies noted, or if any non-material deficiencies are noted, they are mitigated by enhancements in the Proposal Submission.

E3.3 A score of 0 to 5 will be given for each separate Proposal Submission requirement in accordance with how well it compares against the evaluation criteria listed in Appendix B – Proposal Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria. The score ratio out of 5 is multiplied by the maximum possible points to calculate the points contribution for that Proposal Submission requirement (rounded to one decimal place). These are summed for each Proposal Submission requirement to determine the total points contribution for the Step 2 Submission Section.

E4. Evaluation of Scenario-based Interview

E4.1 The Evaluation Team will evaluate each Shortlisted Proponent's Scenario-based Interview results based on the scoring system and evaluation criteria set out in Appendix E – Scenario-based Interview Guidelines to establish each Shortlisted Proponent's Scenario-based Interview Score.

E5. Evaluation of Financial Submission

E5.1 The Evaluation Team will evaluate each Shortlisted Proponent's Financial Submission based on the scoring system set out in Section E1 and the Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria set out in Appendix C – Financial Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria to establish each Shortlisted Proponent's Financial Score.

SECTION F – COMPETITION, NEGOTIATIONS, AND THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE PREFERRED PROPONENT

F1. Evaluation Results and the Identification of a Preferred Proponent or Negotiations Proponents

F1.1 Based on the ranking established pursuant to Section D6, the City may, in its sole discretion:

- (a) identify the highest ranked Shortlisted Proponent as the Preferred Proponent, based upon the Shortlisted Proponent's Step 2 Submission as submitted;
- (b) identify the two highest ranking Shortlisted Proponents as the "**First Negotiations Proponent**" (highest ranked) and the "**Second Negotiations Proponent**" (second highest ranked) (the "**Negotiations Proponents**") and enter into negotiations with the First Negotiations Proponent and, failing successful negotiations, enter into negotiations with the Second Negotiations Proponent and identify the Shortlisted Proponent with whom the City concludes successful negotiations as the Preferred Proponent; or
- (c) enter into separate and distinct but contemporaneous negotiations with the First and Second Negotiations Proponents and identify a Preferred Proponent as a result of those negotiations.

F1.2 The City may use the negotiations process to negotiate any aspect of a Negotiations Proponent's Step 2 Submission, the Draft Agreements, or combination thereof.

F1.3 If, in accordance with Sections F1.1(b) and F1.1(c), the Preferred Proponent and the City negotiate revisions to the Development Phase Agreement, the City and the Preferred Proponent shall reflect those revisions in a revised Development Phase Agreement and, for the purposes of this Section F, the revised Development Phase Agreement shall be the "Development Phase Agreement".

F1.4 For greater clarity, the City may, in its sole discretion, elect to change the selection of which of the Section F1.1 negotiations processes to employ at any time during the application of Section F.

F2. Identification of the Preferred Proponent

F2.1 Subject to Section H1 of the RFP, the City intends to identify a Preferred Proponent in accordance with Section F1.

F3. Preferred Proponent Obligations

F3.1 The Preferred Proponent shall achieve Execution of the DPA prior to the Execution of the DPA Target Date based on the Development Phase Agreement in substantially the same form and content as finalized prior to the Submission Deadline or on the Development Phase Agreement as revised and agreed to by the Preferred Proponent and the City.

F3.2 The Preferred Proponent shall provide access and shall promptly make available to the City and its Advisors, agents and representatives such documentation, financial and technical information as may be reasonably requested by the City from time to time in connection with the City's due diligence investigations including, without limitation, copies of any written representations, statements, assurances, commitments or agreements which the Preferred Proponent, any Proponent Team Member or any of their respective Advisors have received from any municipality, governmental authority or utility relating to the Project. The Preferred Proponent shall provide to the City, in a timely fashion, final draft versions of all documents required to be delivered by the Preferred Proponent in accordance with the Development Phase Agreement, together with such other documentation as the City may reasonably request from time to time.

F4. The City's Authorization and Approvals

F4.1 The Preferred Proponent acknowledges and agrees that the entering into of the Development Phase Agreement by the City is conditional on and subject to the City obtaining any necessary authorizations and approvals required in connection with the Project, including, for greater certainty, the approval of any relevant governmental authority.

APPENDIX A

STEP 2 SUBMISSION FORMs

FORM A-1 –STEP 2 MASTER SUBMISSION FORM

Name of Proponent: _____

Name of Proponent Representative: _____

Address: _____

City / Province / Postal: _____

Proponent
Representative Contact: _____

Title: _____

Telephone: _____ Fax: _____

Alternate Telephone: _____ E-mail: _____

The above named Proponent Representative hereby declares on its own behalf and, for clarity, on behalf of all Proponent Team Members that:

- (a) it has the power and authority to bind the Proponent for the purpose of the RFP Step 2;
- (b) the Proponent is a:
 - a sole proprietor
 - a limited liability or general partnership
 - a corporation
 - a joint venture
 - Other _____

carrying on business under the above mentioned Proponent name;

- (c) it acknowledges that all terms not otherwise defined herein shall have the meaning given to them in the RFP;
- (d) the Proponent agrees to comply with and be bound by the requirements, terms and conditions contained in the RFP;
- (e) the Proponent acknowledges its obligations regarding confidential information contained in C7 of RFP and agrees to be, bound by such terms, irrespective of whether the Proponent, potential Proponent Team Members or Proponent Team Members submit a Step 2 Submission in the RFP Step 2 Process;

- (f) the information submitted in the Step 2 Submission or otherwise related to the RFP is accurate and complete;
- (g) the information required by the RFP has been provided in the Step 2 Submission;
- (h) the Proponent recognizes that subject to provisions of B17, the information submitted will be treated as confidential and will be used only to identify a Preferred Proponent based on their Step 2 Submission;
- (i) the Proponent agrees that the information submitted may be clarified, verified and investigated by the City and that pertinent information may be obtained and hereby consent to such clarification, verification and investigation;
- (j) the Proponent agrees that the City is not obliged, in any way whatsoever, to carry out further clarifications, verifications or investigations of any Step 2 Submission;
- (k) the Proponent understands that any omission or failure to substantially complete the Step 2 Submission or failure to substantially comply with a requirement included in the RFP may result in the Proponent being disqualified;
- (l) the Proponent understands that it must submit a substantially complete Step 2 Submission in accordance with the timelines and requirements of the RFP and a failure to do so may result in disqualification of the Proponent;
- (m) the Proponent understands that the RFP is not an offer to enter into any contract of any kind whatsoever and is not intended to create a bidding contract (often referred to as "Contract A");
- (n) the Proponent understands that the RFP does not constitute any offer of work by the City;
- (o) the Proponent acknowledges [C8] of the RFP and understands that the Proponent may be disqualified if the Proponent or any Proponent Team Member breaches the provisions of [C8], or has been convicted of carrying out inappropriate bidding or procurement practices or engaging in unethical behaviour in relation to a procurement process in Canada;
- (p) the Proponent confirms that the Proponent and each Proponent Team Member has conducted itself with integrity and propriety and has not engaged in any inappropriate bidding practices or unethical behaviour in the course of this Step 2 Process, and there are no charges or investigations by a public body or convictions related to inappropriate bidding practices or unethical behaviour by the Proponent or any Proponent Team Member in relation to a tender or procurement in any Canadian jurisdiction that:
 - (i) are related to the Project;
 - (ii) may compromise the reputation or integrity of the City so as to affect public confidence in the Project; or
 - (iii) would contravene any applicable law or could have a material adverse effect on the Proponent or any Proponent Team Member in a way which could impair the Proponent or any Proponent Team Member's ability to perform its obligations under the Development Phase Agreement or the Development Phase Agreement;

This Form A-1 –Step 2 Master Submission Form has not been modified in any manner, except to include the Proponent’s information required by this Form.

In witness whereof, the Proponent Representative has executed this Form A-1 – Master Step 2 Submission Form as of the date indicated below.

Date: _____

Proponent Representative

Per: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

Company _____

Per: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

Company _____

I/We have authority to bind the Proponent Representative and to bind the Proponent and each Proponent Team Member.

FORM A-2 – STEP 2 PROPONENT TEAM MEMBER CONSENT DECLARATION

I, _____, am an authorized officer or director of _____

(“Proponent Team Member”) and confirm for and on behalf of the Proponent Team Member and without any personal liability that:

- (a) the Proponent Team Member has read and understands the RFP Step 2 and acknowledges that all terms not otherwise defined herein shall have the meaning given to them in the RFP Step 2;
- (b) the Proponent Team Member agrees to be bound by the requirements of the RFP Step 2;
- (c) the Proponent Team Member consents to its inclusion in the Proponent’s Step 2 Submission;
- (d) the Proponent Team Member confirms that the Step 2 Submission accurately reflects the qualifications of the Proponent Team Member;
- (e) the Proponent Team Member consents to the City performing reference checks in accordance with the RFP Step 2;
- (f) the Proponent Team Member understands and accepts the obligations imposed on the Proponent and itself through the Proponent, as a result of the Step 2 Submission; and
- (g) declares that this Form A-2 – Step 2 Proponent Team Member Consent Declaration has not been modified in any manner, except to complete the required information.

In witness whereof, the Proponent Team Member has executed this Form A-2 – Step 2 Proponent Team Member Consent Declaration as of the date indicated below.

Date _____

Proponent Team Member

Per: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

Per: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

I/We have authority to bind the Proponent Team Member.

**FORM A-3 – STEP 2 CONFLICT OF INTEREST, CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION AND LITIGATION
DECLARATION**

[NOTE TO PROPONENTS: Notwithstanding the submission of this declaration, Conflicts of Interest must be disclosed to the Contract Person as soon as one is discovered by the Proponent or a Proponent Team Member.]

This Form A-3 – Step 2 Conflict of Interest, Confidential Information and Litigation Declaration is delivered pursuant to the RFP Step 2. All terms not otherwise defined herein have the meaning given to them in the RFP Step 2.

Notwithstanding the existence of and/or submission of this declaration, the Proponent hereby acknowledges C8 and the Proponent's obligation to continue to declare all Conflicts of Interest as soon as one is discovered and is under a continuing obligation to disclose all Conflicts of Interest that exist or may exist in the future.

The Proponent Representative hereby declares on behalf of the Proponent, the Proponent Team Members that:

1. There is not nor was there any actual or perceived Conflict of Interest or
any other type of unfair advantage in our submitting the Step 2
Submission. True Not True

If the answer to the above statement is "Not True", attach:

- a. on a separate page, a list and explanation of situations, each of which may be a Conflict of Interest or an instance of unfair advantage, or which may appear as a potential Conflict of Interest or unfair advantage in the Proponent submitting the Step 2 Submission and/or
- b. all correspondence related to any Conflict of Interest information which was submitted to the Contact Person prior to the Submission Deadline in accordance with C8.

