

Request for Qualification Ref 01-7001

**Engineering, Procurement and
Construction for the Infrastructures
of the *Réseau électrique
métropolitain de Montréal***

June 28, 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GLOSSARY	1
1. INTRODUCTION	6
1.1 Purpose and Contents of the Document	6
1.2 Brief Description of the Project	6
1.3 Procurement Process	7
1.4 Objectives of the Request for Qualification	7
1.5 Procurement and Project Completion Deadlines.....	8
1.6 Project Governance	9
1.7 Stakeholders	9
1.8 Process Auditor	10
1.9 Conflict of Interest Management.....	10
2. EPC INFRASTRUCTURES	11
2.1 Project Overview.....	11
2.2 Planned Route for the Project.....	12
2.3 Project Components	14
2.4 Division of Responsibilities	14
2.5 Design and Construction Elements	16
2.6 Independent Certifier	16
2.7 Planned Allocation of Risks Related to the EPC Works.....	16
2.8 Management of Interfaces	17
2.9 Other Available Information	21
3. REMUNERATION AND GUARANTEES	22
3.1 Payment Mechanism	22
3.2 Proposal Security Deposit	22
3.3 Performance Guarantees during the Design and Construction Period	22
3.4 Performance Guarantees during the Warranty Period	22
3.5 Parent Company Guarantee.....	22
3.6 Insurance Program	23

4.	PROCUREMENT	23
4.1	Procurement Process	23
4.2	Terms and Conditions.....	23
4.3	Transparency in the Selection Process	25
5.	INSTRUCTIONS FOR RESPONDENTS	25
5.1	Date and Place for Submitting a Response.....	26
5.2	CDPQ Infra’s Representative	27
5.3	Examination of Documents	28
5.4	Requests for Clarification.....	28
5.5	Information Session and Site Visit.....	29
5.6	Preparation and Presentation of a Response.....	29
5.7	Format for a Response	30
5.8	Form of Undertaking	30
5.9	Withdrawal of a Response.....	30
5.10	Request regarding a Conflict of Interest	31
6.	EVALUATION OF RESPONSES	31
6.1	Response Evaluation Process.....	31
6.2	Evaluation Committee.....	32
6.3	Eligibility Criteria	32
6.4	Compliance Requirements	33
6.5	Evaluation Criteria	34
6.6	Selection of Qualified Respondents	35
6.7	Transmission of the Evaluation Results to the Respondents	35
7.	LEGISLATIVE AND NORMATIVE FRAMEWORK	35
7.1	Relevant Applicable Quebec Legislation (Partial List).....	36
7.2	Applicable Canadian Legislation (Partial List)	36
8.	GENERAL CONDITIONS	36
8.1	Communications	36
8.2	Hiring of Certain Advisors or Experts by a Respondent	37

8.3 Access to Information	37
8.4 Conflicts of Interest	38
8.5 Exclusivity	38
8.6 Canadian Content.....	38
8.7 Lobbying and Post-Employment Obligations.....	38
8.8 Disclosure and Public Comments.....	38
8.9 Collusion	39
8.10 Respondents' Costs and Expenses.....	39
8.11 Change in the Composition of a Respondent.....	39
8.12 Rights of CDPQ Infra	39
8.13 Responsibility Relating to the Accuracy of Information	40
8.14 No Recourse	40
8.15 Ownership of Documents	40
8.16 Francization Certificate	40
8.17 Official Language and Translation of Documents.....	40
SCHEDULE 1 – STANDARD LETTERS AND FORMS.....	41
SCHEDULE 1.1 – RESPONDENT’S FORM OF UNDERTAKING.....	42
SCHEDULE 1.2 – LETTER OF INTENT - LETTERS OF CREDIT	45
SCHEDULE 1.3 – LETTER OF INTENT - BOND	46
SCHEDULE 1.4 – REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION.....	47
SCHEDULE 2 – RESPONSE REQUIREMENTS	48
I. Financial Capability on a Pass/Fail Basis	49
II. General Requirements: Integrated Project Management, Approach and Experience.....	50
III. Design Capacity and Experience.....	51
IV. Construction Capacity and Experience.....	53
V. Construction in an Existing Public Transit Corridor	56
VI. Integrating Civil Works and Systems	57
VII. Maximum number of pages per section.....	59

SCHEDULE 3 – DESCRIPTION OF TECHNICAL FEATURES	60
1. Description of the Main Physical Components of the Project.....	60
2. Western Branch	60
3. South Shore Branch	61
SCHEDULE 4 – ACKNOWLEDGMENT	63

GLOSSARY

ADM	Aéroports de Montréal
AMF	Authority responsible under the laws and regulations for issuing an authorization to contractors and subcontractors of public bodies that are required to hold such an authorization pursuant to the Laws and Regulations, namely, the Autorité des marchés financiers created by the <i>Act respecting the Autorité des marchés financiers</i> , CQLR c A-33.2, and any successor, replacement or permitted assign with regard to such role.
AMF Authorization	Authorization issued by the AMF pursuant to the <i>Act respecting contracting by public bodies</i> , CQLR c C-65.1, and most notably in accordance with the related orders in council and implementing regulations and the <i>Integrity in Public Contracts Act</i> , S.Q., 2012, c 25.
AMT	Agence métropolitaine de transport
ARTM	Autorité régionale de transport métropolitain
Associate	A Person is another party's Associate when it has a relationship with the party as defined in section 5 of the <i>Securities Act</i> (CQLR c V-1.1). Moreover, a Person is another party's Associate when it is a subsidiary thereof within the meaning of section 9 of the <i>Securities Act</i> (CQLR c V-1.1).
BAPE	Bureau d'audiences publiques sur l'environnement
CDPQ/Caisse	Caisse de dépôt et placement du Québec
CDPQ Infra	CDPQ Infra inc., a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Caisse, including any subsidiary of CDPQ Infra inc.
CN	Canadian National Railway Company
Consortium	Two or more Persons forming a group for the purpose of submitting a Response and, as the case may be, performing the EPC Works.
Contract	Contract is synonymous with EPC Contract.
Day	Calendar day
Dollars or \$	Canadian dollars
Eligible Insurer	A reputable insurance company in sound financial health that is legally authorized to carry on its operations and that holds the permits required to operate a business in Quebec, issued in accordance with the applicable laws and regulations. To be eligible, the insurer must be able to provide the specific insurance required under the EPC Contract and must have a minimum credit rating of "A-" from A.M. Best Company or its substitute rating agency, or an equivalent rating from another rating agency, on the understanding that in the latter case the insurer's eligibility must be confirmed in advance by CDPQ Infra.
EPC	Engineering, Procurement and Construction
EPC Contract	The contract to be signed by CDPQ Infra and the EPC Contractor that will be responsible for the performance of the EPC Works in connection with the Project.
EPC Contractor	The Proponent selected following the Request for Proposals to sign the EPC Contract with CDPQ Infra and to perform the EPC Works.
EPC Infrastructures	Infrastructures to be designed and constructed by the EPC Contractor, as described in Section 2 of the Request for Qualification.
EPC Works	EPC infrastructure design and construction work

Final Completion	Complete and final acceptance of the infrastructures referred to in the EPC Contract, confirmed by the issuance of a certificate of Final Completion by the Independent Certifier.
Financial Institution	<p>A bank listed in one of Schedules I, II or III to the <i>Bank Act</i> (Canada) (S.C. 1991, c 46) or by a Quebec financial services cooperative whose long-term unsecured debt is rated “A” or better by Standard & Poor’s or “A2” or better by Moody’s, and any other recognized Canadian financial institution deemed acceptable by CDPQ Infra, in CDPQ Infra’s sole discretion, that is established pursuant to the laws of Canada and does business in Canada.</p> <p>The Request for Proposals and the Contract will specify the applicable conditions should a Financial Institution’s credit rating be downgraded or, in the opinion of CDPQ Infra, present risks of variation.</p>
Government	Government of Quebec
Guarantees	The series of guarantees given in accordance with Sections 3.2 to 3.5 inclusively.
IBT	Intermunicipal board of transit
Independent Certifier	The Person appointed as the Independent Certifier, who is responsible, among other duties, for issuing certificates of Substantial Completion and Final Completion.
Key Individual	<p>A natural person who holds a key position with a Respondent, including one of the following positions or an equivalent executive role in the management and performance of the EPC Works:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Manager ▪ Administrative Manager (project control, planning, cost control, accounts payable) ▪ Quality Manager ▪ Environmental Management Manager ▪ Design Manager ▪ Construction Manager ▪ Assistant Construction Manager (civil engineering and other structures) ▪ Airport and Railway Security Manager ▪ Urban Integration Manager ▪ Occupational Health and Safety Manager ▪ Communication Manager ▪ Interface Manager
Legal Review Committee	The committee formed by CDPQ Infra whose mandate consists in examining various legal matters including, in accordance with Section 1.9, situations that are referred to it and that give rise to or could give rise to a real or apparent, existing or apprehended conflict of interest or an unwarranted advantage, and rendering a decision.
LRT	Light rail transit
MDDELCC	The ministère du Développement durable, de l’Environnement et de la Lutte aux changements climatiques, its representative or any other department or entity that assumes functions similar to those performed by the said government department.
Member	One or each of the Persons in a Consortium that forms the Respondent, each of the Members being solidarily liable for the obligations of the EPC Contractor to CDPQ Infra.
MERX	Electronic system for Canadian Public Tenders
MTQ	The Ministère des Transports, de la Mobilité durable et de l’Électrification des transports du Québec, its representative or any other department or entity that assumes functions similar to those performed by the said government department.
Official Email Address	CDPQ Infra’s email address indicated in Section 5.2.

Operator	Any operator of public transit services for the Montreal metropolitan community.
Parent Company	A Person of which another Person is a subsidiary, directly or indirectly, within the meaning of section 9 of the <i>Securities Act</i> (CQLR c V-1.1); the Parent Company named by each Member forming the Respondent must be acceptable to CDPQ Infra, in its sole discretion.
Parent Company Guarantee	The guarantee given by the Parent Company of each of the Members in accordance with Section 3.5 to solidarily secure all obligations of the Proponent to CDPQ Infra.
Participant	<p>A Person who, on behalf of a Respondent, will be responsible for at least one of the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 20% in value of the detailed design work; ▪ 20% in value of the construction work. <p>Any Person designated by a Respondent as a “Participant” because of the particular expertise the Person brings to the performance of the EPC Works is also deemed to be a “Participant” for the purposes of this Request for Qualification.</p>
Period of Validity of the Proposals	The period of time that begins on the date on which the Proposals are submitted and that ends 180 Days after that date.
Person	A natural person, legal person, partnership (including a limited partnership), trust, fund, association or organization, or any other group of persons whether or not established as a legal person, as well as any natural person or other person acting as a trustee, liquidator, executor or legal representative.
Process Auditor	A person whose mandate is to review the entire Procurement Process to ensure that it is open, fair and transparent.
Procurement Process	Steps that will lead to the signing of the EPC Contract, including in order, issuance of the Public Procurement Notice, the Request for Qualification and the Request for Proposals. The Procurement Process ends when the EPC Contract is signed.
Project	A world-class integrated electric automated LRT project including a South Shore Branch (the Highway 10/Downtown Montreal corridor) and a Western Branch (from downtown Montreal to Montréal-Trudeau Airport, Sainte-Anne-de-Bellevue and Deux-Montagnes), referred to as the <i>Réseau électrique métropolitain de Montréal</i> .
Proponent	Qualified Respondent that has signed the Submission Agreement and is authorized to participate in the Request for Proposals.
Proposal	The proposal submitted by a Proponent in response to the Request for Proposals, including a technical section, a price section and the requested Proposal Guarantees.
Proposal Security Deposit	Financial security provided by the Proponent in submitting its Proposal in the form of one or more irrevocable and unconditional letters of credit from a Financial Institution.
Prospective Respondent	A Person or a Consortium that has confirmed its intention to submit a Response.
Public Procurement Notice	Public procurement notice published by CDPQ Infra on SEAO and MERX on May 17, 2016.
Qualification Period	Period provided to Respondents to submit a duly completed Response.
Qualified Respondent	A Respondent who qualifies under the RFQ and who will be invited to participate in the RFP.
RENA	The register of enterprises ineligible for public contracts created under the <i>Act respecting contracting by public bodies</i> (CQLR c C-65.1), which may be consulted at the following address: https://rena.tresor.gouv.qc.ca/rena/
Request for Proposals or RFP	The Request for Proposals for the EPC Contract that will be delivered to Qualified Respondents who are invited to participate.
Request for Qualification or RFQ	This Request for Qualification, including its schedules and, where applicable, addenda.

