

APPENDIX A: EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

The Authority will evaluate the Proposals in accordance with this Appendix A.

A – TECHNICAL SUBMISSION

Subject to the terms of this RFP, the Authority will evaluate each of the Technical Submissions as follows by considering if each Technical Submission:

- (a) contains any Material Non-Compliances;
- (b) satisfies the provisions of this RFP, including the requirements set out in Appendix B of this RFP and the Final Draft Design-Build Agreement; and
- (c) demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Authority that the Proponent is capable of performing the obligations and responsibilities of the Design-Builder and delivering the Project in accordance with the Final Draft Design-Build Agreement, and that the Proponent has a good understanding of the Project and the work.

B – FINANCIAL SUBMISSION

The Authority will evaluate each of the Financial Submissions as follows:

- (a) in accordance with Section 7.1 of the RFP, the Nominal Cost of the Proposal as at the Submission Time for Financial Submissions must not exceed the Design-Build Price Ceiling; and
- (b) each Proponent should indicate whether any Scope Ladder items were used to allow the Nominal Cost of the Proposal to be below the Design-Build Price Ceiling. Proponents proposing reductions to the Statement of Requirements must do so in accordance with Sections 4.3 and 7.1.

Proposals will be examined to determine whether the requirements of this RFP in respect of the Design-Build Price Ceiling have been satisfied.

Subject to the terms of this RFP, the Financial Submission evaluation will consider whether the Financial Submission substantially satisfies the requirements of this RFP.

If the Authority determines, in its discretion, that the Financial Submission does not substantially satisfy the above requirements, the Authority may decide not to complete a detailed evaluation of the Proposal.

C – RANKING PROCESS

Subject to the terms of this RFP, each Proposal, including the Technical Submission and the Financial Submission, that substantially satisfies the requirements of this RFP and the Final Draft Design-Build Agreement, will be evaluated and ranked according to the following process:

- (1) each Proposal will be examined to identify the extent to which, if at all, Scope Ladder items, as described in Section 4.3 of this RFP, have been used to achieve the Design-Build Price Ceiling;
- (2) the Proposals will then be ranked in accordance with the number of Scope Ladder items used, with the Proposals that use the least number of Scope Ladder items being ranked the highest, and the Proposals that use the most Scope Ladder items being ranked the lowest;
- (3) if two or more Proposals are ranked equally high under paragraph 2 above, the Authority will, in respect of such Proposals, consider the points awarded based on the level of achievement of the criteria in Table 1 below, and the Proponent providing the Proposal which offers the highest points total as determined by the Authority, in its discretion, will be designated the Preferred Proponent;
- (4) if two or more of the Proposals that are ranked highest under paragraph 3 above have the same points total, the Authority will, in respect of such Proposals, consider the points awarded based on the level of achievement of criteria and sub-criteria relating to structure and structural system in Table 1 below, and the Proponent providing the Proposal which offers the highest points total in these areas as determined by the Authority, in its discretion, will then be designated the Preferred Proponent.

Table 1 describes these criteria and indicates the maximum points available for each criterion and the weighting of each sub-criterion of the criterion where applicable. Where weightings are not indicated, sub-criterion will be weighted equally. A linear distribution of points between minimum and maximum will apply unless otherwise noted, with the minimum scoring to equal 0 points, and the maximum scoring equalling the maximum available points for the category, taking into account the respective weighting.

Table 1: Scored Elements

Related Section in Appendix B	Criteria	Points
	1. Innovation	60
3.1 c)	<p>The extent to which the proposal demonstrates innovation in the following areas:</p> <p>a. Wood Optimization (25 Points)</p> <p>Optimization of wood content in the following building areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structure (minimum 50%; maximum 74%) • Interior partitions (minimum 25%; maximum 38%) • Non-glazed Exterior Cladding (minimum 25%; maximum 38%) • Total wood volume (minimum 35%; maximum 50%) <p><u>Scoring section 1a:</u></p> <p><i>Refer to information accompanying the FPI Wood Calculator Tool provided in the Data Room entitled “Use of the FPI Wood Calculator Tool and Scoring for Appendix A Scored Elements Criteria 1.a. Wood Optimization”.</i></p>	
3.1 d)	<p>b. Value-added Wood Product Use (20 Points)</p> <p>Extent to which the proposal utilizes Value-added Wood Products as an alternative to contemporary design and construction approaches in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structural system <p>The structural system including columns, load-bearing walls, core walls and shear walls, lateral system bracing, stairs, and floor and roof framing elements such as beams, joists, trusses, sheathing, and mass timber panels, extensively utilizes Value-added Wood Products in an effective and appropriate manner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interior partitions and finishes <p>Interior partitions and finishes including permanent and moveable partitions, doors, floors, ceiling, wall finishes and fittings and fixtures extensively utilize Value-added Wood Products in an effective and appropriate manner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building envelope <p>The building envelope, including roof finish, walls above and below ground floors, windows, exterior doors, balconies, canopies and screens extensively utilize Value-added Wood Products in an effective and appropriate manner.</p> <p><u>Scoring section 1b:</u></p> <p><i>Minimum: Value-added Wood Products not extensively utilized as an alternative to contemporary design and construction approaches or utilized in an inappropriate manner.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum: Proposal demonstrates extensive and appropriate use of Value-added Wood Products as an alternative to contemporary design and construction approaches.</i></p>	