2. We have no knowledge of or the ability to avail ourselves of Confidential Information (other than Confidential Information which may have been disclosed by the City to the Proponents in the normal
course of the Request for Proposals) that is or was relevant to the
Project or the Request for Proposals evaluation process. True Not True

If the answer to the above statement is "Not True", attach, on a separate page, a brief explanation.

3. Neither the Proponent nor the Proponent Team Members are the subject of any adverse ruling or conviction determined in the last 5 years involving fraud, fraudulent misrepresentation or professional misconduct.
True Not True

If the answer to the above statement is "Not True", attach, on a separate page, a brief explanation.

4. Neither the Proponent nor the Proponent Team Members are involved in any litigation that is currently ongoing, either directly or indirectly (e.g. through a related party) that:

- | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) is against or involving the City; or | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | True | Not True |
| b) may materially adversely affect the Proponent's or the Proponent Team Member's ability to participate in the Project; or | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) may materially adversely affect the City's reputation or Project procurement process if the City selects the Proponent as the Preferred Proponent; | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

If the answer to any of the above statements is "Not True", attach, on a separate page, a brief explanation and include the following information: (1) plaintiff name; (2) defendant name; (3) year litigation initiated; (4) disputed amount (\$CAD); and (5) nature of dispute.

- .1 This Form A-3 – Step 2 Conflict of Interest, Confidential Information and Litigation Declaration has not been modified in any manner, except to complete the required information.
- .2 Full disclosure of the requirements set out in the RFP Step 2 has been made.

In witness whereof, the Proponent Representative has executed this Form A-3 – Step 2 Conflict of Interest, Confidential Information and Litigation Declaration as of the date indicated below.

Date: _____

Proponent Representative

Per:

Name: _____

Title: _____

Company _____

Per:

Name: _____

Title: _____

Company _____

I/We have authority to bind the Proponent Representative and to bind the Proponent and each Proponent Team Member.

APPENDIX B

PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

Proposal Submission Requirement	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
Section A – Step 2 Submission Forms			Pass/Fail
<u>Special Instructions:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the name and official capacity of all individuals signing Form A-1 Step 2 Submission Forms shall be printed below the related signature; and • if a Step 2 Submission is submitted jointly by two or more Persons, the term “Proponent” shall mean each and all such Persons, and the undertakings, covenants and obligations of such Persons in the Step 2 Submission shall be both joint and several 			
Form A-1: Step 2 Master Submission Form	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Form fully completed • All addenda acknowledged • Signed and dated by Proponent Representative(s) 	Pass/Fail	
Form A-2: Step 2 Proponent Team Member Consent Declaration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For each Proponent Team Member: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Form fully completed ○ Signed and dated 	Pass/Fail	
Form A-3: Step 2 Conflict of Interest, Confidential Information and Litigation Declaration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Form fully completed • Signed and dated by Proponent Representative(s) 	Pass/Fail	
Section B – Qualifications and Experience of Key Individuals			400
<u>Special Instructions:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • if one individual is fulfilling multiple key roles, separate forms are required per role to outline the scope of services for each specific role. 			

Proposal Submission Requirement	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> if any Key Individual role is not being provided, indicate “not being provided” and provide an explanation in the form for how that Key Individual role will be carried out. “within 10 years” means a project that had a completion date within the last 10 years. A Key Individual may use an ongoing project if it is projected to be completed by December 31, 2023. 			
<p>Form B-1 – Key Individual Qualifications and Experience, Design Build Project Manager</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submit 2 projects 	<p>8 points for qualifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 points: Demonstrates P.Eng., PE, PMP or equivalent licenses and certifications 4 points: Demonstrates 10+ years experience in similar role <p>2 Points: Demonstrates past project experience with another Key Individual or Proponent Team Member</p> <p>15 points for each project (30 Points total)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.5 points: Demonstrates water or wastewater sector project 2.5 points: Demonstrates their scope incorporated an average design flow rate of > 90 ML/d 2.5 points: Demonstrates their scope incorporated a biosolids input of > 30 dry tonnes/day average 1 point: Demonstrates past project was able to meet quality objectives 2.5 points: Demonstrates capital budget of > \$100 M CAD 1.5 points: Demonstrates past project was able to maintain budget 	<p>40</p>	

Proposal Submission Requirement	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 point: Demonstrates past project was able to maintain schedule • 1.5 points: Demonstrates collaborative procurement such as PDB, CMAR, IPD or other types of alternative delivery (DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFMO, other P3) • 1 point: Demonstrates past project within 10 years 		
<p>Form B-2 – Key Individual Qualifications and Experience, Project Design Manager</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submit 2 projects 	<p>8 points for qualifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 points: Demonstrates P.Eng., PE, PMP or equivalent licenses and certifications • 4 points: Demonstrates 10+ years experience in similar role <p>3 Points: Demonstrates past project experience with another Key Individual or Proponent Team Member</p> <p>17 points for each project (34 Points total)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.5 points: Demonstrates wastewater sector project • 3 points: Demonstrates their scope incorporated an average design flow rate of > 90 ML/d • 3 points: Demonstrates their scope incorporated a biosolids input of > 30 dry tonnes/day average • 1.5 points: Demonstrates similar major components to Project 	45	

Proposal Submission Requirement	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 point: Demonstrates similar design considerations to Project • 0.5 points: Demonstrates past project was able to meet quality objectives • 3 points: Demonstrates capital budget of > \$100 M CAD • 1.5 points: Demonstrates past project was able to maintain budget • 0.5 points: Demonstrates past project was able to maintain schedule • 1 point: Demonstrates collaborative procurement such as PDB, CMAR, IPD or other types of alternative delivery (DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFMO, other P3) • 0.5 points: Demonstrates past project within 10 years 		
<p>Form B-3 – Key Individual Qualifications and Experience, Lead Process Engineer (2 Projects)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submit 2 projects 	<p>8 points for qualifications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 points: Demonstrates P.Eng., PE or equivalent licenses and certifications • 4 points: Demonstrates 10+ years experience in similar role <p>2 points: Demonstrates past project experience with another Key Individual or Proponent Team Member</p> <p>15 points for each project (30 Points total):</p>	40	

Proposal Submission Requirement	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 points: Demonstrates their scope incorporated a biosolids input of > 30 dry tonnes/day average • 5 points: Demonstrates design biosolids treatment processes, including phosphorus release, pre-digestion thermal hydrolysis, phosphorus recovery, anaerobic digestion solids dewatering, and digester gas handling • 2 points: Demonstrates collaborative procurement such as PDB, CMAR, IPD or other types of alternative delivery, (DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFMO, other P3) • 2 points: Demonstrates incorporating commissioning, operability and maintainability in design 		
<p>Form B-4 – Key Individual Qualifications and Experience, Lead Automation Engineer (2 Projects)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submit 2 projects 	<p>8 points for qualifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 points: Demonstrates P.Eng., PE or equivalent licenses and certifications • 4 points: Demonstrates 10+ years experience in similar role <p>2 points: Demonstrates past project experience with another Key Individual or Proponent Team Member</p> <p>10 points for each project (20 Points total):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 points: Demonstrates design of automation for municipal wastewater treatment plant and facilities • 2 points: Demonstrates proficiency in Schneider automation products 	30	

Proposal Submission Requirement	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.5 points: Demonstrates ability to troubleshoot automation systems • 1.5 points: Demonstrates ability to manage and supervise systems integration • 1 point: Demonstrates collaborative procurement such as PDB, CMAR, IPD or other types of alternative delivery (DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFMO, other P3) 		
<p>Form B-5 – Key Individual Qualifications and Experience, Lead Electrical Engineer (2 Projects)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submit 2 projects 	<p>8 points for qualifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 points: Demonstrates P.Eng., PE or equivalent licenses and certifications • 4 points: Demonstrates 10+ years experience in similar role <p>2 points: Demonstrates past project experience with another Key Individual or Proponent Team Member</p> <p>10 points for each project (20 Points total):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: Demonstrates experience in design of electrical systems for municipal wastewater treatment plant and facilities • 2 points: Demonstrates experience in design of all voltage systems especially voltage systems ≤ 12.47kV • 1 point: Demonstrates knowledge and proficiency in protection systems related to 12.47kV 	30	

Proposal Submission Requirement	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 point: Demonstrates compliance with electrical codes and regulations • 1 point: Demonstrates ability to troubleshoot electrical systems • 1 point: Demonstrates critical planning capability with respect to connections in a continuously operating wastewater facility, such as installation and switching • 1 point: Demonstrates collaborative procurement such as PDB, CMAR, IPD or other types of alternative delivery (DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFMO, other P3) 		
<p>Form B-6 – Key Individual Qualifications and Experience, Lead Process Mechanical Engineer (2 Projects)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submit 2 projects 	<p>8 points for qualifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 points: Demonstrates P.Eng., PE or equivalent licenses and certifications • 4 points: Demonstrates 10+ years experience in similar role <p>2 points: Demonstrates past project experience with another Key Individual or Proponent Team Member</p> <p>10 points for each project (20 Points total):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 points: Demonstrates design biosolids input of > 30 dry tonnes/day average • 2 points: Demonstrates compliance with building codes and regulations including digester gas code, CSA B149.6, or similar 	30	

Proposal Submission Requirement	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 point: Demonstrates design of biosolids treatment processes • 1 point: Demonstrates design of other similar treatment processes to the Project • 1 point: Demonstrates incorporating operability and maintainability in design • 1 point: Demonstrates collaborative procurement such as PDB, CMAR, IPD or other types of alternative delivery (DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFMO, other P3) 		
<p>Form B-7 – Key Individual Qualifications and Experience, Lead Operation and Maintenance Advisor (2 Projects)</p> <p>Submit 2 projects</p>	<p>8 points for qualifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 points: Demonstrates P.Eng., PE or equivalent licenses and certifications • 4 points: Demonstrates 10+ years experience in similar role <p>2 points: Demonstrates past project experience with another Key Individual or Proponent Team Member</p> <p>10 points for each project (20 Points total):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 points: Demonstrates wastewater sector project • 1.5 points: Demonstrates their scope incorporated an average design flow rate of > 90 ML/d • 2 points: Demonstrates their scope incorporated a biosolids input of > 30 dry tonnes/day average 	30	