Réseau électrique métropolitain de Montréal or REM	Refers to the Project to which this Request for Qualification relates.
Respondent	A Person or a Consortium that submits a Response to a Request for Qualification.
Respondent's Representative	Natural person named by the Respondent as the preferred contact for communications between the Respondent and CDPQ Infra during the Procurement Process.
Response	All the information prepared and provided by a Respondent in support of a Response to this Request for Qualification, as well as any information resulting from verifications carried out by CDPQ Infra and additional information obtained during the evaluation of the Respondent's Response and this RFQ.
Revenu Québec	Quebec Revenue Agency
Rolling Stock or RS	Rolling stock
RSSOM	Rolling Stock, Systems, operating services, regular and long-term maintenance.
RSSOM Contract	Contract to be signed by CDPQ Infra and the RSSOM Contractor that will be responsible for providing the RSSOM Services in connection with the Project.
RSSOM Contractor	The Proponent selected following the Request for Proposals to sign the RSSOM Contract with CDPQ Infra and to provide the RSSOM Services.
RSSOM Services	The supply of Rolling Stock, Systems, operating, regular maintenance and long-term maintenance services for the Project infrastructures, Rolling Stock and assets.
RTL	Réseau de transport de Longueuil
SEAO	Electronic system for public tender notices used in Quebec, particularly by the Government.
Selected Proponent	Following the Request for Proposals, the Proponent selected to sign the EPC Contract.
Selection Committee	Committee responsible for reviewing the recommendations of each evaluation committee, compiling the results and making recommendations to CDPQ Infra concerning the qualification and selection of the Qualified Respondents.
STL	Société de transport de Laval
STM	Société de transport de Montréal
SSL	Signature on the Saint Lawrence Group
Submission Agreement	The agreement between CDPQ Infra and each Proponent that is invited to take part in the Request for Proposals, signed before access is provided to the virtual data room and to document downloads for the Request for Proposals. The draft Submission Agreement is one of the Request for Proposals documents.
Submission Price	Lump sum proposed by a Proponent to perform the EPC Works.
Substantial Completion	Provisional acceptance by CDPQ Infra of the infrastructure referred to in the EPC Contract in accordance with the conditions and technical requirements set out in the EPC Contract, confirmed by the issuance of a certificate of Substantial Completion by the Independent Certifier.
Surety	A Person holding a permit issued in accordance with the <i>Act respecting insurance</i> (CQLR c A-32) authorizing it to offer surety insurance, a trust company holding a permit issued pursuant to the <i>Act respecting trust companies and savings companies</i> (CQLR c S-29.01), a financial services cooperative subject to the <i>Act respecting financial services cooperatives</i> (CQLR c C-67.3) or a bank within the meaning of the <i>Bank Act</i> (S.C. 1991, c 46). To qualify, the Surety must have a minimum credit rating of "A-" from A.M. Best Company or its substitute rating agency, or an equivalent rating from another rating agency, on the understanding that in the latter case the Surety's eligibility must be confirmed in advance by CDPQ Infra. The Surety may not, in any case, be a restricted Person.

Systems

All assets whose interrelated functions are necessary to operate the REM and the Rolling Stock, including without limitation the following components: (i) radio and wireless communications systems, (ii) telecommunications systems, (iii) telephone and interphone systems, (iv) switchgear, (v) (fixed and onboard) train control systems, CBTC, signalling, (vi) (low and medium voltage) traction power, (vii) screen doors, (viii) command centre equipment, (ix) onboard systems, (x) ground passenger information and dynamic display systems, (xi) ground passenger information and public address systems, (xii) security and access control systems, (xiii) anti-intrusion detection and obstacle detection systems, (xiv) CCTV systems, and (xv) operating assistance systems and maintenance management systems.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE AND CONTENTS OF THE DOCUMENT

CDPQ Infra has begun planning a world-class integrated electric automated LRT project including a South Shore Branch (the Highway 10/downtown Montreal corridor) and a Western Branch (from downtown Montreal to Montréal-Trudeau Airport, Sainte-Anne-de-Bellevue and Deux-Montagnes).

The Project Procurement Process, following requests for qualifications and the issuance of international requests for proposals, will lead to the signing of major contracts:

- A contract for the infrastructure design and construction work under an Engineering, Procurement and Construction Contract (EPC Contract);
- A contract for the supply of Rolling Stock, Systems, operating, regular maintenance and long-term maintenance services for the Project infrastructure and assets (RSSOM Contract).

For optimization purposes, one or several additional requests for qualifications and for proposals may also be issued for the performance of construction work packages involving certain peripheral work for the Project.

This Request for Qualification, which relates only to the EPC Contract, aims to qualify Respondents who will be invited to take part in the Request for Proposals and to submit a Proposal for the performance of the EPC Contract.

The Procurement Process does not constitute, directly or indirectly, an offer to enter into a public contract, and does not require CDPQ Infra to enter into a public contract with any party. CDPQ Infra may, at any time, terminate or amend the Procurement Process or the Request for Qualification, in its sole discretion.

1.2 BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

1.2.1 Project Overview

The Project will allow for the deployment of a new high-frequency, LRT network by building and transforming close to 67 km of double tracks, 24 stations, 9 bus terminals and 13 park-and-ride facilities. The Project will also include the acquisition of a fleet of over 200 cars that will ultimately be required for commissioning.

The capital costs relating to the Project will total approximately \$5.5 billion, of which \$4 billion will be for the EPC Contract and \$1.5 billion for the RSSOM Contract.

CDPQ Infra is responsible for Project financing and will be the owner of the REM.

Additional information is presented in Section 2 of this document.

1.2.2 Guidelines

The broad guidelines for developing the Project include the following:

- Meet the needs of public transit users;
- Address the various functional and technical needs identified, including using a solution based on automated electric technology;
- Integrate the Project on a metropolitan scale;
- Foster social acceptance by holding stakeholder consultations;

- Take part in working towards the objective of having a harmonized fare structure for the entire metropolitan area;
- Foster economic development;
- Rely on private sector financing and government financial involvement; and
- Generate appropriate financial returns for Caisse depositors.

1.3 PROCUREMENT PROCESS

CDPQ Infra would like to identify contractors, by way of the Procurement Process, who will be able to meet its objectives and requirements, including in particular by:

- Completing the EPC Works at the lowest price and within the timeframe provided;
- Providing the necessary expertise for the EPC Works;
- Proposing an innovative approach; and
- Transparency in performing the EPC Works.

1.4 OBJECTIVES OF THE REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATION

The objectives of the Request for Qualification are as follows:

- Present the Project, the EPC Works and the Procurement Process to Respondents;
- Invite Prospective Respondents to reply to the Request for Qualification for the performance of the EPC Works;
- Specify the information that must be included in the Responses;
- Determine the eligibility and evaluation criteria based on which CDPQ Infra will evaluate the Responses; and
- Qualify up to three (3) Respondents to participate in the Request for Proposals for the performance of the EPC Works.

The Response guidelines, as well as the eligibility and evaluation criteria, are outlined in Sections 5 and 6 of this Request for Qualification.

1.5 PROCUREMENT AND PROJECT COMPLETION DEADLINES

Table 1 presents the principal targeted deadlines for the Procurement Process and Project completion, including the ones related to the Request for Qualification.

Table 1 - Procurement and Project Completion Deadlines

Steps	Deadlines
Land reserves order-in-council	May 2016
Public Procurement Notice	May 17, 2016
Information session	June 7, 2016
Request for Qualification for the EPC Contract	June 28, 2016
Request for Qualification for the RSSOM Contract	June 28, 2016
Information session and site visit	To confirm
Deadline for sending requests for clarification and for submitting an acknowledgment	August 5, 2016
Deadline for issuing addenda, if applicable	August 12, 2016
Deadline to receive Responses	August 26, 2016
Announcement of Qualified Respondents	To confirm
BAPE public hearings	To confirm
Request for Proposals for the EPC Contract	To confirm
Request for Proposals for the RSSOM Contract	To confirm
Receipt of Proposals for the EPC Contract	To confirm
Receipt of Proposals for the RSSOM Contract	To confirm
Tabling of the BAPE report	To confirm
Environmental order-in-council	To confirm
Acquisition of the Deux-Montagnes line	To confirm
Financial close for the EPC Contract and the RSSOM Contract	To confirm
Beginning of work for the EPC Contract and the RSSOM Contract	To confirm
Beginning of commercial service	To confirm

1.6 PROJECT GOVERNANCE

This section presents the principal organizations and Persons involved in Project governance.

1.6.1 Caisse de dépôt et placement du Québec

Created in 1965, the Caisse is one of the largest institutional fund managers in Canada and North America. It invests in major financial markets, private equity, infrastructure and real estate.

The Caisse serves 40 depositors, which are primarily public and parapublic pension and insurance funds. As at December 31, 2015, its depositors' net assets totalled \$248 billion (including \$13 billion in the infrastructure portfolio). The infrastructure portfolio includes major investments in the transportation sector, such as the following:

- *Eurostar* - *Eurostar* is the primary high-speed train operator in Europe and the only service provider between London and the European continent, carrying more than 10 million passengers annually via the Channel Tunnel;
- *InTransit BC* - *InTransit BC* is a 35-year concession for LRT service on a 19.5 km line connecting downtown Vancouver with the City of Richmond and Vancouver International Airport;
- *Heathrow Airport Holdings Limited* - *HAH*, formerly known as *BAA*, is a leading airport operator that owns Heathrow Airport as well as Heathrow Express, the rail link between the Heathrow and Paddington stations in London.

The Caisse's solid financial position has earned it the best credit ratings issued by the following credit rating agencies: Moody's Investors Service ("Aaa"), Standard and Poor's ("AAA") and Dominion Bond Rating Service ("AAA").