Related Section in Appendix B	Criteria	Points
3.1 e)	<p>Use of Value-added Wood Products in the structural system will comprise 50% of the weighting towards the overall score for section 1b.</p> <p>c. Value-added Wood Product Use Innovation (15 Points)</p> <p>Extent to which the proposal demonstrates innovation in Value-added Wood Products application in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structural system <p>The structural system including columns, load-bearing walls, core walls and shear walls, lateral system bracing, stairs, and floor and roof framing elements such as beams, joists, trusses, sheathing, and mass timber panels demonstrates use of Value-added Wood Products in innovative and appropriate ways to resolve traditional structural challenges.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interior partitions and finishes <p>Interior partitions and finishes including permanent and moveable partitions, doors, floors, ceiling, wall finishes and fittings and fixtures demonstrate use of Value-added Wood Products in appropriate, new and non-traditional ways. Innovations contribute to increased Value-added Wood use, overall quality of interior finishes, product performance and overall occupant experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building envelope <p>The building envelope including roof finish, walls above and below ground floors, windows, exterior doors, balconies and screens demonstrates use of Value-added Wood Products in a safe, non-traditional and innovative manner. Proposal utilizes Value-added Wood Products in innovative ways to resolve traditional building envelope and mechanical load challenges.</p> <p><u>Scoring section 1c:</u></p> <p><i>Minimum: Proposal indicates limited innovation in application of Value-added Wood Products.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum: Proposal demonstrates extensive innovation in the application of Value-added Wood Products.</i></p> <p>Innovation in the application of Value-added Wood Products in the structural system will comprise 50% of the weighting towards the overall score for section 1c.</p>	
	2. Aesthetics	15
3.1 a)	<p>Extent to which the proposal demonstrates design excellence in the following areas:</p> <p>a. Exterior design</p> <p>Including building architectural design, clarity of intention, urban design, site design and contextual relationships including massing, scale, colours, materials, textures and supporting details.</p> <p>In assessing exterior design, evaluators will consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design is clearly identifiable and embodies the principles of wood innovation through its physical elements. 	

Related Section in Appendix B	Criteria	Points
3.1 a) and 3.4 a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design has a human scale, welcoming and sensitive to the setting, and enhances the urban context. • The form and materials are well-detailed; colours and textures are articulate and enrich the building's form. • Materials enhance the building as a whole, including recognition of the City of Prince George and its wood culture and heritage. <p style="text-align: center;">b. Interior design</p> <p>Including building design, clarity of intention, appropriateness, program definition, colour and material selection, textures and supporting details.</p> <p>In assessing interior design, evaluators will consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational and office space are easily distinguished and coordinated to create a cohesive interior design that emphasise the collaborative nature of the building. • Interiors are welcoming to staff, students and visitors. The scale and quality of spaces is appropriate to a progressive educational and office environment that supports interaction between students, educators, business, industry and the downtown community. • Materials enhance the vision of the building. The form and materials are well-detailed and the building is a showcase of wood innovation. 	
3.4 a)	<p style="text-align: center;">c. Overall spatial relationships</p> <p>Including building design, clarity of intention, program definition, educational and office area design as well as flexibility, adaptability and building operational design efficiency.</p> <p>In assessing overall spatial relationships, evaluators will consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design includes sufficient variety to create interest, separating programmatic functions while sharing circulation and amenity spaces. • The design demonstrates how it can be flexible to adapt to meet changes and innovations in education and office environments without significant implications and changes to the building's operational systems, structure or general circulation. • The relationship of the interior spaces to the exterior promotes visual and spatial interconnectivity. • Circulation and way finding is clear, complementary, and integrated within the overall programmatic requirements and its relation to the site and context of downtown Prince George. <p><u>Scoring section 2:</u></p> <p><i>Minimum: Proposal indicates limited excellence in design.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum: Proposal demonstrates extensive excellence in design.</i></p>	