Proposal Submission Requirement	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 points: Demonstrates advising design on commissioning, training, operability and maintainability • 1.5 points: Demonstrates input in O&M documents • 1 point: Demonstrates input on project handover readiness 		
<p>Form B-8 – Key Individual Qualifications and Experience, Lead Architect (2 Projects)</p> <p>Submit 2 projects</p>	<p>4 points for qualifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 points: Demonstrates registered architect or equivalent licenses and certifications • 2 points: Demonstrates 10+ years experience in similar role <p>1 point: Demonstrates past project experience with another Key Individual or Proponent Team Member</p> <p>5 points for each project (10 Points total):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 point: Demonstrates water or wastewater sector project • 1 point: Demonstrates capital budget of > \$100 M CAD • 2 points: Demonstrates experience with Manitoba Building Code • 1 point: Demonstrates collaborative procurement such as PDB, CMAR, IPD or other types of alternative delivery (DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFMO, other P3) 	15	

Proposal Submission Requirement	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
<p>Form B-9 – Key Individual Qualifications and Experience, Lead Geotechnical Engineer (2 Projects)</p> <p>Submit 2 projects</p>	<p>4 points for qualifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 points: Demonstrates P.Eng., PE or equivalent licenses and certifications • 2 points: Demonstrates 10+ years experience in similar role <p>1 point: Demonstrates past project experience with another Key Individual or Proponent Team Member</p> <p>5 points for each project (10 Points total):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 point: Demonstrates water or wastewater sector project • 1 point: Demonstrates capital budget of > \$100 M CAD • 2 points: Demonstrates local experience or experience with similar soil and climactic conditions • 1 point: Demonstrates collaborative procurement such as PDB, CMAR, IPD or other types of alternative delivery (DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFMO, other P3) 	<p>15</p>	
<p>Form B-10 – Key Individual Qualifications and Experience, Lead Civil Engineer (2 Projects)</p> <p>Submit 2 projects</p>	<p>4 points for qualifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 points: Demonstrates P.Eng., PE or equivalent licenses and certifications • 2 points: Demonstrates 10+ years experience in similar role 	<p>15</p>	

Proposal Submission Requirement	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
	<p>1 point: Demonstrates past project experience with another Key Individual or Proponent Team Member</p> <p>5 points for each project (10 Points total):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 point: Demonstrates water or wastewater sector project • 1 point: Demonstrates capital budget of > \$100 M CAD • 2 points: Demonstrates local experience • 1 point: Demonstrates collaborative procurement such as PDB, CMAR, IPD or other types of alternative delivery (DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFMO, other P3) 		
<p>Form B-11 – Key Individual Qualifications and Experience, Lead Structural Engineer (2 Projects)</p> <p>Submit 2 projects</p>	<p>4 points for qualifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 points: Demonstrates P.Eng., PE or equivalent licenses and certifications • 2 points: Demonstrates 10+ years experience in similar role <p>1 point: Demonstrates past project experience with another Key Individual or Proponent Team Member</p> <p>5 points for each project (10 Points total):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 point: Demonstrates water or wastewater sector project • 1 point: Demonstrates capital budget of > \$100 M CAD 	15	

Proposal Submission Requirement	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 points: Demonstrates experience with Manitoba Building Code • 1 point: Demonstrates collaborative procurement such as PDB, CMAR, IPD or other types of alternative delivery (DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFMO, other P3) 		
<p>Form B-12 – Key Individual Qualifications and Experience, Lead Building Mechanical Engineer (2 Projects)</p> <p>Submit 2 projects</p>	<p>4 points for qualifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 points: Demonstrates P.Eng., PE or equivalent licenses and certifications • 2 points: Demonstrates 10+ years experience in similar role <p>1 point: Demonstrates past project experience with another Key Individual or Proponent Team Member</p> <p>5 points for each project (10 Points total):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 point: Demonstrates water or wastewater sector project • 1 point: Demonstrates capital budget of > \$100 M CAD • 2 points: Demonstrates experience with NFPA 820 • 1 point: Demonstrates collaborative procurement such as PDB, CMAR, IPD or other types of alternative delivery (DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFMO, other P3) 	15	
<p>Form B-13 – Key Individual Qualifications</p>	<p>8 points for qualifications:</p>	40	

Proposal Submission Requirement	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
<p>and Experience, Project Construction Manager (2 Projects)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submit 2 projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 points: Demonstrates P.Eng., PE or equivalent licenses and certifications 4 points: Demonstrates 10+ years experience in similar role <p>2 points: Demonstrates past project experience with another Key Individual or Proponent Team Member</p> <p>15 points for each project (30 Points total):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 points: Demonstrates wastewater sector project 2.5 points: Demonstrates their scope incorporated an average design flow rate of > 90 ML/d and/or biosolids input of > 30 dry tonnes/day average 3 points: Demonstrates similar construction considerations to Project 0.5 points: Demonstrates past project was able to meet quality objectives 1 point: Demonstrates past project was able to meet safety, health and environmental objectives 2.5 points: Demonstrates capital budget of > \$100 M CAD 1.5 points: Demonstrates past project was able to maintain budget 0.5 points: Demonstrates past project was able to maintain schedule 1 point: Demonstrates collaborative procurement such as PDB, CMAR, IPD or other types of 		

Proposal Submission Requirement	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
	alternative delivery (DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFMO, other P3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.5 points: Demonstrates past project within 10 years 		
Form B-14 – Key Individual Qualifications and Experience, Commissioning Lead (2 Projects) Submit 2 projects	8 points for qualifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 points: Demonstrates P.Eng., PE or equivalent licenses and certifications • 4 points: Demonstrates 10+ years experience in similar role 2 points: Demonstrates past project experience with another Key Individual or Proponent Team Member 7.5 points for each project (15 Points total): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 point: Demonstrates wastewater sector project • 1.5 point: Demonstrates their scope incorporated an average design flow rate of > 90 ML/d • 1.5 points: Demonstrates their scope incorporated commissioning of biosolids input of > 30 dry tonnes/day average • 1 point: Demonstrates commissioned biosolids treatment processes • 0.5 points: Demonstrates commissioned other similar treatment processes to the Project • 1 point: Demonstrates participated in all phases of commissioning • 0.5 points: Demonstrates participated in training 	25	

Proposal Submission Requirement	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0.5 points: Demonstrates collaborative procurement such as PDB, CMAR, IPD or other types of alternative delivery (DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFMO, other P3) 		
<p>Form B-15 – Key Individual Qualifications and Experience, Social Procurement Lead (2 Projects)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submit 2 projects 	<p>4 points for qualifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 points: Demonstrates relevant education, licenses or certifications 2 points: Demonstrates 5+ years experience in similar role <p>1 point: Demonstrates past project experience with another Key Individual or Proponent Team Member</p> <p>5 points for each project (10 Points total):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 point: Demonstrates large design and construction project with capital budget of > \$100 M CAD 1 point: demonstrates experience in reporting requirements and innovations 2 points: demonstrates experience with resourcing of qualified Skilled Labour from Indigenous Peoples and Under-Represented Groups in a competitive market 1 point: demonstrates success in meeting targets and Best Efforts achieved 	15	

Proposal Submission Requirement	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
Section C – Project Management Methodology			300
<p><u>Special Instructions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Proponent should indicate the name of the Proponent, Proponent Team Lead or Proponent Team Member represented in the response and their respective role. the Proponent or its Proponent Team Members should indicate if they have no experience with a specific item, and explain how they will implement measures to address shortfalls in experience or capacity. 			
<p>Using the previously provided organizational chart from the Proponent’s Step 1 Submission, provide the following additional information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify all Key Individuals and their role in their respective Proponent Team Member 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20 points: The Proponent's organizational chart will be evaluated based on the extent to which it demonstrates a strong understanding of the required reporting relationships of the Key Individuals and are logical, reasonable, and appropriate for the Project. 	20	
<p>Provide a description of the relationships to be established by Proponent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A brief description of the Proponent and Proponent Team Members explaining the management structure, interface arrangements, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6 points: The Proponent's description will be evaluated based on the extent to which it demonstrates a strong understanding of the required relationships between the Proponent Team Members that are complete, comprehensive, and reasonable for the Project 9 points: Demonstrates previous working relationship between the Proponent Team Members 	15	

Proposal Submission Requirement	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
<p>dispute resolution mechanisms, and roles and responsibilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The planning, supervision and decision-making responsibilities of the Proponent, Proponent Team Lead(s) and Proponent Team Members • Describe commercial relationship, risk allocation, joint and several liability between the Proponent Team Members (as applicable) <p>Provide a chart or table that lists the projects where the Proponent and Proponent Team Members have previously worked together, and in what role / capacity</p>			

Proposal Submission Requirement	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
<p>Provide a description of the capabilities of the Proponent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approach to ensuring suitable and effective integration of the functions of the Proponent and Proponent Team Members • How the Proponent intends to take on the challenge of successfully completing this Project at every stage of the Work and why the City should select their team. Address the advantage that the Proponent and the Proponent Team brings to the City indicating key differences and value proposition • The Proponent's approach to developing a successful collaborative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 points: The Proponent's description will be evaluated based on the extent to which it demonstrates a strong understanding of the required capabilities that are complete, comprehensive, and reasonable for the Project 	<p>15</p>	

Proposal Submission Requirement	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
<p>working relationship with the City and City Project Team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approach to supply chain management and managing cost escalation 			
<p>Description of the experience of the Proponent in leading and taking responsibility in a collaborative procurement such as PDB, or other type of alternate delivery.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 15 points: Demonstrates providing overall management responsibility for a large wastewater project, (≥\$100 million CAD capital) and achieving budget and schedule objectives that met or exceeded owner expectations including the key elements that made that project successful 15 points: Demonstrates continuous effective communications and collaborative coordination with the owner to avoid or mitigate disputes and to keep the owner informed of design, construction commissioning and other activities 	<p>60</p>	

Proposal Submission Requirement	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 points: Demonstrates providing performance security for a large project (≥\$100 million CAD) including the surety requirements and due diligence in providing such security and explaining surety arrangements if co-bonding with another DB or contractor was utilized • 8 points: Demonstrates providing performance guarantees for wastewater treatment plant performance including type and performance period for guarantees, and providing the project name and owner reference (if not included as a project in Section C) • 7 points: Demonstrates providing maintenance services from substantial completion to final completion 		
<p>Description of the experience of the Project Management Team Lead(s) or a Proponent Team Member of the Project Management Team in planning and executing the overall project management.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 points: Demonstrates methodology used for identifying, evaluating and pro-actively managing project risks and opportunities. • 10 points: Demonstrates establishing and maintaining progress in the project schedule, including actions to avoiding delays and methodologies used for corrective action when delays were incurred including capabilities used in establishing and analyzing the project critical path • 10 points: Demonstrates establishing communication, coordination and documentation of work activities among the Proponent, Proponent Team Leads, other Proponent Team Members, and the owner • 10 points: Demonstrates implementing a quality management plan including quality planning, 	40	