1.6.2 CDPQ Infra

CDPQ Infra inc., a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Caisse, is a private company incorporated in 2015 under the Quebec *Business Corporations Act*, CQLR c S-311. Its head office is located at 1000 Place Jean-Paul-Riopelle, in Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

Its principal activities consist in developing, managing and financing major infrastructure projects.

The Government and the Caisse have signed a commercial agreement setting out the general framework and the guiding principles allowing for the realization by CDPQ Infra of public infrastructure projects in Quebec. CDPQ Infra can also invest in projects elsewhere in Canada and in other countries, which are not subject to this agreement.

1.6.3 Governments of Quebec and Canada

The Government is considering contributing to the completion of the Project in accordance with the general framework and guidelines agreed with the Caisse in the above-mentioned commercial agreement. The involvement of the Government of Canada is also sought for purposes of completing the Project.

1.7 STAKEHOLDERS

The many Project stakeholders include the following parties (partial list in alphabetical order):

- ADM;
- AMT/ARTM;
- Amtrak, CN and Via Rail;
- Cities and boroughs along the REM route;
- Commission de la santé et de la sécurité du travail (CSST);
- Communities (citizen groups, residents, community or environmental organizations, and certain property owners);

- Infrastructure Canada and SSL in connection with the new Champlain Bridge;
- Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO);
- Heritage Canada in connection with Central Station;
- IBTs (South Shore, North Shore and West Island);
- MTQ;
- MDDELCC;
- Place Bonaventure;
- RTL;
- STL;
- STM;
- The Jacques Cartier and Champlain Bridges Incorporated (JCCBI);
- Transport Canada (TC);
- Utilities (Bell, Commission des services électriques de Montréal, Gaz Métro, Hydro-Québec; Vidéotron).

1.8 PROCESS AUDITOR

A Process Auditor has been tasked with overseeing the Procurement Process and the selection of Qualified Respondents and the Selected Proponent until the Contract is signed. The Process Auditor's mandate is to provide assurance to CDPQ Infra, the Respondents and the Proponents that the Procurement Process is honest, open, fair and transparent and proceeds in accordance with the terms and conditions set out in the Request for Qualification and the Request for Proposals. The Process Auditor must prepare an independent report to that effect and, consequently, must observe the conduct of the Procurement Process as a whole. To that end, the Process Auditor may attend any meeting, visit, workshop or other session organized as part of the Procurement Process. At the end of the Procurement Process, the Process Auditor will prepare and make public a final report.

1.9 CONFLICT OF INTEREST MANAGEMENT

The role of CDPQ Infra's Legal Review Committee is to make recommendations regarding possible conflicts of interest that may be raised in connection with the Request for Qualification and the Request for Proposals.

The Legal Review Committee of CDPQ Infra may rule on situations that give rise to or could give rise to a real or apparent, existing or apprehended conflict of interest or an unwarranted advantage.

Procedures to be followed for conflict of interest requests are outlined in Section 5.10. The commitments of a Respondent, its Members, Participants and Key Individuals with respect to conflicts of interest are also presented in Section 8.4.

2. EPC INFRASTRUCTURES

2.1 PROJECT OVERVIEW

Table 2 presents the Project highlights, including the EPC Works and the RSSOM Services, as contemplated at the date of publication of the Request for Qualification.

Table 2 - Project highlights

	SOUTH SHORE BRANCH (Highway 10/Downtown Montreal Corridor)	WESTERN BRANCH (Downtown Montreal to Montréal-Trudeau Airport, Sainte-Anne-de-Bellevue, Deux-Montagnes)
Size	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 km of double tracks • 5 stations • 2 bus terminals • 2 park-and-ride facilities • 1.3 km of new cut-and-cover tunnels and 1.6 km of tunnel in the rock 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 52 km of double tracks • 19 stations (including existing stations) • 7 bus terminals (including existing terminals) • 11 park-and-ride facilities (including existing facilities) • 2.5 km of new tunnel
Chosen technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electric LRT-type cars • Automated driverless system • Platforms approximately 80 m long • Platform screen doors • Power supplied through catenary: 1,500 VDC • Elevators and escalators in stations • Wi-Fi throughout the network 	
Rolling stock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ultimately, a fleet of over 200 cars • Four-car trains at rush hour; two-car trains at off-peak times 	
Operation and regular and long-term maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Automated train operation • Attendants circulating in the trains and stations for information and inspection purposes • Integration of networks and feeder bus service provided by other Operators at the stations • Tickets sold through ARTM vendors and integrated into the Opus card or similar technology • Daily inspection, regular and long-term maintenance of rail infrastructure, civil engineering structures and buildings (e.g., rail line foundations and right-of-way, stations, maintenance facilities, storage centres, substations and power cables, park-and-ride facilities, bridges and tunnels) • Regular and long-term maintenance of Rolling Stock, automated train control system, command centre, screen doors and all of the low current and high current systems 	

2.2 PLANNED ROUTE FOR THE PROJECT

Figure 1 shows the planned route for the Project.

South Shore Branch

The planned route is approximately 15 km long with tracks on fully dedicated lanes running in both directions. It begins south-east of the Highway 10 / Highway 30 interchange, in the City of Brossard, runs along the centre of Highway 10 until the new Champlain Bridge, using the right-of-way for the existing reserved bus lanes on the central median of Highway 10, then continues along the central deck of the new Champlain Bridge, which will be reserved for public transit, until Nuns' Island.

After Nuns' Island, the route crosses the channel by way of a new bridge to be built for public transit needs, and then runs along Marc Cantin Street. The elevated route will be progressively lowered before Fernand-Séguin Street, where it will enter a tunnel to pass under the CN rail tracks and the Lachine Canal.

In the Peel Basin sector, the route will be raised again and will run parallel to the CN structure towards the west, reaching Central Station via the existing railway overpass.

Western Branch

This route relies on use of the Deux-Montagnes line, an existing rail corridor used exclusively by commuter trains. This 33 km rail corridor connects Deux-Montagnes to Central Station, in the city's downtown core, by way of a tunnel under Mount Royal.

This railway corridor, currently used by heavy rail commuter trains, will be transformed to accommodate an LRT system. This will require the elimination of all grade crossings and the duplication of the railway tracks to maintain operations during the construction/track redesign period.

Moreover, this route is to use the existing Doney Spur railway right-of-way to create two new public transit lines: one to Montréal-Trudeau Airport and the other to the West Island, running along Highway 40. The Doney Spur connects with the Deux-Montagnes line in the Highway 13 sector and runs south of Highway 40.

Figure 1 – Planned route for the Project



2.3 PROJECT COMPONENTS

It is contemplated that for the South Shore Branch, which will make it possible to create a network of almost 15 km of dedicated passenger rail tracks, the Project will include the following:

- A terminal at the starting point of the South Shore route, three intermediate stations and one station in Downtown Montreal. Some intermediate stations will allow for buses to make stops without a terminal being built. Entrances will be enclosed and climate-controlled. Platforms will be protected from the tracks by screen doors that open only when a train is present. Stations will be equipped with elevators and escalators. The terminals will also be designed to allow for the installation of turnstiles at access points to validate tickets;
- Two park-and-ride facilities and two bus terminals will allow for connections with bus lines of other Operators;
- Bike racks for active transportation users and kiss-and-ride areas.

It is contemplated that for the Western Branch the Project will make it possible to develop a network of close to 52 km of track dedicated to passenger service. This will include:

- Converting the existing railway infrastructure for the Deux-Montagnes commuter train and its 12 stations to introduce automated LRT. The existing stations will have to be refurbished to take into account the smaller size of the LRT cars. This will require adjustments to the height and width of platforms in all stations, including Central Station. Access points to the new, shorter platforms will have to be optimized according to the location of access points to the parking facilities;
- Construction of an elevated section, almost 16 km long starting from Highway 13, to serve the West Island through to Sainte-Anne-de-Bellevue, running along Highway 40, using part or all of the Doney Spur railway right-of-way;
- Seven new stations, including five intermediate stations, one terminal in the West Island branch and one station at Montréal-Trudeau Airport. As is the case for the South Shore Branch, entrances will be enclosed and climate-controlled (including those for the 12 existing stations of the Western Branch line to Deux-Montagnes). Platforms will be protected from the tracks by screen doors that open only when a train is present. Stations will be equipped with elevators and escalators. They will also be designed to allow for the installation of turnstiles at access points to validate tickets;
- Eleven park-and-ride facilities and seven bus terminals (including those of the Western Branch line to Deux-Montagnes);
- Bike racks for active transportation users and kiss-and-ride areas.

Components that are common to both corridors:

The Project includes:

- A command centre for managing all operations in addition to providing information to passengers and ensuring their safety;
- Maintenance and storage facilities for storing trains at the end of the line during non-peak periods, for preventive or corrective maintenance operations, for washing and cleaning the cars and for testing Rolling Stock once work has been completed before putting cars back into service. The facility also includes the Operator's administrative offices;
- Stations that may eventually be added depending on changes in demand and economic development.

2.4 DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITIES

Table 3 presents the proposed division of responsibilities for design, construction, operation and regular and long-term maintenance activities between the EPC Contract and the RSSOM Contract.

Table 3 - Proposed Division of Responsibilities

	Design and Construction	Operation and Regular and Long-term Maintenance
Civil engineering work		
Rail line foundation	EPC	RSSOM
Drainage along the rail line	EPC	RSSOM
Conduit for traction system electrical wiring	EPC	RSSOM
Conduit for low-voltage electrical wiring	EPC	RSSOM
Telecommunications conduit	EPC	RSSOM
Foundations and supporting masses for catenary systems	EPC	RSSOM
Parking facilities and outdoor lighting	EPC	RSSOM
Bus platform and terminal	EPC	Other
Pedestrian crossing	EPC	RSSOM
Sidewalk	EPC	RSSOM
Modifications to existing infrastructure		
Relocation of utilities	EPC	n/a
Engineering work		
Bridge, overpass and culvert	EPC	RSSOM
Tunnel and related equipment	EPC	RSSOM
Underground pedestrian crossing	EPC	RSSOM
Buildings		
Stations	EPC	RSSOM
Train storage depot	EPC	RSSOM
Bungalow for electrical substation	EPC	RSSOM
Bus terminal	EPC	Other
Train maintenance facility	EPC	RSSOM
LRT command centre building	EPC	RSSOM
Superstructures		
Rails	EPC	RSSOM
Catenary equipment and system	EPC	RSSOM
Sound barriers, security measures and equipment, lighting, etc.	EPC	RSSOM
Rolling Stock, Systems and related equipment		
Rolling Stock	RSSOM	RSSOM
Automatic train control system	RSSOM *	RSSOM
LRT command centre equipment	RSSOM	RSSOM
Traction power	EPC	RSSOM
Screen doors	RSSOM *	RSSOM
Telecommunications	RSSOM *	RSSOM
CCTV systems and surveillance equipment and signage	RSSOM *	RSSOM

* Defined and procured by RSSOM Contractor; installed by EPC Contractor.