Related Section in Appendix B	Criteria	Points																																				
	3. Private Sector Participation	25																																				
3.4 b)	<p>Extent to which the proposal includes private sector provision of additional building area (beyond base scope):</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="573 615 1276 1337"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="573 615 854 680">Building area (square metres)</th> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="854 615 1276 680">Points Available</th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="573 680 854 810"></td> <th data-bbox="854 680 1068 810">Design consistent with use of SSR</th> <th data-bbox="1068 680 1276 810">Design consistent with current BCBC*</th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="573 810 854 863">Additional Area</td> <td data-bbox="854 810 1068 863">(i)</td> <td data-bbox="1068 810 1276 863">(ii)</td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="573 863 854 915">500 - 1000</td> <td data-bbox="854 863 1068 915">2</td> <td data-bbox="1068 863 1276 915">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="573 915 854 968">1001 - 1500</td> <td data-bbox="854 915 1068 968">4</td> <td data-bbox="1068 915 1276 968">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="573 968 854 1020">1501 - 2000</td> <td data-bbox="854 968 1068 1020">7</td> <td data-bbox="1068 968 1276 1020">3.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="573 1020 854 1073">2001 - 2500</td> <td data-bbox="854 1020 1068 1073">10</td> <td data-bbox="1068 1020 1276 1073">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="573 1073 854 1125">2501 - 3000</td> <td data-bbox="854 1073 1068 1125">13</td> <td data-bbox="1068 1073 1276 1125">6.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="573 1125 854 1178">3001 - 3500</td> <td data-bbox="854 1125 1068 1178">16</td> <td data-bbox="1068 1125 1276 1178">8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="573 1178 854 1230">3501 - 4000</td> <td data-bbox="854 1178 1068 1230">19</td> <td data-bbox="1068 1178 1276 1230">9.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="573 1230 854 1283">4001 - 4500</td> <td data-bbox="854 1230 1068 1283">22</td> <td data-bbox="1068 1230 1276 1283">11</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="573 1283 854 1337">4500+</td> <td data-bbox="854 1283 1068 1337">25</td> <td data-bbox="1068 1283 1276 1337">12.5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="591 1356 1243 1415">* Current British Columbia Building Code not amended by the SSR for the WIDC.</p> <p data-bbox="431 1451 662 1478"><u>Scoring section 3:</u></p> <p data-bbox="431 1507 1393 1566"><i>Minimum: Proposal includes no private sector provision of additional building area beyond base scope.</i></p> <p data-bbox="431 1602 1417 1780"><i>Maximum: Proposal includes private sector provision of additional building area that is consistent with WIDC proposal with regards to Value-added Wood Products use will be allocated a score that is consistent with column (i). Additional building area that is not consistent with the WIDC proposal with regards to Value-added Wood Products use will be allocated a score that is consistent with column (ii).</i></p>	Building area (square metres)	Points Available			Design consistent with use of SSR	Design consistent with current BCBC*	Additional Area	(i)	(ii)	500 - 1000	2	1	1001 - 1500	4	2	1501 - 2000	7	3.5	2001 - 2500	10	5	2501 - 3000	13	6.5	3001 - 3500	16	8	3501 - 4000	19	9.5	4001 - 4500	22	11	4500+	25	12.5	
Building area (square metres)	Points Available																																					
	Design consistent with use of SSR	Design consistent with current BCBC*																																				
Additional Area	(i)	(ii)																																				
500 - 1000	2	1																																				
1001 - 1500	4	2																																				
1501 - 2000	7	3.5																																				
2001 - 2500	10	5																																				
2501 - 3000	13	6.5																																				
3001 - 3500	16	8																																				
3501 - 4000	19	9.5																																				
4001 - 4500	22	11																																				
4500+	25	12.5																																				

The Technical Proposal will be scored and awarded points based on the level of achievement of the criteria in Table 1, based on information provided in the Technical Submission as described in Appendix B, Proposal Requirements.