Proposal Submission Requirement	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
	control, resolution of non-conformance work, and quality assurance, and lessons learned.		
Description of the experience of the Design Team Lead(s) or a Proponent Team Member of the Design Team in planning and executing the project engineering and design.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 points: Demonstrates incorporating safety-in-design principles (e.g. HAZOP, HIRA, Asset Criticality) and methods to ensure that the facility was designed with consideration toward safety in construction, and plant operations and maintenance, including examples which demonstrated initiative and innovation • 8 points: Demonstrates incorporating life cycle costs in the design of a project • 15 points: Demonstrates designing a user-friendly, maintainable and reliable operations strategy and control system into a wastewater treatment plant, especially for the process systems • 15 points: Demonstrates planning and integrating subconsultant’s design deliverables in the overall project design to maintain design quality and avoid design errors and omissions, including lessons learned • 7 points: Demonstrates providing technical support, reviewing and validating quality and performance during construction, testing and commissioning 	60	
Description of experience of the Construction Team Lead(s) or a Proponent Team Member of the Construction Team in planning and executing the project construction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 points: Demonstrates resolving quality issues when non-conformance items were identified by the owner, and either re-work or replacement was involved • 10 points: Demonstrates implementation of strategies in planning and executing pile driving activities to keep plant staff and local residents 	50	

Proposal Submission Requirement	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
management and construction.	<p>advised with minimum disturbance, including lessons learned</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 points: Demonstrates planning for and providing a safe and secure work environment for trade labour, technical staff, supplier representatives and owner personnel during construction, including lessons learned • 10 points: Demonstrates conducting testing and commissioning of similar wastewater treatment processes and systems for the project, including lessons learned • 5 points: Demonstrates proactively managing suppliers to meet delivery of long lead items • 5 points: Demonstrates proactively managing subcontractors to meet quality and schedule requirements, and correcting subcontractor performance to address non-performance issues and potential schedule delays, including lessons learned 		
Description of experience of the Construction Team Lead(s) or a Proponent Team Member of the Construction Team implementing social procurement objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 points: Demonstrates methodology for achieving social procurement objectives including the employment of Skilled Labour from Indigenous Peoples and Under-Represented Groups • 20 points: Demonstrates proactively resourcing Skilled Labour from Indigenous Peoples and Under-Represented Groups 	40	

FORM B-1 – KEY INDIVIDUAL QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

Design Build Project Manager

Key Individual’s Name:	<i>John Doe</i>
Current Employer – Proponent / Proponent Team Member:	<i>e.g. AECOM Canada Ltd – Proponent or AECOM Canada Ltd – Construction Team Member</i>
Education, Professional Licenses / Certifications & Specialized Training (include institutions, certifying agency & license / cert.):	<i>e.g. P.Eng., PE, PMP etc., trained in confined space entry</i>
Proposed Role & Scope of Responsibility on this Biosolids Facilities Project:	
Years of Experience	<i>Indicate</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>years of experience similar to the proposed role for the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Facilities Project and</i> • <i>Total years of experience</i>
Project 1	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	<i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Project sector</i> • <i>Flow rates</i> • <i>Biosolids input capacity</i> • <i>Quality management methods</i>
Past Project Schedule Dates (start–finish), duration (mos.) and % complete	<i>Indicate original past project schedule and actual past project delivery schedule, showing design and construction schedules and provide the reasons for any discrepancies between original and final (if any). Also, indicate if your role in past project was full time or for only a portion of the schedule.</i>
Total Project Cost: Original vs. Final; explain difference	<i>Provide the original and final cost of the past project, for both the full scope and your scope specifically. If the final cost varies from</i>

	<i>the original cost, provide reasons for the discrepancies.</i>
Delivery Method:	<p><i>Collaborative methods: PDB, CMAR, IPD</i></p> <p><i>Other alternative methods: DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFOM, or other P3</i></p> <p><i>Traditional: DBB</i></p>
Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:	
Client Reference for Past Project:	Reference Contact Name:
	Title:
	Reference Role on Past Project:
	Phone No.:
	Email:
Project 2	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	<p><i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Project sector</i> <i>• Flow rates</i> <i>• Biosolids input capacity</i> <i>• Quality management methods</i>
Past Project Schedule Dates (start–finish), duration (mos.) and % complete	<i>Indicate original past project schedule and actual past project delivery schedule, showing design and construction schedules and provide the reasons for any discrepancies between original and final (if any). Also, indicate if your role in past project was full time or for only a portion of the schedule.</i>
Total Project Cost: Original vs.	<i>Provide the original and final cost of the past project, for both the full scope and your scope specifically. If the final cost varies from</i>

Final; explain difference	<i>the original cost, provide reasons for the discrepancies.</i>
Delivery Method:	<i>Collaborative methods: PDB, CMAR, IPD</i> <i>Other alternative methods: DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFOM, or other P3</i> <i>Traditional: DBB</i>
Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:	
Client Reference for Past Project:	Reference Contact Name:
	Title:
	Reference Role on Past Project:
	Phone No.:
	Email:

**FORM B-2 – KEY INDIVIDUAL QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE
 Project Design Manager**

Key Individual’s Name:	<i>John Doe</i>
Current Employer – Proponent / Proponent Team Member:	<i>e.g. AECOM Canada Ltd – Proponent or AECOM Canada Ltd – Construction Team Member</i>
Education, Professional Licenses / Certifications & Specialized Training (include institutions, certifying agency & license / cert. numbers:	<i>e.g. P.Eng., PE, PMP etc., trained in confined space entry</i>
Proposed Role & Scope of Responsibility on this Biosolids Facilities Project:	
Years of Experience	<i>Indicate</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>years of experience similar to the proposed role for the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Facilities Project and</i> • <i>Total years of experience</i>
Project 1	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	<i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Project sector</i> • <i>Flow rates</i> • <i>Biosolids production capacity</i> • <i>Other major components:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Anaerobic digestion</i> ○ <i>Solids dewatering</i> ○ <i>Digester gas treatment</i> ○ <i>Odour control</i> • <i>Design considerations:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Operability and maintainability</i> ○ <i>Upgrades to existing plant in continuous operation</i> ○ <i>Climatic conditions of past project location</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Building codes and standards of past project location • Quality management methods
Past Project Schedule Dates (start–finish), duration (mos.) and % complete	<i>Indicate original past project schedule and actual past project delivery schedule, showing design and construction schedules and provide the reasons for any discrepancies between original and final (if any). Also, indicate if your role in past project was full time or for only a portion of the schedule.</i>
Total Project Cost: Original vs. Final; explain difference	<i>Provide the original and final cost of the past project, for both the full scope and your scope specifically. If the final cost varies from the original cost, provide reasons for the discrepancies.</i>
Delivery Method:	<p><i>Collaborative methods: PDB, CMAR, IPD</i></p> <p><i>Other alternative methods: DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFOM, or other P3</i></p> <p><i>Traditional: DBB</i></p>
Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:	
Client Reference for Past Project:	Reference Contact Name:
	Title:
	Reference Role on Past Project:
	Phone No.:
	Email:
Project 2	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	<p><i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project sector • Flow rates

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Biosolids production capacity</i> • <i>Other major components:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Anaerobic digestion</i> ○ <i>Solids dewatering</i> ○ <i>Digester gas treatment</i> ○ <i>Odour control</i> • <i>Design considerations:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Operability and maintainability</i> ○ <i>Upgrades to existing plant in continuous operation</i> ○ <i>Climatic conditions of past project location</i> ○ <i>Building codes and standards of past project location</i> • <i>Quality management methods</i>
<p>Past Project Schedule Dates (start–finish), duration (mos.) and % complete</p>	<p><i>Indicate original past project schedule and actual past project delivery schedule, showing design and construction schedules and provide the reasons for any discrepancies between original and final (if any). Also, indicate if your role in past project was full time or for only a portion of the schedule.</i></p>
<p>Total Project Cost: Original vs. Final; explain difference</p>	<p><i>Provide the original and final cost of the past project, for both the full scope and your scope specifically. If the final cost varies from the original cost, provide reasons for the discrepancies.</i></p>
<p>Delivery Method:</p>	<p><i>Collaborative methods: PDB, CMAR, IPD</i></p> <p><i>Other alternative methods: DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFOM, or other P3</i></p> <p><i>Traditional: DBB</i></p>
<p>Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:</p>	
<p>Client Reference for Past Project:</p>	<p>Reference Contact Name:</p> <hr/> <p>Title:</p> <hr/> <p>Reference Role on Past Project:</p> <hr/> <p>Phone No.:</p> <hr/> <p>Email:</p>

**FORM B-3 – KEY INDIVIDUAL QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE
 Lead Process Engineer**

Key Individual’s Name:	<i>John Doe</i>
Current Employer – Proponent / Proponent Team Member:	<i>e.g. AECOM Canada Ltd – Proponent or AECOM Canada Ltd – Construction Team Member</i>
Education, Professional Licenses / Certifications & Specialized Training (include institutions, certifying agency & license / cert. numbers:	<i>e.g. P.Eng., PE, PMP etc., trained in confined space entry</i>
Proposed Role & Scope of Responsibility on this Biosolids Facilities Project:	
Years of Experience	<i>Indicate</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>years of experience similar to the proposed role for the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Facilities Project and</i> • <i>Total years of experience</i>
Project 1	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	<i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Biosolids input capacity</i> • <i>Other major components:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Anaerobic digestion</i> ○ <i>Solids dewatering</i> ○ <i>Digester gas treatment</i> ○ <i>Phosphorus release</i> ○ <i>Pre-digestion thermal hydrolysis</i> ○ <i>Phosphorus recovery</i> • <i>Design for commissioning; operability and maintainability</i>
Delivery Method:	<i>Collaborative methods: PDB, CMAR, IPD</i> <i>Other alternative methods: DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFOM, or other P3</i>