2.5 DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION ELEMENTS

The responsibilities of the EPC Contractor, which will be set out in the Request for Proposals, include:

- Obtaining, maintaining in force and renewing all of the necessary permits and construction authorization certificates to perform the EPC Works throughout the term of the EPC Contract and the five-year (5) warranty period following Final Completion of the EPC Infrastructures;
- Designing and constructing the EPC Infrastructures, whose principal components are set out in Sections 2.3 and 2.4 and whose technical features are described in Schedule 3, within the timeframe provided and in accordance with the requirements set out in the EPC Contract;
- Maintaining and managing traffic flow in work zones and at interfaces for these zones while the EPC Works are being performed, which includes managing traffic detours and signage;
- Managing environmental protection measures and the related follow-ups;
- Managing interfaces for work to be carried out by the EPC Contractor and the RSSOM Contractor according to Section 2.8.1;
- Managing interfaces with third parties according to Section 2.8.2;
- Overseeing, ensuring the quality of and providing administrative management of all the EPC Works; and
- Ensuring the partial and full commissioning of the EPC Infrastructures.

Various other factors to be considered include:

- The environmental impact study performed by CDPQ Infra's technical advisors, presented to the MDDELCC in the summer of 2016. The Project will then be the subject of an inquiry and public hearing by the BAPE commencing in September 2016. This consultation will allow for the comments and concerns of various groups, organizations, municipalities and citizens to be heard.
- The orders in council to create land reserves issued by the Government in May 2016. The acquisition of land required to construct the EPC Infrastructures will be completed according to a schedule established by the MTQ;
- The EPC Infrastructures will become the property of CDPQ Infra as they are completed; and
- For the Request for Proposals, CDPQ Infra will make specifications describing the architectural requirements available to the Proponents.

2.6 INDEPENDENT CERTIFIER

The Independent Certifier will be responsible, among other things, for issuing certificates of Substantial Completion and Final Completion. More details regarding the responsibilities and the scope of the Independent Certifier's role will be included in the Request for Proposals.

2.7 PLANNED ALLOCATION OF RISKS RELATED TO THE EPC WORKS

Table 4 presents the planned allocation of risks related to the EPC Works. This allocation of risks will be specified in the Request for Proposals.

Table 4 – Planned Allocation of Risks Related to the EPC Works

	CDPQ Infra	EPC Contractor
Obtain environmental authorizations and permits		
Certificate of authorization for the realization of a project (CAR) issued by the Government under the <i>Environment Quality Act</i> (CQLR c Q-2), environmental screening required under the <i>Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012</i> (S.C. 2012, c. 19, s 52) and certificate of conformity provided for in section 149 of the <i>Act respecting land use planning and development</i> (CQLR c A-19.1)	✓	
Certificate of authorization for construction (CAC) issued by the Government in accordance with section 22 of the <i>Environment Quality Act</i> (CQLR c Q-2)		✓
Road work authorizations and permits (by the City of Montreal's Project Management Office)		✓
Other required permits and authorizations	✓	✓
Design and construction		
Ownership of right-of-way and EPC Infrastructures	✓	
Design and construction		✓
Cost compliance and compliance with construction schedule		✓
Insurance and guarantee program	✓	✓
Relocation of public utilities	✓	✓
Principal contractor on the site within the meaning of the <i>Act respecting occupational health and safety</i> (CQLR c S-2.1)		✓
Contaminated soil – undocumented and existing before the EPC Contract is signed	✓	
Contaminated soil – documented and resulting from construction		✓
Geotechnical risks		✓
Obtaining complementary or temporary servitudes	✓	✓

2.8 MANAGEMENT OF INTERFACES

The EPC Contractor will be required to manage numerous interfaces in constructing the EPC Infrastructures. The most important interfaces are outlined in Sections 2.8.1 to 2.8.2.

2.8.1 Interfaces Between the Work of the EPC Contractor and the RSSOM Contractor in accordance with the Division of Responsibilities

The RSSOM Contractor will develop and operate assets, Systems or equipment on or in the EPC Infrastructures. For this reason, the EPC Contractor and the RSSOM Contractor will be required to execute an interface agreement before beginning their respective work. Examples of interfaces include the following:

Table 5 - Description of EPC and RSSOM Interfaces

	Design and Construction	Operation and Maintenance	Description of Interfaces Principal Areas (partial list)
Civil engineering work			
Rail line foundation	EPC	RSSOM	
Drainage along the rail line	EPC	RSSOM	
Conduit for traction system electrical wiring	EPC	RSSOM	Rolling Stock: Dimensioning of electrical power and distance between substations
Conduit for low-voltage electrical wiring	EPC	RSSOM	Automatic train control system: Dimensioning and number of cables Telecommunications: Dimensioning and number of cables
Telecommunications conduit	EPC	RSSOM	Telecommunications: Dimensioning and number of fiber-optic cables
Foundations and supporting masses for catenary system	EPC	RSSOM	Rolling Stock: Static and dynamic train features (minimum/maximum pantograph height) and operating range of catenary/pantograph
Parking and outdoor lighting	EPC	RSSOM	
Bus platforms and terminal	EPC	Other	Equipment to provide information to passengers of Operators
Pedestrian crosswalk and sidewalk	EPC	RSSOM	
Modifications to existing infrastructures			
Relocation of utilities	EPC	n/a	
Engineering work			
Bridge, overpass and culvert	EPC	RSSOM	
Tunnel and related equipment	EPC	RSSOM	
Underground pedestrian crossing	EPC	RSSOM	

	Design and Construction	Operation and Maintenance	Description of Interfaces Principal Areas (partial list)
Buildings			
Stations	EPC	RSSOM	<p>Rolling Stock: Platform alignment</p> <p>Automatic train control system: Positioning of beacons in stations</p> <p>Screen doors: Position, electrical connection and controls</p> <p>Telecommunications: Installation and connection of fiber-optic backbone, routers and local antennas</p> <p>CCTV systems and surveillance equipment: Number, position, electrical and IT connection of dynamic displays, speakers, microphones, cameras and other sensors</p>
Train storage depot	EPC	RSSOM	<p>Rolling Stock: Alignments, cleaning equipment, power and pneumatic supply</p> <p>Automatic train control system: Positioning of beacons in zone to transfer to manual operation</p> <p>Command centre equipment: a work station shared with the train maintenance facility</p> <p>Telecommunications: Installation and connection of fiber-optic backbone, routers and local antennas</p> <p>Workshop design: According to RSSOM needs</p>
Bungalow for electrical substation	EPC	RSSOM	<p>Rolling Stock: Dimensioning of electrical power, EMC, distance between substations</p>
Bus terminal	EPC	Other	
Train maintenance facility	EPC	RSSOM	<p>Rolling Stock: Alignment, cleaning system for trains, position of pits, drop-table, cleaning equipment, other equipment, electric power and pneumatic supply</p> <p>Automatic train control system: Positioning of beacons in zone to transfer to manual operation</p> <p>Command centre equipment: a work station shared with the train storage depot</p> <p>Telecommunications: Installation and connection of fiber-optic backbone, routers and local antennas</p> <p>Workshop design: According to RSSOM needs and train length</p>
LRT command centre building	EPC	RSSOM	<p>Command centre equipment: Positions, power connection and work station network (including furniture), screens and servers</p> <p>Telecommunications: Installation and connection of fiber-optic backbone, routers and local antennas</p> <p>Ergonomics: To be determined by the RSSOM Contractor</p> <p>Equipment: For the command centre video wall</p>

	Design and Construction	Operation and Maintenance	Description of Interfaces Principal Areas (partial list)
Superstructures			
Rails	EPC	RSSOM	<p>Rolling Stock: Static and dynamic train features (mass, acceleration, lateral effort), maximum cant deficiency, ride quality and rail profile</p> <p>Automatic train control system: Position of beacons, track coupling and rail conductivity (return current and rail break detection)</p> <p>Telecommunications: Installation and connection of fiber-optic backbone, routers and local antennas</p> <p>CCTV systems and surveillance equipment: Number, position, electrical power and IT connection for cameras and other intrusion detectors</p>
Catenary equipment and system	EPC	RSSOM	<p>Rolling Stock: Electrical power, static and dynamic train features (min/max pantograph height), operating range of catenary/pantograph, pressure and contact quality, arcs</p>
Sound barriers, security measures and equipment, lighting, etc.	EPC	RSSOM	
Rolling Stock, Systems and related equipment			
Rolling Stock	RSSOM	RSSOM	
Automatic train control system	RSSOM*	RSSOM	See above
LRT command centre equipment	RSSOM	RSSOM	
Traction power	EPC	RSSOM	<p>Rolling Stock: Dimensioning of electrical power, EMC (Electromagnetic compatibility), distance between substations, regeneration capacity and degraded modes</p> <p>Automatic train control system: EMC, harmonics, stray current and interference</p>
Screen doors	RSSOM *	RSSOM	See above
Telecommunications	RSSOM *	RSSOM	See above
CCTV systems and surveillance equipment and signage	RSSOM *	RSSOM	See above

* Defined and procured by RSSOM Contractor; installed by EPC Contractor.

2.8.2 Interfaces with Third Parties other than the RSSOM Contractor

The interfaces required with third parties are described briefly in **Table 6**. Management of certain interfaces with third parties will be facilitated by creation of a project management office by the City of Montreal. This will allow city permits and authorizations, as well as modifications to public utilities, to be dealt with in a diligent manner.

Table 6 – Brief Description of Interfaces Required With Third Parties

Stakeholder	Brief description of interfaces required with third parties
City of Montreal and its boroughs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relocation of utilities • Permanent road closures • Temporary road closures and maintenance of traffic flow • Addition or moving of traffic lights • Harmonization of permanent road signs • Planning of work together with other city projects • Marc Cantin – tie-in with projects to collect and treat contaminated water
Cities of Brossard, Dorval, Deux-Montagnes, Sainte-Anne-de-Bellevue and other cities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as for the City of Montreal • Park-and-ride facilities and road access • Coordination with city work regarding new Du Quartier Boulevard overpass
AMT / ARTM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance of current service on the Deux-Montagnes line and planning of temporary service reductions/interruptions • Test planning and commissioning • Service transfer • Design of connecting station between the Mascouche and the LRT lines
STM, RTL, STL, IBTs and ARTM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination work for temporary terminals and transfer of services to new terminals • Coordination of traffic flow maintenance when reserved bus lanes along the centre of Highway 10 have to be closed
Place Bonaventure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical coordination (work)
Utilities (Bell, CSEM, Hydro-Québec, Gaz Métro, Vidéotron)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical coordination (design and work) • Relocation of power lines • Connection to existing networks
CN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical coordination (design and work)
ADM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning of work together with other city projects • Technical coordination (design and work)
Infrastructure Canada	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination with SSL of work schedule for central bridge span and for the Nuns' Island station
MTQ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New highway ramps, urbanization of part of the highway, access under highway lanes, etc. • Coordination of work and maintenance of traffic flow for work along the centre of Highway 10 • Protection between road vehicles and LRT

2.9 OTHER AVAILABLE INFORMATION

Additional information is available on the CDPQ Infra website using the following links:

- http://cdpqinfra.com/fr/Reseau_electrique_metropolitain (French);
- http://cdpqinfra.com/en/Reseau_electrique_metropolitain (English).

3. REMUNERATION AND GUARANTEES

3.1 PAYMENT MECHANISM

In consideration of the performance of all the EPC Contractor's obligations under the EPC Contract, the contemplated method of remuneration will include payment of an advance for mobilization costs, monthly progress payments based on the acquired certified value and milestone payments until the EPC Works are completed. The monthly certification of the acquired value will be determined by an Independent Certifier.