	<i>Traditional: DBB</i>
Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:	
Client Reference for Past Project:	Reference Contact Name:
	Title:
	Reference Role on Past Project:
	Phone No.:
	Email:
Project 2	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	<p><i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Biosolids input capacity</i> • <i>Other major components:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Anaerobic digestion</i> ○ <i>Solids dewatering</i> ○ <i>Digester gas treatment</i> ○ <i>Phosphorus release</i> ○ <i>Pre-digestion thermal hydrolysis</i> ○ <i>Phosphorus recovery</i> • <i>Design for commissioning, operability and maintainability</i>
Delivery Method:	<p><i>Collaborative methods: PDB, CMAR, IPD</i></p> <p><i>Other alternative methods: DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFOM, or other P3</i></p> <p><i>Traditional: DBB</i></p>
Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in	

past project and their Roles:	
Client Reference for Past Project:	Reference Contact Name:
	Title:
	Reference Role on Past Project:
	Phone No.:
	Email:

**FORM B-4 – KEY INDIVIDUAL QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE
 Lead Automation Engineer**

Key Individual’s Name:	<i>John Doe</i>
Current Employer – Proponent / Proponent Team Member:	<i>e.g. AECOM Canada Ltd – Proponent or AECOM Canada Ltd – Construction Team Member</i>
Education, Professional Licenses / Certifications & Specialized Training (include institutions, certifying agency & license / cert. numbers:	<i>e.g. P.Eng., PE, PMP etc., trained in confined space entry</i>
Proposed Role & Scope of Responsibility on this Biosolids Facilities Project:	
Years of Experience	<i>Indicate</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>years of experience similar to the proposed role for the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Facilities Project and</i> • <i>Total years of experience</i>
Project 1	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	<i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Automation design for municipal wastewater</i> • <i>Design with Schneider automation products</i> • <i>Troubleshooting automation systems</i> • <i>Managing and supervising systems integration</i>
Delivery Method:	<i>Collaborative methods: PDB, CMAR, IPD</i> <i>Other alternative methods: DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFOM, or other P3</i> <i>Traditional: DBB</i>

Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:	
Client Reference for Past Project:	Reference Contact Name:
	Title:
	Reference Role on Past Project:
	Phone No.:
	Email:
Project 2	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	<p><i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Automation design for municipal wastewater</i> • <i>Design with Schneider automation products</i> • <i>Troubleshooting automation systems</i> • <i>Managing and supervising systems integration</i>
Delivery Method:	<p><i>Collaborative methods: PDB, CMAR, IPD</i></p> <p><i>Other alternative methods: DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFOM, or other P3</i></p> <p><i>Traditional: DBB</i></p>

Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:	
Client Reference for Past Project:	Reference Contact Name:
	Title:
	Reference Role on Past Project:
	Phone No.:
	Email:

**FORM B-5 – KEY INDIVIDUAL QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE
 Lead Electrical Engineer**

Key Individual’s Name:	<i>John Doe</i>
Current Employer – Proponent / Proponent Team Member:	<i>e.g. AECOM Canada Ltd – Proponent or AECOM Canada Ltd – Construction Team Member</i>
Education, Professional Licenses / Certifications & Specialized Training (include institutions, certifying agency & license / cert. numbers:	<i>e.g. P.Eng., PE, PMP etc., trained in confined space entry</i>
Proposed Role & Scope of Responsibility on this Biosolids Facilities Project:	
Years of Experience	<i>Indicate</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>years of experience similar to the proposed role for the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Facilities Project and</i> • <i>Total years of experience</i>
Project 1	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	<i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Electrical design for municipal wastewater</i> • <i>Design for all voltage systems</i> • <i>Design for electrical protection systems</i> • <i>Relevant electrical codes and standards</i> • <i>Troubleshooting electrical systems</i> • <i>Planning for connections to a continuously operating plant</i>
Delivery Method:	<i>Collaborative methods: PDB, CMAR, IPD</i> <i>Other alternative methods: DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFOM, or other P3</i>

	<i>Traditional: DBB</i>
Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:	
Client Reference for Past Project:	Reference Contact Name:
	Title:
	Reference Role on Past Project:
	Phone No.:
	Email:
Project 2	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	<p><i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Electrical design for municipal wastewater</i> • <i>Design for all voltage systems</i> • <i>Design for electrical protection systems</i> • <i>Relevant electrical codes and standards</i> • <i>Troubleshooting electrical systems</i> • <i>Planning for connections to a continuously operating plant</i>
Delivery Method:	<p><i>Collaborative methods: PDB, CMAR, IPD</i></p> <p><i>Other alternative methods: DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFOM, or other P3</i></p> <p><i>Traditional: DBB</i></p>

Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:	
Client Reference for Past Project:	Reference Contact Name:
	Title:
	Reference Role on Past Project:
	Phone No.:
	Email:

**FORM B-6 – KEY INDIVIDUAL QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE
 Lead Process Mechanical Engineer**

Key Individual’s Name:	<i>John Doe</i>
Current Employer – Proponent / Proponent Team Member:	<i>e.g. AECOM Canada Ltd – Proponent or AECOM Canada Ltd – Construction Team Member</i>
Education, Professional Licenses / Certifications & Specialized Training (include institutions, certifying agency & license / cert. numbers:	<i>e.g. P.Eng., PE, PMP etc., trained in confined space entry</i>
Proposed Role & Scope of Responsibility on this Biosolids Facilities Project:	
Years of Experience	<i>Indicate</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>years of experience similar to the proposed role for the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Facilities Project and</i> • <i>Total years of experience</i>
Project 1	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	<i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Biosolids input capacity</i> • <i>Relevant codes and standards</i> • <i>Biosolids treatment processes</i> • <i>Other treatment processes</i> • <i>Design for operability and maintainability</i>

Delivery Method:	<p><i>Collaborative methods: PDB, CMAR, IPD</i></p> <p><i>Other alternative methods: DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFOM, or other P3</i></p> <p><i>Traditional: DBB</i></p>
Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:	
Client Reference for Past Project:	Reference Contact Name:
	Title:
	Reference Role on Past Project:
	Phone No.:
	Email:
Project 2	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	<p><i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Biosolids input capacity</i> • <i>Relevant codes and standards</i> • <i>Biosolids treatment processes</i> • <i>Other treatment processes</i> • <i>Design for operability and maintainability</i>
Delivery Method:	<p><i>Collaborative methods: PDB, CMAR, IPD</i></p> <p><i>Other alternative methods: DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFOM, or other P3</i></p> <p><i>Traditional: DBB</i></p>

Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:	
Client Reference for Past Project:	Reference Contact Name:
	Title:
	Reference Role on Past Project:
	Phone No.:
	Email:

**FORM B-7 – KEY INDIVIDUAL QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE
 Lead Operations and Maintenance Advisor**

Key Individual’s Name:	<i>John Doe</i>
Current Employer – Proponent / Proponent Team Member:	<i>e.g. AECOM Canada Ltd – Proponent or AECOM Canada Ltd – Construction Team Member</i>
Education, Professional Licenses / Certifications & Specialized Training (include institutions, certifying agency & license / cert. numbers:	<i>e.g. P.Eng., PE, PMP etc., trained in confined space entry</i>
Proposed Role & Scope of Responsibility on this Biosolids Facilities Project:	
Years of Experience	<i>Indicate</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>years of experience similar to the proposed role for the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Facilities Project and</i> • <i>Total years of experience</i>
Project 1	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	<i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Project sector</i> • <i>Flow rates</i> • <i>Biosolids input capacity</i> • <i>Design considerations:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>commissioning, training, operability and maintainability</i> ○ <i>O&M documents</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>asset O&M manuals</i> ▪ <i>SOPs, SWPs</i> ▪ <i>operations manuals</i> • <i>Project handover</i>

Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:	
Client Reference for Past Project:	Reference Contact Name:
	Title:
	Reference Role on Past Project:
	Phone No.:
	Email:
Project 2	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	<p><i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Project sector</i> • <i>Flow rates</i> • <i>Biosolids input capacity</i> • <i>Design considerations:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>commissioning, training, operability and maintainability</i> ○ <i>O&M documents</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>asset O&M manuals</i> ▪ <i>SOPs, SWPs</i> ▪ <i>operations manuals</i> • <i>Project handover</i>
Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:	

Client Reference for Past Project:	Reference Contact Name:
	Title:
	Reference Role on Past Project:
	Phone No.:
	Email:

**FORM B-8 – KEY INDIVIDUAL QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE
 Lead Architect**

Key Individual’s Name:	<i>John Doe</i>
Current Employer – Proponent / Proponent Team Member:	<i>e.g. AECOM Canada Ltd – Proponent or AECOM Canada Ltd – Construction Team Member</i>
Education, Professional Licenses / Certifications & Specialized Training (include institutions, certifying agency & license / cert. numbers:	<i>e.g. P.Eng., PE, PMP etc., trained in confined space entry</i>
Proposed Role & Scope of Responsibility on this Biosolids Facilities Project:	
Years of Experience	<i>Indicate</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>years of experience similar to the proposed role for the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Facilities Project and</i> • <i>Total years of experience</i>
Project 1	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	<i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Project sector</i> • <i>Relevant codes and standards</i>
Total Project Cost:	<i>Provide the original and final cost of the past project, for both the full scope and your scope specifically</i>

Delivery Method:	<p><i>Collaborative methods: PDB, CMAR, IPD</i></p> <p><i>Other alternative methods: DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFOM, or other P3</i></p> <p><i>Traditional: DBB</i></p>
Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:	
Client Reference for Past Project:	Reference Contact Name:
	Title:
	Reference Role on Past Project:
	Phone No.:
	Email:
Project 2	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	<p><i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Project sector</i> • <i>Relevant codes and standards</i>
Total Project Cost:	<i>Provide the original and final cost of the past project, for both the full scope and your scope specifically</i>
Delivery Method:	<p><i>Collaborative methods: PDB, CMAR, IPD</i></p> <p><i>Other alternative methods: DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFOM, or other P3</i></p> <p><i>Traditional: DBB</i></p>

Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:	
Client Reference for Past Project:	Reference Contact Name:
	Title:
	Reference Role on Past Project:
	Phone No.:
	Email:

**FORM B-9 – KEY INDIVIDUAL QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE
 Lead Geotechnical Engineer**

Key Individual’s Name:	<i>John Doe</i>
Current Employer – Proponent / Proponent Team Member:	<i>e.g. AECOM Canada Ltd – Proponent or AECOM Canada Ltd – Construction Team Member</i>
Education, Professional Licenses / Certifications & Specialized Training (include institutions, certifying agency & license / cert.):	<i>e.g. P.Eng., PE, PMP etc., trained in confined space entry</i>
Proposed Role & Scope of Responsibility on this Biosolids Facilities Project:	
Years of Experience	<i>Indicate</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>years of experience similar to the proposed role for the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Facilities Project and</i> • <i>Total years of experience</i>
Project 1	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	<i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Project sector</i> • <i>Relevant codes and standards</i> • <i>Local experience</i>
Total Project Cost:	<i>Provide the original and final cost of the past project, for both the full scope and your scope specifically</i>
Delivery Method:	<i>Collaborative methods: PDB, CMAR, IPD</i> <i>Other alternative methods: DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFOM, or other P3</i> <i>Traditional: DBB</i>

Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:	
Client Reference for Past Project:	Reference Contact Name:
	Title:
	Reference Role on Past Project:
	Phone No.:
	Email:
Project 2	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	<p><i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Project sector</i> • <i>Relevant codes and standards</i> • <i>Local experience</i>
Total Project Cost:	<i>Provide the original and final cost of the past project, for both the full scope and your scope specifically</i>
Delivery Method:	<p><i>Collaborative methods: PDB, CMAR, IPD</i></p> <p><i>Other alternative methods: DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFOM, or other P3</i></p> <p><i>Traditional: DBB</i></p>
Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:	

Client Reference for Past Project:	Reference Contact Name:
	Title:
	Reference Role on Past Project:
	Phone No.:
	Email:

**FORM B-10 – KEY INDIVIDUAL QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE
 Lead Civil Engineer**

Key Individual’s Name:	<i>John Doe</i>
Current Employer – Proponent / Proponent Team Member:	<i>e.g. AECOM Canada Ltd – Proponent or AECOM Canada Ltd – Construction Team Member</i>
Education, Professional Licenses / Certifications & Specialized Training (include institutions, certifying agency & license / cert. numbers:	<i>e.g. P.Eng., PE, PMP etc., trained in confined space entry</i>
Proposed Role & Scope of Responsibility on this Biosolids Facilities Project:	
Years of Experience	<i>Indicate</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>years of experience similar to the proposed role for the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Facilities Project and</i> • <i>Total years of experience</i>
Project 1	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	<i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Project sector</i> • <i>Relevant codes and standards</i> • <i>Local experience</i>
Total Project Cost:	<i>Provide the original and final cost of the past project, for both the full scope and your scope specifically</i>
Delivery Method:	<i>Collaborative methods: PDB, CMAR, IPD</i> <i>Other alternative methods: DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFOM, or other P3</i> <i>Traditional: DBB</i>

Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:	
Client Reference for Past Project:	Reference Contact Name:
	Title:
	Reference Role on Past Project:
	Phone No.:
	Email:
Project 2	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	<p><i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Project sector</i> • <i>Relevant codes and standards</i> • <i>Local experience</i>
Total Project Cost:	<i>Provide the original and final cost of the past project, for both the full scope and your scope specifically</i>
Delivery Method:	<p><i>Collaborative methods: PDB, CMAR, IPD</i></p> <p><i>Other alternative methods: DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFOM, or other P3</i></p> <p><i>Traditional: DBB</i></p>
Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:	

Client Reference for Past Project:	Reference Contact Name:
	Title:
	Reference Role on Past Project:
	Phone No.:
	Email:

**FORM B-11 – KEY INDIVIDUAL QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE
 Lead Structural Engineer**

Key Individual’s Name:	<i>John Doe</i>
Current Employer – Proponent / Proponent Team Member:	<i>e.g. AECOM Canada Ltd – Proponent or AECOM Canada Ltd – Construction Team Member</i>
Education, Professional Licenses / Certifications & Specialized Training (include institutions, certifying agency & license / cert. numbers:	<i>e.g. P.Eng., PE, PMP etc., trained in confined space entry</i>
Proposed Role & Scope of Responsibility on this Biosolids Facilities Project:	
Years of Experience	<p><i>Indicate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>years of experience similar to the proposed role for the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Facilities Project and</i> • <i>Total years of experience</i>
Project 1	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	<p><i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Project sector</i> • <i>Relevant codes and standards</i> • <i>Local experience</i>
Total Project Cost:	<i>Provide the original and final cost of the past project, for both the full scope and your scope specifically</i>
Delivery Method:	<p><i>Collaborative methods: PDB, CMAR, IPD</i></p> <p><i>Other alternative methods: DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFOM, or other P3</i></p> <p><i>Traditional: DBB</i></p>

Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:	
Client Reference for Past Project:	Reference Contact Name:
	Title:
	Reference Role on Past Project:
	Phone No.:
	Email:
Project 2	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	<p><i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Project sector</i> • <i>Relevant codes and standards</i> • <i>Local experience</i>
Total Project Cost:	<i>Provide the original and final cost of the past project, for both the full scope and your scope specifically</i>
Delivery Method:	<p><i>Collaborative methods: PDB, CMAR, IPD</i></p> <p><i>Other alternative methods: DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFOM, or other P3</i></p> <p><i>Traditional: DBB</i></p>
Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:	

Client Reference for Past Project:	Reference Contact Name:
	Title:
	Reference Role on Past Project:
	Phone No.:
	Email:

**FORM B-12 – KEY INDIVIDUAL QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE
 Lead Building Mechanical Engineer**

Key Individual’s Name:	<i>John Doe</i>
Current Employer – Proponent / Proponent Team Member:	<i>e.g. AECOM Canada Ltd – Proponent or AECOM Canada Ltd – Construction Team Member</i>
Education, Professional Licenses / Certifications & Specialized Training (include institutions, certifying agency & license / cert.)	<i>e.g. P.Eng., PE, PMP etc., trained in confined space entry</i>
Proposed Role & Scope of Responsibility on this Biosolids Facilities Project:	
Years of Experience	<i>Indicate</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>years of experience similar to the proposed role for the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Facilities Project and</i> • <i>Total years of experience</i>
Project 1	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	<i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Project sector</i> • <i>Relevant codes and standards</i>
Total Project Cost:	<i>Provide the original and final cost of the past project, for both the full scope and your scope specifically</i>
Delivery Method:	<i>Collaborative methods: PDB, CMAR, IPD</i> <i>Other alternative methods: DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFOM, or other P3</i> <i>Traditional: DBB</i>

Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:	
Client Reference for Past Project:	Reference Contact Name:
	Title:
	Reference Role on Past Project:
	Phone No.:
	Email:
Project 2	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	<i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Project sector</i> • <i>Relevant codes and standards</i>
Total Project Cost:	<i>Provide the original and final cost of the past project, for both the full scope and your scope specifically</i>
Delivery Method:	<i>Collaborative methods: PDB, CMAR, IPD</i> <i>Other alternative methods: DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFOM, or other P3</i> <i>Traditional: DBB</i>
Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:	

Client Reference for Past Project:	Reference Contact Name:
	Title:
	Reference Role on Past Project:
	Phone No.:
	Email:

**FORM B-13 – KEY INDIVIDUAL QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE
 Project Construction Manager**

Key Individual’s Name:	<i>John Doe</i>
Current Employer – Proponent / Proponent Team Member:	<i>e.g. AECOM Canada Ltd – Proponent or AECOM Canada Ltd – Construction Team Member</i>
Education, Professional Licenses / Certifications & Specialized Training (include institutions, certifying agency & license / cert. numbers:	<i>e.g. P.Eng., PE, PMP etc., trained in confined space entry</i>
Proposed Role & Scope of Responsibility on this Biosolids Facilities Project:	
Years of Experience	<i>Indicate</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>years of experience similar to the proposed role for the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Facilities Project and</i> • <i>Total years of experience</i>
Project 1	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	<i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Project sector</i> • <i>Flow rates</i> • <i>Biosolids input capacity</i> • <i>Construction considerations:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Size of workforce</i> ○ <i>Significant portion of specialized process mechanical and electrical equipment</i> ○ <i>Upgrades to existing plant in continuous operation</i> ○ <i>Climatic conditions of past project location</i> ○ <i>Building codes and standards of past project location</i> ○ <i>Multiple tie-ins to existing facility</i> • <i>Safety, health, and environmental programs</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality management methods
Past Project Schedule Dates (start–finish), duration (mos.) and % complete	Indicate original past project schedule and actual past project delivery schedule, showing design and construction schedules and provide the reasons for any discrepancies between original and final (if any). Also, indicate if your role in past project was full time or for only a portion of the schedule.
Total Project Cost: Original vs. Final; explain difference	Provide the original and final cost of the past project, for both the full scope and your scope specifically. If the final cost varies from the original cost, provide reasons for the discrepancies.
Delivery Method:	Collaborative methods: PDB, CMAR, IPD Other alternative methods: DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFOM, or other P3 Traditional: DBB
Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:	
Client Reference for Past Project:	Reference Contact Name:
	Title:
	Reference Role on Past Project:
	Phone No.:
	Email:
Project 2	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project sector Flow rates Biosolids input capacity Construction considerations:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Size of workforce</i> ○ <i>Significant portion of specialized process mechanical and electrical equipment</i> ○ <i>Upgrades to existing plant in continuous operation</i> ○ <i>Climatic conditions of past project location</i> ○ <i>Building codes and standards of past project location</i> ○ <i>Multiple tie-ins to existing facility</i> ● <i>Safety, health, and environmental programs</i> ● <i>Quality management methods</i>
<p>Past Project Schedule Dates (start–finish), duration (mos.) and % complete</p>	<p><i>Indicate original past project schedule and actual past project delivery schedule, showing design and construction schedules and provide the reasons for any discrepancies between original and final (if any). Also, indicate if your role in past project was full time or for only a portion of the schedule.</i></p>
<p>Total Project Cost: Original vs. Final; explain difference</p>	<p><i>Provide the original and final cost of the past project, for both the full scope and your scope specifically. If the final cost varies from the original cost, provide reasons for the discrepancies.</i></p>
<p>Delivery Method:</p>	<p><i>Collaborative methods: PDB, CMAR, IPD</i></p> <p><i>Other alternative methods: DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFOM, or other P3</i></p> <p><i>Traditional: DBB</i></p>
<p>Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:</p>	
<p>Client Reference for Past Project:</p>	<p>Reference Contact Name:</p> <hr/> <p>Title:</p> <hr/> <p>Reference Role on Past Project:</p> <hr/> <p>Phone No.:</p> <hr/> <p>Email:</p> <hr/>