These monthly progress payments may be subject to deductions or may not be made, in whole or in part, if the requirements of the EPC Contract are not met. CDPQ Infra has provided, in particular, a structure of liquidated damages to be paid for each Day of delay relative to the scheduled dates of Substantial Completion or Final Completion.

3.2 PROPOSAL SECURITY DEPOSIT

CDPQ Infra is currently evaluating the nature and scope of the Guarantees that will be required of Proponents. These Guarantees will be finalized and detailed in the Request for Proposals. For information purposes, CDPQ Infra currently expects that Proponents will need to provide a Proposal Security Deposit, in accordance with the terms and conditions set out in the Submission Agreement, in the form of one or more irrevocable and unconditional letters of credit from a Financial Institution in favour of CDPQ Infra. Such Proposal Security Deposit must be valid from the time that it is presented until expiry of the Period of Validity of the Proposals. Any Proposal Security Deposit provided by a Proponent who is not selected in connection with the Request for Proposals will be reimbursed according to the terms and conditions set out in the Submission Agreement.

3.3 PERFORMANCE GUARANTEES DURING THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PERIOD

For information purposes, CDPQ Infra currently plans to require the following Guarantees from the EPC Contractor:

- One or more irrevocable and unconditional letters of credit from a Financial Institution for an amount equivalent to:
 - Between 5% and 7.5% of the value of the EPC Contract;
 - Between 100% and 200% of the value of any corrective work required in connection with the deficiencies noted upon Substantial Completion. This guarantee must be provided prior to the date of Substantial Completion and be maintained in effect until the date of Final Completion.

3.4 PERFORMANCE GUARANTEES DURING THE WARRANTY PERIOD

The EPC Contractor will remain responsible for correcting any defects during a period of 5 years starting from the date of Final Completion of the EPC Infrastructures. During this 5-year period, the EPC Contractor will have to provide the following:

- One or more irrevocable and unconditional letters of credit from a Financial Institution for the 5-year period following the date of Final Completion;
- One or more performance bonds for the 3-year period following the date of Final Completion;
- One or more performance bonds for years 4 and 5 following the date of Final Completion.

3.5 PARENT COMPANY GUARANTEE

For information purposes, CDPQ Infra intends to require a Parent Company Guarantee, in an amount equivalent to 40% of the Submission Price in the EPC Contract, to cover solidarily all of the EPC Contractor's obligations towards CDPQ Infra.

3.6 INSURANCE PROGRAM

CDPQ Infra is currently evaluating the nature and scope of insurance coverage to be required from Proponents. This insurance program will be finalized and detailed in the Request for Proposals.

4. PROCUREMENT

4.1 PROCUREMENT PROCESS

The Procurement Process leading to the choice of the Selected Proponent includes three main stages:

- A Public Procurement Notice was issued in May 2016 on the SEAO and MERX platforms. At the same time, CDPQ Infra retained the services of KPMG LLP (**KPMG**) to conduct a market study in advance of the Request for Qualification, to provide CDPQ Infra with a more thorough understanding of the current market capacity as well as various commercial, technical and procurement-related issues with respect to the EPC Contract;
- This Request for Qualification, issued on SEAO and MERX, following which up to a maximum of three (3) Qualified Respondents will be invited to participate in the Request for Proposals targeting the EPC Works. The guidance for Responses, as well as the eligibility and evaluation criteria for Responses are described in Sections 5 and 6 of this document;
- The Request for Proposals that will be sent directly to the Qualified Respondents via an information-sharing website, at the end of which the Selected Proponent will be able to sign the EPC Contract and perform the EPC Works.

4.2 TERMS AND CONDITIONS

The terms and conditions described below have been provided for information purposes only and may be amended in CDPQ Infra's Request for Proposals.

4.2.1 Negotiation Phase

The EPC Contract will be granted on the same date as the RSSOM Contract.

Between the announcement of the Selected Proponents (EPC and RSSOM) and the financial close, the Procurement Process will include a negotiation phase to agree upon the terms and conditions of an interface management agreement between the EPC Works and the RSSOM Services.

4.2.2 Group of Persons

Various experience, expertise and capabilities will need to be pooled in order to perform the EPC Works. CDPQ Infra is therefore open to receive Responses from Consortiums. In such cases, the Respondent will have to provide a description of the composition and operations of the Consortium, in addition to the roles of its Members, Participants and Key Individuals.

4.2.3 Submission Agreement

Signing the Submission Agreement will be a mandatory prerequisite for obtaining the status of Proponent and authorization to submit a Proposal as part of the Request for Proposals process. The Submission Agreement will, in particular, specify the obligations of the Proponents concerning confidentiality, intellectual property and Guarantees, as well as the terms and conditions for the compensation to be paid to Proponents who are not selected.

If, when the Request for Proposals is issued, one of the three Qualified Respondents withdraws from the Procurement Process or is disqualified, for example, due to a refusal to sign the required Submission Agreement, CDPQ Infra will invite the Qualified Respondent with the highest score after these first three (3) Qualified Respondents to participate in the Request for Proposals and to present a Proposal for the provision of the EPC Works. The new Qualified Respondent will then also have to sign the Submission Agreement in order to be eligible to participate.

4.2.4 Proposal

The Proposal must include, in particular, a technical section, a price section and the required Guarantees, in the form specified in the Request for Proposals.

The technical section of the Proposal must present the main elements of the EPC Works in sufficient detail to allow them to be evaluated. More specifically, the Proposal must include, without limitation:

- Preliminary plans and specifications and a report describing the final concept and its characteristics, the materials used and the construction techniques applied. The report will also describe how the technical solution satisfies the technical requirements;
- A price offer, in the form of a fixed amount in Dollars;
- Confirmation of the ability of the Proponent, its Members and Participants and the Parent Company of each of its Members and Participants to put in place the Guarantees (including the Parent Company Guarantee), bonds and insurance required upon signing the EPC Contract;
- An update of the financial situation of the Proponent, its Members and Participants, and of the Parent Company of each of the Members and Participants, in particular in the form of their most recent financial statements;
- A Proposal Security Deposit as indicated in Section 3.2;
- A demonstration that the Proposal satisfies all the requirements of the Request for Proposals.

4.2.5 EPC Contract

A draft EPC Contract will be included in the Request for Proposals (Note 1).

Qualified Respondents will have an opportunity to submit questions, comments, and suggestions for changes to the EPC Contract. In light of the comments and suggestions received, a revised version of the draft EPC Contract may be issued. CDPQ Infra reserves the right to accept or reject, in its sole discretion, any suggestion for a change to the draft EPC Contract.

The revised EPC Contract must be used by the Proponents in preparing their Proposals.

Note 1: At the Request for Proposals stage, Proponents will need to provide a valid licence issued in accordance with the *Building Act* (CQLR c B-1.1). Some services to be provided by the EPC Contractor are considered under the *Building Act* (CQLR c B-1.1) and its implementing regulations to be construction work that can only be performed with a licence. Consequently, the EPC Contractor must at least hold a general contractor's licence (subclass 1.3: All buildings) issued by the Régie du bâtiment and any other subclass and general or specialized contractor's licence required depending on the EPC Works to be provided directly by the EPC Contractor or by a Subcontractor.

The following website provides additional information to Respondents regarding licences issued by the Régie du bâtiment: <https://www.rbq.gouv.qc.ca/entrepreneur/la-rbq-et-les-entrepreneurs/la-rbq-et-vous.html>

4.2.6 Financial Compensation

It is anticipated that financial compensation will be paid to non-selected Proponents that submitted a Proposal that was deemed compliant with the terms of the Request for Proposals. CDPQ Infra will pay each non-selected Proponent that submitted a Proposal that was compliant in all respects, financial compensation of \$5 million, as full and final compensation, *inter alia* to cover costs and expenses that a Proponent incurred in the Procurement Process. Such compensation will be paid subject to satisfaction of the terms and conditions of payment of such compensation contained in the Submission Agreement and in consideration of the Proponent assigning to CDPQ Infra all the concepts, ideas and goods proposed, developed or incorporated in the Proponent's proposal in whatever manner that were designed and developed exclusively for the Project and that are owned by the Proponent, its Members or Participants.

4.3 TRANSPARENCY IN THE SELECTION PROCESS

The Public Procurement Notice and the Request for Qualification concerning the Project have been published on SEAO and MERX.

Following review and analysis of the Responses, the following information will be published on CDPQ Infra's website:

- The list of Respondents who have confirmed their interest in submitting a Response by returning the acknowledgment included in Schedule 4;
- The list of Qualified Respondents.

The following information will be published on CDPQ Infra's website after the Request for Proposals documents have been issued:

- The list of Qualified Respondents who received the Request for Proposals documents;
- The list of Proponents who duly signed the Submission Agreement in order to participate in the Request for Proposals;
- The governance and the expected amount of the financial compensation to be paid at the end of the Procurement Process to non-selected Proponents who submitted a compliant Proposal.

The following information will be published on CDPQ Infra's website after the EPC Contract is signed:

- The Request for Proposals documents integrating the criteria and weighting for the evaluation of the Responses;
- The name of the Selected Proponent, the date of signing of the EPC Contract and the principal Project milestones;
- The Process Auditor's final report.

5. INSTRUCTIONS FOR RESPONDENTS

The documents relating to the Request for Qualification include this document and any related Addenda.

Respondents must obtain all the documents relating to the RFQ from the following website: SEAO (www.seao.ca) or MERX (www.merx.com), in accordance with their respective terms and conditions.

A Respondent that obtains the documents relating to the RFQ otherwise than from the SEAO or MERX websites takes full responsibility for obtaining all relevant and complete information relating to the RFQ. Such a Respondent takes full and sole responsibility for not obtaining all the relevant information.

The Request for Qualification documentation may not be used for purposes other than the preparation of Responses by Respondents.

CDPQ Infra reserves the right to make amendments and to provide additional information for the Request for Qualification by way of Addenda prior to the date of submission of Responses provided for in Section 5.1, including amendments for the purpose of changing the date of submittal, as necessary.

Any Addendum will become an integral part of the Request for Qualification whose provisions it serves to complete, amend or supersede, as the case may be. Any Addendum must be issued at least five (5) business days before the date of submission of Responses.

The Respondent must confirm its interest in submitting a Response by completing the acknowledgment contained in Schedule 4 and returning it to the email address indicated in Section 5.2 by the deadline of August 5, 2016 at 3 PM, Montreal time. The Respondent must indicate on the acknowledgment the name of the Respondent's Representative, who will be the only person authorized to contact and to send requests for clarification to CDPQ Infra. CDPQ Infra will address all communications relating to the Request for Qualification duly submitted to the Respondent's Representative.

5.1 DATE AND PLACE FOR SUBMITTING A RESPONSE

Respondents must submit all required documentation under the terms of the Request for Qualification in a sealed envelope or package with the following indications:

- In the upper left-hand corner, the sender's name and return address;
- In the upper right-hand corner, the indication STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL;
- In the central section: the addressee and the following address:

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS 01-7001: ENGINEERING, PROCUREMENT AND
CONSTRUCTION OF INFRASTRUCTURES
RÉSEAU ÉLECTRIQUE MÉTROPOLITAIN DE MONTRÉAL Project
CDPQ Infra inc.
Attention: Procurement Department
1000 place Jean Paul Riopelle
Centre CDP Capital
Montreal, Quebec H2Z 2B3

Responses must be submitted at the delivery dock of the Centre CDP Capital known as "Quai Est", which is located on Saint-Alexandre Street, between Saint-Antoine and Viger Streets (see photo below).



Pedestrians may use the door on the right side, which will be open from 9 AM every morning.

Vehicular access is through the grille, which will open automatically from 9 AM every morning.

Respondents must request a signed acknowledgment indicating the date and time of submission of their Response.

The deadline for submitting a Response is:

Friday, August 26, 2016, at 3 PM, Montreal time.

CDPQ Infra reserves the right, in its sole discretion, to extend the deadline for submitting a Response by way of an addendum no less than five (5) business days before the deadline for submitting a Response.

CDPQ Infra may in no way be held liable for delays that may be caused by the methods used by Respondents to send their Responses. Any Response received after the deadline for submitting Responses will be refused and returned unopened to the Respondent. Responses sent electronically or by fax will not be accepted.

The Response must be valid for at least 120 Days from the expiry of the Qualification Period.

5.2 CDPQ INFRA'S REPRESENTATIVE

To ensure consistency in the interpretation of Request for Qualification documents, and to facilitate the exchange of information, all communications must be sent to CDPQ Infra using the following email address and mentioning "EPC" in the subject line:

Email address: AQREM@cdpqinfra.com
Subject: EPC

The email address AQREM@cdpqinfra.com is the only way Respondents can officially communicate with CDPQ Infra with regard to this Request for Qualification. Such communication will be conducted in accordance with Section 5.4 below. Information provided by a Person by means other than through this address will not be binding on CDPQ Infra, and a Respondent should not rely on such information. Any communication by any Person not authorized by CDPQ Infra, may lead to the rejection of the Response.

5.3 EXAMINATION OF DOCUMENTS

Respondents must ensure that they have received all the documents for the Request for Qualification, including the Schedules listed in the table of contents. Unless notification to the contrary has been sent to the Official Email Address prior to the opening of Responses, Respondents will be deemed to have received all the documents.

Each Respondent must examine the Request for Qualification documents carefully, and is responsible for ascertaining the purpose and requirements of the Request for Qualification.

A Respondent who notes any ambiguity, oversight or discrepancy in the documents, or has any doubts about their meaning, must advise CDPQ Infra by email sent to the Official Email Address. As stated in the form of undertaking that appears in Schedule 1.1, a Respondent, by submitting a Response, acknowledges that it has examined the documents and accepts their terms and conditions.

5.4 REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION

Any requests for clarification or questions concerning the Request for Qualification must be submitted to CDPQ Infra's representative through the Official Email Address on or after the date on which the Request for Qualification is issued. The deadline for making a request for clarification is **August 5, 2016, 3 PM, Montreal time**. Requests for clarification submitted must be formulated in accordance with the template included in Schedule 1.4.

Any request for clarification will be dealt with by CDPQ Infra. All non-confidential answers will be redistributed to all Prospective Respondents through the Official Email Address. CDPQ Infra also reserves the right to share with all Prospective Respondents any additional information or amendments to the Request for Qualification that arise from a request for clarification made by a Prospective Respondent.

If a Prospective Respondent making a request for clarification checks the "confidential request" box, CDPQ Infra will examine the justification for such confidentiality request and, if the request is justified, will answer only the Prospective Respondent who made the request. If the confidentiality request is considered not to be justified, CDPQ Infra will notify the Prospective Respondent that, unless CDPQ Infra is advised otherwise within 24 hours, it will issue the answer to all Prospective Respondents on a non-confidential basis. If the Prospective Respondent decides to withdraw its request for clarification within such 24-hour period, CDPQ Infra will not reply to the request.

Any request for clarification will be dealt with in CDPQ Infra's sole discretion. CDPQ Infra reserves the right not to reply to requests for clarification and will notify the Prospective Respondent concerned.

If a question or answer leads to an amendment of the Request for Qualification, the amendment will be made in an addendum sent through the Official Email Address to all Prospective Respondents. The addendum will state the question concerned, without revealing the identity of the Prospective Respondent who asked the question and the answer given by CDPQ Infra. An addendum will supplement or supersede the information and requirements contained in the Request for Qualification. Only information that CDPQ Infra's Representative provides by way of an addendum will change the requirements of the Request for Qualification.

5.5 INFORMATION SESSION AND SITE VISIT

It is possible that CDPQ Infra will organize an information session and site visit as per the timetable in Section 1.5. The information session is open to all Prospective Respondents. During the information session, CDPQ Infra will present the Project and the EPC Works to the Persons present. Only Respondents who have sent their acknowledgment at least 48 hours prior to the date of the event will be notified of the place, time and date of the information session, through the Official Email Address.

5.6 PREPARATION AND PRESENTATION OF A RESPONSE

Evaluation committees are responsible for analyzing and evaluating Responses using the criteria and weighting defined in Section 6 and making recommendations to CDPQ Infra's Selection Committee concerning the qualification of Respondents. It is essential for Respondents to provide precise and ordered answers to the criteria and to indicate, for each criterion, why they are qualified to perform the EPC Works. The Response should address clearly and in sufficient depth the items that are included in the evaluation criteria against which the Response will be evaluated.

The requirements for the presentation of Responses, which are also requirements for compliance, are as follows:

- Responses and any related documents must be in French if the Proponent has an establishment in Quebec, except financial statements, annual reports and credit rating reports as described in Section I of Schedule 2, and certified excerpts of resolutions or other documents authorizing the signing of the Response and the forms of undertaking, which may be in French or English;
- The Response outline, including the numbering of paragraphs, as specified in Schedule 2, must be used;
- The maximum number of pages allowed for each section in Schedule 2 must be respected. Any pages over the allowed maximum will be removed from the Response;
- The Response must be made on 8½" x 11" paper, or the international system equivalent (A4);
- The font used must be Arial Narrow 10 point, 1.5 spaced.

5.7 FORMAT FOR A RESPONSE

The Respondent must submit copies of its Response, in paper and electronic format (USB key), in the required format and the quantities noted in **Table 7**.

Table 7 – Required Format and Number of Copies for Responses

Envelope (or Package)	Contents	Number of copies	
		Paper format	USB Keys
Original	In a sealed package, marked "Original": The original complete version of the Response (including the contents of envelopes 1, 2, 3 and 4).	1	1
1	In a sealed package, marked "Envelope 1": The parts of the Response meeting the eligibility requirements of Section 6.3.1.	5	0
2	In a sealed package, marked "Envelope 2": The parts of the Response meeting the compliance requirements of Section 6.3.2 and Schedule 1 (Letters and Forms).	5	0
3	In a sealed package, marked "Envelope 3": The parts of the Response meeting the requirements of Section I of Schedule 2 (Financial capability).	7	3
4	In a sealed package, marked "Envelope 4": The parts of the Response meeting the requirements of Sections II to VI of Schedule 2, i.e.: II. General Requirements: Integrated Project Management, approach and experience III. Design Capacity and Experience IV. Construction Capacity and Experience V. Construction in an Existing Transit Corridor VI. Integrating Civil Works and Systems	10	5

5.8 FORM OF UNDERTAKING

The Respondent must submit through the Official Email Address the form of undertaking presented in Schedule 1.1, duly signed by the Respondent no later than **August 26, 2016**. Any Respondent that fails to submit the form of undertaking will be unable to submit a request for clarification or to obtain access to the answers provided and will be unable to participate in the Request for Proposals process.

5.9 WITHDRAWAL OF A RESPONSE

A Respondent may withdraw its Response by giving written notice through the Official Email Address at any time prior to the Response deadline, without in any way waiving its right to present another Response before the deadline. All Responses become the property of CDPQ Infra once submitted and will not be returned to the Respondent.

5.10 REQUEST REGARDING A CONFLICT OF INTEREST

A Respondent may ask the Legal Review Committee to rule on a situation that gives rise to or could give rise to a real or apparent conflict of interest or an unwarranted advantage no later than 15 business days after the Response deadline. The request may be made based on preliminary information. The Legal Review Committee will analyze any such request.

In the event of a request for a ruling to determine whether a Person is excluded from the Request for Qualification, according to the definition in Section 8.4 of this document, or whether it has an unwarranted advantage, a Respondent must submit its request to the Official Email Address no later than ten (10) business days after the Response deadline.

All requests may be submitted through the Official Email Address and must contain the following information:

- a) The names and contact information for communicating with the Respondent and the Person regarding whom the advance ruling is requested;
- b) A description of the relationship that raises the possibility or appearance of a conflict of interest or an unwarranted advantage;
- c) A description of the actions taken or foreseen to eliminate the conflict of interest or the unwarranted advantage; and
- d) Copies of all relevant information.

All requests for a ruling will be dealt with confidentially. In the event that a Respondent, Member, Participant, Key Individual, or advisor of a Respondent is deemed to be an ineligible Person, its name may be added to Section 8.2 by an addendum to this RFQ or listed as such in the Request for Proposals documents.

CDPQ Infra may also request the Legal Review Committee for a ruling if it suspects or believes that a Person should be declared ineligible. In such a case, the required information will be submitted to the Legal Review Committee and the Person concerned will be informed, so that it can submit its comments directly to the Legal Review Committee.

6. EVALUATION OF RESPONSES

Responses must be prepared in accordance with the outline in Schedule 2.

6.1 RESPONSE EVALUATION PROCESS

The following will be taken into account in evaluating Responses:

- Responses received by CDPQ Infra in connection with the Request for Qualification;
- Clarifications, additional information or confirmations obtained in writing as a result of requests for clarification issued by CDPQ Infra;
- All information obtained as the result of research by CDPQ Infra or its advisors, including Respondent reference checks or any other verification in connection with the Responses received.

Unless the Request for Qualification expressly includes provisions to the contrary, CDPQ Infra will evaluate only documents provided together with the Response. CDPQ Infra will not evaluate information such as references to website addresses that contain additional information or technical manuals or brochures that have not been submitted with the Response.

Respondents are encouraged to provide comments regarding the Project, particularly with respect to alternatives in terms of design and construction requirements, payment mechanisms and conditions, Guarantees, etc. Although such comments may be taken into account by CDPQ Infra in preparing the Request for Proposals or other contractual documents, they will not be considered in evaluating the Responses received.

6.2 EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Responses will be analyzed and evaluated by different evaluation committees, made up of individuals appointed by CDPQ Infra. The committees will study the Responses on the basis of the requirements and documents specified in the Request for Qualification. The services of experts in relevant fields may be retained to support the work of these committees.

Responses are evaluated in four stages, namely through an assessment of the Response's eligibility, satisfaction of the compliance criteria, evaluation of the financial capacity and evaluation of the technical capacity.