**FORM B-14 – KEY INDIVIDUAL QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE
 Commissioning Lead**

Key Individual’s Name:	<i>John Doe</i>
Current Employer – Proponent / Proponent Team Member:	<i>e.g. AECOM Canada Ltd – Proponent or AECOM Canada Ltd – Construction Team Member</i>
Education, Professional Licenses / Certifications & Specialized Training (include institutions, certifying agency & license / cert. numbers:	<i>e.g. P.Eng., PE, PMP etc., trained in confined space entry</i>
Proposed Role & Scope of Responsibility on this Biosolids Facilities Project:	
Years of Experience	<i>Indicate</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>years of experience similar to the proposed role for the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Facilities Project and</i> • <i>Total years of experience</i>
Project 1	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	<i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Project sector</i> • <i>Flow rates</i> • <i>Biosolids input capacity</i> • <i>Biosolids treatment processes</i> • <i>Other major components</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Anaerobic digestion</i> ○ <i>Solids dewatering</i> ○ <i>Digester gas treatment</i> ○ <i>Phosphorus release</i> ○ <i>Pre-digestion thermal hydrolysis</i> ○ <i>Phosphorus recovery</i> • <i>Commissioning phases (equipment start-up to full performance testing)</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Training</i>
Delivery Method:	<i>Collaborative methods: PDB, CMAR, IPD</i> <i>Other alternative methods: DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFOM, or other P3</i> <i>Traditional: DBB</i>
Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:	
Client Reference for Past Project:	Reference Contact Name:
	Title:
	Reference Role on Past Project:
	Phone No.:
	Email:
Project 2	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	

<p>Description of Past Project:</p>	<p><i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Project sector</i> • <i>Flow rates</i> • <i>Biosolids input capacity</i> • <i>Biosolids treatment processes</i> • <i>Other major components</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Anaerobic digestion</i> ○ <i>Solids dewatering</i> ○ <i>Digester gas treatment</i> ○ <i>Phosphorus release</i> ○ <i>Pre-digestion thermal hydrolysis</i> ○ <i>Phosphorus recovery</i> • <i>Commissioning phases (equipment start-up to full performance testing)</i> • <i>Training</i>
<p>Delivery Method:</p>	<p><i>Collaborative methods: PDB, CMAR, IPD</i></p> <p><i>Other alternative methods: DB, DBO, DBFO, DBFOM, or other P3</i></p> <p><i>Traditional: DBB</i></p>
<p>Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:</p>	
<p>Client Reference for Past Project:</p>	<p>Reference Contact Name:</p> <hr/> <p>Title:</p> <hr/> <p>Reference Role on Past Project:</p> <hr/> <p>Phone No.:</p> <hr/> <p>Email:</p> <hr/>

**FORM B-15 – KEY INDIVIDUAL QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE
 Social Procurement Lead**

Key Individual’s Name:	<i>John Doe</i>
Current Employer – Proponent / Proponent Team Member:	<i>e.g. AECOM Canada Ltd – Proponent or AECOM Canada Ltd – Construction Team Member</i>
Education, Professional Licenses / Certifications & Specialized Training (include institutions, certifying agency & license / cert. numbers:	
Proposed Role & Scope of Responsibility on this Biosolids Facilities Project:	
Years of Experience	<p><i>Indicate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>years of experience similar to the proposed role for the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Facilities Project and</i> • <i>Total years of experience</i>
Project 1	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	<p><i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Project budget</i> • <i>Reporting requirements for social procurement</i> • <i>Resourcing of Skilled Labour from Indigenous Peoples and Under-Represented Groups</i> • <i>Social procurement targets and Best Efforts criteria</i>
Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:	

Client Reference for Past Project:	Reference Contact Name:
	Title:
	Reference Role on Past Project:
	Phone No.:
	Email:
Project 2	
Past Project Owner and location (City, Province / State, Country)	
Past Project Name	
Role and Responsibility of Key Individual on Past Project:	
Description of Past Project:	<p><i>Provide a narrative describing the project scope in enough detail to indicate how this past project is relevant to the NEWPCC Upgrade: Biosolids Project. At a minimum, the description should include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Project budget</i> • <i>Reporting requirements for social procurement</i> • <i>Resourcing of Skilled Labour from Indigenous Peoples and Under-Represented Groups</i> • <i>Social procurement targets and Best Efforts criteria</i>
Name(s) of other Proponent Team Member(s) involved in past project and their Roles:	
Client Reference for Past Project:	Reference Contact Name:
	Title:
	Reference Role on Past Project:
	Phone No.:
	Email:

APPENDIX C

FINANCIAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

Financial Submission Requirements	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
SECTION A FINANCIAL AND PERFORMANCE SECURITY INFORMATION			Pass/Fail
A1. The Proponent shall submit the following financial information:			
A1.1 For each Proponent Team Member and each Guarantor, a letter from the chief financial officer, or equivalent officer, of the organization, or organizations, whose financial statements were provided as part of its Step 1 Submissions confirming no material adverse changes to each Proponent Team Member’s or Guarantor’s financial capacity relative to its Step 1 Submission, including but not limited to, credit ratings and / or bond ratings.	The Proponent’s response will be evaluated based on the extent to which the letter from the chief financial officer provided confirms or indicates the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that there is no material adverse change to the Proponent Team Member’s and each Guarantor’s financial capacity relative to the Proponent’s Step 1 Submission; and • in the event that relevant material adverse changes have occurred in the financial capacity of the relevant Proponent Team Member and each Guarantor, the letter is supported by adequate supporting documents with respect to the financial capacity (example, bond rating) and demonstrates that the financial 	N/A	Pass/Fail

Financial Submission Requirements	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
	capacity is adequate to meet its financial obligations required by the Work.		
<p>A1.2 A letter from each Guarantor and / or other supporting entity describing all parent company guarantees and / or other support which will be provided to the Proponent, on a joint and several basis, and enforceable by the City pursuant to the Development Phase Agreement.</p>	<p>The Proponent’s response will be evaluated based on the extent to which the letter from each Guarantor and / or other supporting entity provides the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> evidence and confirmation of the extent of support in respect of the obligations and liabilities of the Proponent, including details on the Guarantor and / or other supporting entity involvement in any and all such elements of support / backing and details of how the Proponent will satisfy any terms of the guarantees and / or other support. 		Pass/Fail
<p>A2. The Proponent shall submit the following information related to performance security</p>			
<p>A2.1 A Surety’s consent for the Development Partner Scope of Work in the form set out in Appendix H – Form of Surety’s Consent.</p>	<p>The Proponent’s response will be evaluated based on the extent to which the Surety’s consent is submitted per the requirements in Appendix H – Form of Surety’s Consent.</p>	N/A	Pass/Fail

Financial Submission Requirements	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
<p>A2.2 For each Proponent Team Member(s) who will act as the general contractor, a letter of confirmation from a duly licensed Canadian bonding company (“Surety”) clearly stating:</p> <p>(a) the name and address of the Proponent Team Member for which the confirmation letter is being provided; and</p> <p>(b) the Proponent Team Member’s single bond amount limit and the Proponent Team Member’s total aggregate bonding project amount.</p>	<p>The Proponent’s response will be evaluated based on the extent that the letter of confirmation from a Surety meets the requirements in this Section A2.2.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Pass/Fail</p>
<p>SECTION B DEVELOPMENT PHASE AND IMPLEMENTATION PHASE PRICING</p>			<p>100</p>
<p>B1. Fee – Corporate Overhead and Profit</p>			
<p>B1.1 The Proponent shall submit the Financial Submission Form in Appendix G – Financial Submission Form, which shall include the following:</p> <p>(a) The Proponent shall identify each of its Primary Construction Team Member(s) and Primary Design Team Member(s) (collectively the “Primary Team”) which shall satisfy the following requirements:</p> <p>(i) a Proponent Team Member may be identified as either a Primary Design</p>	<p>Refer to Appendix F – Fee Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Methodology for details on the evaluation criteria.</p>	<p>100</p>	<p>100</p>

Financial Submission Requirements	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
<p>Team Member, a Primary Construction Team Member or both;</p> <p>(ii) Proponents may elect to identify additional Proponent Team Members as either a Primary Design Team Member and/or a Primary Construction Team Member;</p> <p>(iii) during the DPA Term (and, if applicable, the Project Term), the Proponent Team Member's Corporate Overhead and Profit will be billed in accordance with the rates provided for the Primary Design Team or Primary Construction Team identified in the Preferred Proponent's Appendix G – Financial Submission Form; and</p> <p>(iv) the Corporate Overhead rate and Profit rate applicable for the Development Partner Scope of Work performed during the DPA Term (and, if applicable, the Project Term) by a DPA Subcontractor will be:</p> <p>(A) the Corporate Overhead rate and Profit rate for the Primary Team Subcontracted</p>			

Financial Submission Requirements	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
<p>Construction Work, if the DPA Subcontractor's scope of work is the Early Works; or</p> <p>(B) the Corporate Overhead rate and Profit rate for the Primary Team Subcontracted Design Work, if the DPA Subcontractor's scope of work is all other Development Partner Scope of Work that are not Early Works,</p> <p>and, in each case, the rates payable to the Development Partner (pursuant to the Development Phase Agreement) and, if applicable, to the Design Builder (pursuant to the Design Build Agreement) with respect to the Development Phase Scope of Work performed by the DPA Subcontractor shall be lower than the rates of the Development Phase Scope of Work performed by the Primary Team and, in each case, the rates payable to the Development Partner (pursuant to the Development Phase Agreement) and, if applicable, to the Design Builder (pursuant to the Design Build</p>			

Financial Submission Requirements	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
<p>Agreement) with respect to the Development Partner Scope of Work performed by the Primary Team shall be greater than zero.</p> <p>[Note to Proponents: The members of the Primary Team identified by the Proponent in its Financial Submission (including each Primary Construction Team Member and each Primary Design Team Member) will be adopted in the applicable definitions in the Development Phase Agreement and the Draft Design Build Agreement (including “Primary Team”, “Primary Construction Team” and “Primary Design Team”).]</p> <p>(b) In respect of each Proponent Team Member which is not a Primary Team member, the Proponent shall identify each DPA Subcontractor.</p> <p>(c) The Proponent shall submit the following rates (in percentage) relative to Eligible Costs in the form provided in Appendix G – Financial Submission Form entering inputs into cells which are shaded yellow only:</p> <p>(i) Corporate Overhead, payable by the City to Development Partner</p>			

Financial Submission Requirements	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
<p>(pursuant to the Development Phase Agreement) or the Design Builder (pursuant to the Design Build Agreement), and broken down as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (A) combined Corporate Overhead for Primary Team Subcontracted Construction Work; (B) combined Corporate Overhead for Primary Team Subcontracted Design Work; (C) combined Corporate Overhead for Primary Team Self-Performed Construction Work; and (D) combined Corporate Overhead for Primary Team Self-Performed Design Work; and <p>(ii) Profit, payable by the City to Development Partner (pursuant to the Development Phase Agreement) or the Design Builder (pursuant to</p>			

Financial Submission Requirements	Evaluation Criteria	Contributing Points	Points
<p>the Design Build Agreement), and broken down as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (A) combined Profit for Primary Team Subcontracted Construction Work; (B) combined Profit for Primary Team Subcontracted Design Work; (C) combined Profit for Primary Team Self-Performed Construction Work; and (D) combined Profit for Primary Team Self-Performed Design Work. <p>(iii) The percentages in Schedule 8 of the Development Phase Agreement will be updated prior to the Effective Date to account for these rates as identified in the Preferred Proponent's Financial Submission.</p>			

APPENDIX D

COMMERCIALLY CONFIDENTIAL MEETING GUIDELINES

A1. General

- A1.1 The fundamental rules and requirements with respect to the Commercially Confidential Meetings are set out in RFP Section D4.2.
- A1.2 Proponents are reminded that Commercially Confidential Meetings are not intended to be a question and answer session about the RFP Process or the RFP Documents (the RFI process outlined in RFP Section D2.2 is intended for this purpose) or the forum in which commercially confidential questions are submitted for oral responses. The Commercially Confidential RFI process outlined in RFP Section D2.2(a)(i)(B) is intended to serve that purpose.
- A1.3 The City views Commercially Confidential Meetings as a tool intended to facilitate frank and open communications between the Proponents and the City on key issues. These meetings are also intended as an important forum for getting input on terms and conditions of the Draft Agreements to be signed between the parties, in an effort to ensure that the Draft Agreements are commercially reasonable.