6.3 ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

6.3.1 Eligibility Requirements

All the eligibility criteria must be met so that a Response is considered eligible, otherwise it will be automatically rejected. The eligibility criteria are as follows:

- The Response must be delivered to the address specified in this document by the stipulated deadline;
- It must be confirmed that the Respondent's Members and Participants are not included in the Register of enterprises ineligible for public contracts (RENA in French). The RENA includes the names of enterprises that have committed an offence as set out in Schedule 1 to the *Act respecting contracting by public bodies* (CQLR c C-65.1) (**ACPB**). The ACPB also provides that the names of enterprises that have been refused authorization by the AMF to enter into public contracts or subcontracts, or that have had their authorization revoked, will be included in the register. Once an enterprise's name has been included in the register, the enterprise cannot be awarded a public contract or subcontract or continue to work on such a contract already in progress;
- Provide an attestation by Revenu Québec (confirming that the returns and reports required under Quebec tax laws have been filed and that there is no overdue account under such laws) or, alternatively, an attestation that there is no establishment in Quebec;
- Provide an AMF certificate: parties interested in making a Proposal in response to the Request for Proposals and their partners and subcontractors must first obtain an AMF Authorization. Since this authorization may take time to obtain, it is strongly suggested that Prospective Respondents and their partners and subcontractors initiate this process as soon as possible;

When they submit their Response, interested parties and their partners and subcontractors will have to provide the AMF certificate, or, if they have not obtained it already, proof that they have filed their application for an AMF Authorization.

The AMF provides a guide to Quebec-based and foreign or extra-provincial enterprises to assist them in preparing their application for an AMF Authorization. This guide is available via the following links:

- In French: <https://www.lautorite.qc.ca/files/pdf/contrats-public/guide-accompagnement-fr.pdf>;
- In English: <https://www.lautorite.qc.ca/files/pdf/contrats-public/guide-accompagnement-an.pdf>.

Other relevant information for the preparation of an application for an AMF Authorization includes:

Type of applicants	Source of information	Web site
Quebec companies	Application for authorization to be submitted through the AMF's online services	https://www.lautorite.qc.ca/fr/services-en-ligne-autre.html (bilingual site)
Foreign or extra-provincial enterprises ¹	Application for authorization to be completed manually	https://www.lautorite.qc.ca/fr/entreprises-etrangeres-cp.html (site in French) https://www.lautorite.qc.ca/en/foreign-enterprises-pc.html (site in English)

6.3.2 Compliance Criteria

All the compliance criteria described below must be met for a Response to be considered admissible. However, omission or error will not lead to the automatic rejection of the Response concerned, provided the Respondent corrects the error or omission to the satisfaction of CDPQ Infra within the time determined by CDPQ Infra, which must be at least two (2) business days following the date on which the Respondent receives a written request to that effect from CDPQ Infra.

The Respondent's Representative and of each of the Respondent's Members and Participants must complete and sign the form of undertaking included in Schedule 1.1. This form must be in French.

A Respondent must provide a certified true excerpt of a resolution, the resolution itself or another document indicating that the Respondent's Representative is authorized to sign the Response on behalf of the Respondent and its Members and Participants.

A Respondent must provide a certified true excerpt of a resolution, the resolution itself or another document authorizing a Respondent's Representative, and of each of its Members and Participants, to sign the form of undertaking included in Schedule 1.1.

A Respondent must disclose the existence and scope of past or pending litigation involving CDPQ Infra or CDPQ or, as the case may be, the Respondent must provide confirmation that no such litigation exists.

A Respondent must provide evidence, from one or more Financial Institutions or an Eligible Insurer, that it is able to obtain the bonds in accordance with the standard form included in Schedule 1.3.

A Respondent must provide evidence, from one or more Financial Institutions, that it is able to obtain letters of credit in accordance with the standard form included in Schedule 1.2.

6.4 COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS

All Responses must satisfy the compliance requirements contained in Section 5.6 and Schedule 1.

¹ Foreign or extraprovincial enterprises include companies that are not incorporated under the laws of Quebec and that do not have either a head office or an establishment in Quebec where their business is mainly carried on.

6.5 EVALUATION CRITERIA

All Responses considered eligible will be analyzed and evaluated based on the evaluation criteria and weighting presented in **Table 8**.

Table 8 – Evaluation Criteria - RFQ

EVALUATION CRITERIA	
	Weighting %
I. Financial Capability	
Key requirements evaluated on a pass / fail basis	Pass / Fail
II. General Requirements: Integrated Project Management, approach and experience	10
III. Design Capacity and Experience	30
1. Team Organization and Experience	10
2. Key Individual Organization and Experience and Depth of Team	5
3. Approach to Key Issues, Risks and Mitigation	15
IV. Construction Capacity and Experience	35
1. Team Organization and Experience	10
2. Key Individual Organization and Experience and Depth of Team	5
3. Approach to Key Issues, Risks and Mitigation	20
V. Constructing in an Existing Transit Corridor	15
1. Team Organization and Experience	5
2. Approach to Key Issues, Risks and Mitigation	10
VI. Integrating Civil Works and Systems	10
1. Team Organization and Experience	5
2. Approach to Key Issues, Risks and Mitigation	5
Total	100

To allow their capability and competency to be assessed, Respondents must demonstrate their qualifications by providing the information requested in Schedule 2, which provides details regarding evaluation criteria and the structure of their Responses.

A Response must specify, for each evaluation criterion, the respective responsibilities and roles of the Respondent and of its Members, Participants and Key Individuals, and must demonstrate the respective expertise, experience and capability of each, solidarily, to meet the evaluation criteria.

For each criterion, each Respondent will receive a score between zero (0) and one hundred (100). The weighting assigned to each criterion is based on its relative importance. The total score for each Respondent will correspond to the sum of the weighted scores on the evaluation matrix for each criterion.

Notwithstanding the Respondent's total score, failure to achieve 50% of the available points under any one of the rated criteria categories (e.g., failure to achieve a score of 50% in any of the categories in **Table 8**) will preclude the Respondent from being qualified;

CDPQ Infra may ask a Respondent to provide clarifications of certain aspects of its Response, in writing and within the time determined by the evaluation committee, which may not be less than two (2) business days following the date on which the Respondent receives a written request to that effect from the Official Email Address. The clarifications provided will become an integral part of the Response. CDPQ Infra will not accept any clarification or additional information that it has not requested.

6.6 SELECTION OF QUALIFIED RESPONDENTS

The bullet points below provide an overview of elements of the selection process of the RFQ:

- Total Score calculated as \sum [Evaluation Criterion Weight] x [Respondent Score for the relevant evaluation criterion];
- In the project experience provided, a Respondent should ensure that the proportion of projects provided is matched to the degree of responsibility and involvement of its Members, Participants and Key Individuals as well as the particular role assigned to each of them in this project. For example, project experience that covers only one Member of the Respondent that had a relatively minor role in the project may not receive full scoring;
- Notwithstanding a Respondent's total score, failure to achieve 50% of the available points under any one of the categories evaluated (e.g., failure to achieve a score of 50% of the available points in any of the categories in **Table 8**) will preclude the Respondent from being qualified;
- The three highest-scoring Respondents will be qualified. If the 3rd and 4th-placed Respondents obtain the same total score, the selection will be based on criterion V in Table 8 or, where two Respondents are still ranked equally, based on criterion IV or, if two Respondents are still ranked equally, based on criterion III. The Response of the Respondent who is not qualified will be retained in case one of the Qualified Respondents withdraws at a later date.

CDPQ Infra reserves the right to accept none of the Responses received.

6.7 TRANSMISSION OF THE EVALUATION RESULTS TO THE RESPONDENTS

Once the evaluation has been completed, each Respondent will receive the following information:

- The number of Responses found eligible and the number found ineligible;
- Its total score and the score obtained for each evaluation criterion;
- If its Response was found to be ineligible, the reasons for its rejection;
- The names of the Qualified Respondents.

The Respondents who have not been selected as one of the first three Qualified Respondents with the highest scores will be notified in writing and, following signature of the Submission Agreement by the three Respondents, they may ask for an explanation by contacting the person referenced in the notice letter. The explanation will include the reasons why the Respondent was not selected as one of the Qualified Respondents with the highest score. The explanation will be limited to the evaluation of the Response of the Respondent in question and will not include any details about the content or results of the evaluation of the Responses of the other Respondents. The confidentiality of the information pertaining to the other Respondents will be protected. CDPQ Infra will not assume any expenses with respect to the explanations.

7. LEGISLATIVE AND NORMATIVE FRAMEWORK

The realization of the Project requires compliance, by the Respondent, its Members, Participants and Key Individuals and, where applicable, all their subcontractors, agents or other representatives, with (i) all applicable laws, and (ii) the directives, decisions, etc. of any governmental or judicial authority, or any authority recognized by agreement, as specified in more detail in the EPC Contract.

Consequently, Respondents are invited to familiarize themselves with certain legislative documents that may apply to the Project. Partial lists of relevant legislation and guidelines applicable in Quebec and Canada are presented in Sections 7.1 and 7.2.

7.1 RELEVANT APPLICABLE QUEBEC LEGISLATION (PARTIAL LIST)

- *Act respecting the Caisse de dépôt et placement du Québec*, CQLR c C-2;
- *Act respecting occupational health and safety*, CQLR c S-2.1;
- *Act respecting the Ministère des Transports*, CQLR c M-28;
- *Act to ensure safety in guided land transport*, CQLR c S-3.3;
- *Anti-corruption Act*, CQLR c L-6.1;
- *Building Act*, CQLR c B-1.1;
- *Charter of the French language*, CQLR c C-11;
- *Engineers Act*, CQLR c I-9;
- *Environment Quality Act*, CQLR c Q-2;
- *Expropriation Act*, CQLR c E-24;
- *Lobbying Transparency and Ethics Act*, CQLR c T-11.011;
- *Railway Act*, CQLR c C-14.1;
- *Sustainable Development Act*, CQLR c D-8.1.1;
- *Transport Act*, CQLR c T-12.

7.2 APPLICABLE CANADIAN LEGISLATION (PARTIAL LIST)

- *Canada Transportation Act*, SC 1996, c 10;
- *Lobbying Act*, RSC, c 44 (4th Supp);
- *The Railway Relocation and Crossing Act*, RSC 1985, c R-4;
- *Railway Safety Act*, RSC 1985, c 32 (4th Supp).

8. GENERAL CONDITIONS

8.1 COMMUNICATIONS

The Respondent and its Members, Participants and Key Individuals must refrain from engaging in any communication relating to the RFQ with any Person, except via the Official Email Address.

If a Respondent, its Members, Participants or Key Individuals or Associates violate such obligation, CDPQ Infra may, in its sole discretion, disqualify such Respondent.

The Respondent, as well as its Members and Participants, agree to have their names disclosed, regardless whether their Response is accepted.

8.2 HIRING OF CERTAIN ADVISORS OR EXPERTS BY A RESPONDENT

CDPQ Infra has retained the services of experts and advisors to provide Project implementation support. These experts and advisors (Ineligible Persons) are the following:

- Business services advisor: KPMG LLP;
- Technical services advisors: CIMA+ general partnership, groupe SETEC, HATCH (previously Hatch Mott MacDonald Ltd.) and groupe SYSTRA;
- Legal advisor: Norton Rose Fulbright Canada LLP and Lavery, de Billy LLP;
- Insurance advisor: AON Parizeau inc.;
- EPC Process Auditor: Mr. Jean Montplaisir, Eng. (Knowles Consultancy Services Inc.);
- RSSOM Process Auditor: Mr. André Dumais, Eng.