A2. Background and Purpose of the CCMs

- A2.1 The primary purpose of the Commercially Confidential Meetings is to discuss the Draft Agreements and the Proponent's suggested amendments to the Draft Agreements and to solicit feedback from Proponents based on the comments received by the City and the agendas proposed by Proponents. It is likely that different Proponents may wish to discuss different matters with the City during the CCMs and the meetings are intended to be flexible enough to allow this. Proponents should note that they are expected to lead the discussion through their agendas and the City representatives may ask questions and provide responses as the meeting progresses.
- A2.2 As set out in RFP Section D2.3 and the RFP Data Sheet, Proponents are requested to submit comments on the Draft Agreements as well as an agenda for each CCM. The deadlines to submit comments and an agenda for each round of CCMs are also set out in the RFP Data Sheet.
- A2.3 At the CCMs, Proponents may raise issues on certain commercial principles of the transaction by identifying and explaining problems and/or inconsistencies with those commercial principles. Proponents may also raise issues on specific sections of the Draft Agreements by identifying and explaining problems and/or inconsistencies with those sections. Proponents are strongly encouraged to propose solutions or revised drafting and rationale for consideration by the City.

A3. Questions During Commercially Confidential Meetings

- A3.1 The City may or may not respond to questions or comments during the Commercially Confidential Meetings and may request that a Proponent submit a question in writing pursuant to the RFI submission process. Subject to any questions submitted in writing to the City pursuant to the RFI submission process, the information provided by the Proponents in the Commercially Confidential Meeting will remain confidential with the City.

If the City makes a decision to amend the RFP Documents, the revisions will be communicated to all Proponents by Addendum.

- A3.2 If a Proponent raises problems and/or inconsistencies in the Draft Agreements and the City is of the view that the Proponent has misunderstood a particular provision of the Draft Agreements or the City is of the view that the problem or inconsistency raised is covered in another provision, the City may direct the Proponent to certain provisions. If the Proponent has a question regarding the interpretation of a certain provision of the Draft Agreements, the Proponent should raise the question either in its comments on the Draft Agreements or in the form of a RFI.

A4. General Principles

- A4.1 Proponents are reminded that, as set out in RFP Section D4.2(d), all Commercially Confidential Meetings are non-binding and nothing said at the Commercially Confidential Meetings, by either the City or its advisors can amend any of the RFP Documents (including the Draft Agreements), nor will anything said be binding on the City except when and only to the extent expressly confirmed in an Addendum to the RFP Documents.
- A4.2 Proponents are not evaluated on either their submissions for the Commercially Confidential Meetings or Proponent comments made during these meetings. Commercially Confidential Meetings are not interviews for the purpose of evaluation.
- A4.3 The Fairness Advisor will provide third-party independent oversight and will attend the Commercially Confidential Meetings.
- A4.4 All participants in Commercially Confidential Meetings are obliged to treat all information received at the meetings in confidence in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Request for Proposals (see RFP Section D7.4).
- A4.5 Proponents are advised that a separate room will be available to accommodate break-out sessions as may be required by the City or the Proponent team.

APPENDIX E

SCENARIO-BASED INTERVIEW GUIDELINES

B1. Overview

- B1.1 The objective of the Scenario-based Interview is to assess the extent to which the Proponent exhibits and evidences the behaviours necessary for effective collaborative working in respect of the following sub-criteria:
- (a) collaborative leadership;
 - (b) collaborative culture;
 - (c) learning, continuous improvement and innovation.
- B1.2 The Scenario-based Interview will take place in person in Winnipeg and shall be independently facilitated and managed by the Interview Facilitator.
- B1.3 The Scenario-based Interview shall comprise a set of exercises where the Proponent's representatives will interact and engage with the City's representatives in mixed groups.
- B1.4 At the beginning of the Scenario-based Interview, the Fairness Advisor will provide the attendees with a briefing on the overall approach along with more specific briefings for each of the exercises.
- B1.5 The Proponent shall ensure that Key Individuals, as identified below, attend the Scenario-based Interview. If any of the Key Individuals do not attend the Scenario-based Interview and the City considers this to be material, the Proponent's score for the Scenario-based Interview may be reduced or the Proponent's Step 2 Submission may be disqualified.
- (a) Design Build Project Manager
 - (b) Project Design Manager
 - (c) Lead Process Engineer
 - (d) Project Construction Manager
 - (e) 1 other Key Individual as selected by the Proponent
- B1.6 A maximum number of 5 Proponent representatives will be allowed for the Scenario-based Interview.
- B1.7 The Proponent shall not use the Scenario-based Interview as an opportunity for the Proponent to engage with the City's representatives in relation to any other part of the RFP Process or the status of the evaluation process.

B2. Evaluation and Scoring Process

B2.1 The Scenario-based Interview will be evaluated with reference to the evaluation criteria and sub-criteria set out below.

Scenario-based Interview Requirement	Evaluation Criteria	Points
Collaborative leadership	The Proponent evidences the behaviours necessary for effective collaborative working in respect of collaborative leadership	75
Collaborative culture	The Proponent evidences the behaviours necessary for effective collaborative working in respect of collaborative culture	75
Learning, continuous improvement and innovation.	The Proponent evidences the behaviours necessary for effective collaborative working in respect of learning, continuous improvement and innovation.	50

APPENDIX F

FEE EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING METHODOLOGY

A1. General

B2.1 The following sets out the process for evaluation of the Corporate Overhead rate and Profit rate submitted by the Proponent.

A2. Equations

B2.2 Design Team Blended Corporate Overhead = (Primary Team Self-Performed Design Work weighting * Primary Team Self-Performed Design Work Corporate Overhead Rate) + (Primary Team Subcontracted Design Work weighting * Primary Team Subcontracted Design Work Corporate Overhead Rate).

B2.3 Design Team Blended Profit = (Primary Team Self-Performed Design Work weighting * Primary Team Self-Performed Design Work Profit Rate) + (Primary Team Subcontracted Design Work weighting * Primary Team Subcontracted Design Work Profit Rate).

B2.4 Design Team Blended Fee = (Design Team Blended Corporate Overhead + Design Team Blended Profit).

B2.5 Construction Team Blended Corporate Overhead = (Primary Team Self-Performed Construction Work weighting * Primary Team Self-Performed Construction Work Corporate Overhead Rate) + (Primary Team Subcontracted Construction Work weighting * Primary Team Subcontracted Construction Work Corporate Overhead Rate)

B2.6 Construction Team Blended Profit = (Primary Team Self-Performed Construction Work weighting * Primary Team Self-Performed Construction Work Profit Rate) + (Primary Team Subcontracted Construction Work weighting * Primary Team Subcontracted Construction Work Profit Rate)

B2.7 Construction Team Blended Fee = (Construction Team Blended Corporate Overhead + Construction Team Blended Profit)

B2.8 Proponent Blended Fee = (Design Team Blended Fee * Design Team weighting) + (Construction Team Blended Fee * Construction Team weighting)

B2.9 The lowest Proponent Blended Fee will be awarded the maximum points available for the Fee – Corporate Overhead and Profit evaluation (100 points) and the City will deduct 5.0 points from the maximum points available for the Fee – Corporate Overhead and Profit evaluation for every percentage point by which the Proponent's Blended Fee is greater than the lowest Proponent Blended Fee, per the following formula:

(a) Proponent's Financial Score = Maximum points available – (Proponent Blended Fee – lowest Proponent Blended Fee) * 5 * 100.

B2.10 Scoring shall be rounded to four decimal places.

B2.11 The scoring methodology in Sections B2.3 to B2.8 is applicable to Corporate Overhead and Profit for Primary Team Self-Performed Design Work and Primary Team Self-Performed Construction Work, and to Corporate Overhead and Profit for Primary Team Subcontracted Design Work and Primary Team Subcontracted Construction Work.

APPENDIX G
FINANCIAL SUBMISSION FORM

See attached Excel file

APPENDIX H
FORM OF SURETY'S CONSENT

Date:

Number:

To:

Whereas **[Insert legal name of Proponent]** (the "**Principal**") has submitted a written Proposal to the City, dated **[Insert date of Proposal]** for the design and construction of the North End Sewage Treatment Plant (NEWPCC) Upgrade: Biosolids Facilities.

The condition of this obligation is such that if the Principal shall have its Proposal accepted and shall cause the Development Partner to execute the Development Phase Agreement by **[Insert the Execution of the DPA Target Date]**, then **[Insert legal name of Surety]**, a corporation created and existing under the laws of Canada and duly authorized to transact the business of suretyship in Canada as surety (the "**Surety**") hereby undertakes and agrees with the Obligee to issue the performance bond in respect of the Development Partner Scope of Work and the labour and material payment bond in respect of the Development Partner Scope of Work, **[each bond to be in the amount as set out in Section [x] of Schedule 11 – Development Phase Insurance of the Development Phase Agreement.]**

Provided, however, this consent shall be null and void unless an application for such bonds is delivered to the Surety by the Principal within 365 days following the RFP Submission Deadline.

Unless otherwise defined herein, all capitalized terms herein shall have the meaning ascribed thereto in the Request for Proposals No. 779-2021B issued **[date of Step 2 release]**, as amended from time to time.

[Surety]

By: _____
Name

Attorney-in-Fact

By: _____
Name

Attorney-in-Fact