A Respondent, one of its Members, Participants, Key Individuals or the Parent Company of a Member of a Respondent may not use the services of a Person listed above or of an Associate of such a Person to complete tasks or mandates in the context of the Project.

CDPQ Infra may amend the list of Ineligible Persons during the Request for Qualification process.

An affiliate of such Ineligible Person may however be eligible to become a Member of a Respondent or an advisor of a Respondent after obtaining the written consent of CDPQ Infra to that effect. To obtain such consent, the Respondent must make an application for consent to CDPQ Infra through the Official Email Address. Once CDPQ Infra has received the application for consent duly completed by the Respondent, CDPQ Infra will decide, in its sole discretion, but as necessary with the support of the Legal Review Committee, whether there exists a real, perceived or potential conflict of interest and whether it is possible to manage, mitigate or adequately reduce the effect of such conflict. The Respondent will be notified of CDPQ Infra's decision by a letter of consent stating the nature of the consent and the management, mitigation and reduction measures required as a condition of the consent. If an affiliate of an Ineligible Person is deemed to be in a conflict of interest which cannot be managed, mitigated or reduced adequately, CDPQ Infra will add the affiliate to the above list of Ineligible Persons by means of an addendum to the Request for Qualification.

8.3 ACCESS TO INFORMATION

To the extent permitted by Quebec access to information legislation, including the *Act respecting Access to documents held by public bodies and the Protection of personal information* (CQLR c A-2.1), CDPQ Infra will ensure the confidentiality of information identified by Respondents as confidential in their respective Responses.

Each Respondent, including its Members and Participants, hereby agrees that any information contained in its Response may be transmitted, as allowed by the consent given in the form of undertaking included in Schedule 1.1, to the various agents, representatives and experts of CDPQ Infra, and to their respective staff members who are required to assist them as part of the Request for Qualification process. In addition, CDPQ Infra may transmit, without the consent of the Respondent, Member, Participant or Key Individual, as the case may be, any information contained in a Response that access to information legislation allows or requires to be transmitted to a third party even if consent has not been obtained or requested, as the case may be, from the Respondent or one of its Members or Participants.

In addition, nothing in this Request for Qualification may or should be interpreted as limiting in any way the ability of CDPQ Infra, or its agents, representatives or experts or any of their respective staff members to transmit any information contained in a Response if so required by a court or a public authority having the power or jurisdiction to order its transmission.

Moreover, any Person who presents a Response consents to disclosure of the following information:

- Its name, whether or not its Response is selected; and
- Where applicable, the fact that its Response is selected.

The previous paragraph, adapted as required, also applies to each of the Members and Participants of a Respondent.

8.4 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Respondents and their Members, Participants or Key Individuals and their respective staff members and representatives agree to avoid any situation that places their personal interest in conflict with the interest of CDPQ Infra.

In the event that such a situation should arise, the Respondent must immediately notify CDPQ Infra by way of the Official Email Address and CDPQ Infra may indicate, in its sole discretion, how to remedy said conflict of interest, or disqualify the Respondent.

As noted in Section 1.9, CDPQ Infra will appoint a Legal Review Committee whose mandate will include making recommendations regarding conflict of interest issues that may be raised in the Request for Qualification and the Request for Proposals. Any decision made by CDPQ Infra further to a recommendation by the Legal Review Committee, be it in response to an application for an advance ruling or as requested by CDPQ Infra at any stage in the Request for Qualification and the Request for Proposals, is final and binding regarding the Persons who submitted the matter to arbitration and any other party to the Request for Qualification and the Request for Proposals, including a Respondent, a Member, a Participant or a Key Individual, and their Associates.

8.5 EXCLUSIVITY

The Members, Participants and Key Individuals of a Respondent, as well as any of their Associates, must act exclusively for a Respondent and, as a result, cannot form part of the team of another Respondent submitting a Response to the Request for Qualification.

8.6 CANADIAN CONTENT

There will be no minimum Canadian content requirements in connection with the EPC Works to be performed.

8.7 LOBBYING AND POST-EMPLOYMENT OBLIGATIONS

A Respondent and its Members, Participants and Key Individuals undertake to comply, and ensure that their respective staff members and representatives comply, with the lobbying and post-employment obligations set out, in particular, in the *Lobbying Transparency and Ethics Act* (CQLR c T-11.011), the *Act respecting the Ministère du Conseil Exécutif* (CQLR c M-30) and the *Lobbyists Registration Act* (R.S.C., 1985, c 44 (4th Supp.)), and the regulations thereunder.

No member of the Quebec National Assembly may have an interest of any kind in the Request for Qualification, the Request for Proposals or the Contract to be entered into, or in any related advantage.

If a Respondent, one of its Members or Participants, one of their respective staff members or representatives, or one of their Key Individuals, fails to comply with the lobbying and post-employment obligations in connection with the Request for Qualification or the Request for Proposals, CDPQ Infra may, in its sole discretion, disqualify the Respondent.

8.8 DISCLOSURE AND PUBLIC COMMENTS

No Respondent, and no Member, Participant or Key Individual of a Respondent, may comment publicly, answer questions at a public forum, or take part in any promotional or advertising activities that mention the interest or participation of the Respondent in the selection process, without the prior written consent of CDPQ Infra.

8.9 COLLUSION

Each Respondent must present its Response without any concerted action, exchange, or comparison of information or arrangements with any other Respondent or any other staff member, representative or Member or Participant of a Respondent, or with an Associate of any of the above. Each Respondent is responsible for ensuring that it participates in the Request for Qualification honestly, without collusion or fraud. If a situation of collusion comes to light, CDPQ Infra will disqualify the Respondents concerned.

8.10 RESPONDENTS' COSTS AND EXPENSES

CDPQ Infra will not reimburse Respondents for any costs or expenses incurred by them as part of this Request for Qualification.

8.11 CHANGE IN THE COMPOSITION OF A RESPONDENT

A Respondent may not add, remove, or replace any Member, Participant, or Key Individual of a Respondent, or make any changes to the participation of any Member, Participant, or Key Individual, between the time when its Response is submitted and the time of the announcement of the Qualified Respondents in connection with the Request for Qualification.

If, in exceptional circumstances, following the announcement of Respondents qualified to participate in the Request for Proposals and before the signing of the Submission Agreement, a Respondent wishes to add, remove, or replace any Member, Participant, or Key Individual, or make any changes to the participation of any Member, Participant, or Key Individual, the Qualified Respondent must submit these changes to CDPQ Infra, explaining the nature of and reasons for the change or changes.

Any proposed change will be analyzed by and is subject to the approval of CDPQ Infra, in its sole discretion, in light of the conditions and requirements herein and in the Request for Proposals. Any change made in breach of the provisions of this section will lead to the disqualification of the Qualified Respondent.

The Request for Proposals and the Contract will specify the procedure for adding, removing, replacing or changing the participation of a Member, Participant or Key Individual. In particular, it will be specified that after the Contract is signed, any replacement of a Member, Participant or Key Individual may lead to a substantial penalty, and may be interpreted as a failure to comply.

8.12 RIGHTS OF CDPQ INFRA

CDPQ Infra is fully empowered to carry out an independent verification of the information relating to a Respondent and to obtain extra information about that Respondent. CDPQ Infra reserves the right, and has full power, to change the dates, deadlines, limits and scope of the Contract, to reject any or all Responses, to cancel this Request for Qualification or the Project, to launch a new Request for Qualification, to modify the selection process or to decide not to launch the Request for Proposals, without engaging CDPQ Infra's liability for any costs or damages incurred by any Respondent, including its Members, Participants and Key Individuals.

CDPQ Infra reserves the right, and has full power, to overlook or allow the correction of any irregularity CDPQ Infra considers minor that comes to light in a Response and to carry out verifications and request clarifications concerning any Response.

CDPQ Infra reserves the right to disqualify any Response which, in the opinion of and in CDPQ Infra's sole discretion, contains false or misleading information.

8.13 RESPONSIBILITY RELATING TO THE ACCURACY OF INFORMATION

CDPQ Infra, as well as the bodies, partnerships and Persons mentioned in Sections 1.6 and 8.2, decline all responsibility for and do not vouch for the accuracy, relevance or integrity of the information transmitted to a Respondent by a third Person or CDPQ Infra. Only the information contained in this document should be considered by the Persons interested in participating in this Request for Qualification.

8.14 NO RECOURSE

Each Respondent, in submitting its Response, irrevocably waives all recourse against CDPQ Infra or against its agents, representatives, advisors and experts on any ground that may arise from the preparation, presentation or reception of a Response, or from the Respondents' selection process or the Project.

8.15 OWNERSHIP OF DOCUMENTS

CDPQ Infra will be the sole owner of the Responses, without any compensation for the Respondents, Members, Participants or Key Individuals.

8.16 FRANCIZATION CERTIFICATE

To the extent that a Respondent is subject to sections 135 to 154 of the *Charter of the French Language* (CQLR c C-11), the Respondent represents and warrants that it has provided to the Office québécois de la langue française, within the prescribed timeframe, an analysis of its linguistic situation, that it has obtained an attestation of implementation of a francization program and holds a Francization Certificate and that its name is not on the List of companies failing to comply with francization processes that is published on the Office québécois de la langue française website. The Respondent agrees to submit a copy of any relevant document to CDPQ Infra upon request.

8.17 OFFICIAL LANGUAGE AND TRANSLATION OF DOCUMENTS

Only the French-language version of the Request for Qualification is official and produces legal effects.

Under the *Charter of the French language* (CQLR c C-11), contracts entered into by CDPQ Infra must be drawn up in the official language, French. In addition, any communication or notice arising from the exercise of a right or obligation under the EPC Contract must be in writing and in French.

English versions of the Request for Qualification and Request for Proposals will be made available, but only for information purposes.

SCHEDULE 1 – STANDARD LETTERS AND FORMS

The Response submitted must start with an introductory cover letter (no more than three (3) pages) to the Response, signed by the Respondent and each of the Members and Participants, confirming that they are submitting their Response, accompanied with (i) the certified true copy of the resolution, the resolution or another document showing that the Respondent's Representative is authorized to sign the Response on behalf of the Respondent and its Members and Participants, and (ii) the certified true copy of the resolution, the resolution or another document authorizing the Respondent's Representative and each of its Members and Participants to sign the form of undertaking included in Schedule 1.1.

The Respondent must only include in its Response the information relating to its organization and its Members, Participants and Key Individuals. Only the information relating to the Respondent and its Members, Participants and Key Individuals who have signed the form of undertaking included in Schedule 1.1 will be considered.

Only the information contained in the Response, supplemented by the clarifications submitted by the Respondent at the request of CDPQ Infra and information in the possession of CDPQ Infra following its own inquiries, and obtaining of additional information, will be considered in evaluating the Response.

SCHEDULE 1.1 – RESPONDENT’S FORM OF UNDERTAKING

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

FORM OF UNDERTAKING

This form of undertaking must be completed by the Respondent and each of its Members, Participants and Key Individuals. It is an integral part of the Response and must be inserted at the beginning of the Response. For the purposes of this form of undertaking, the Respondent and each of its Members, Participants and Key Individuals is an “Interested Party” and the defined expressions used in the form have the meaning given in the Request for Qualification.

TO: CDPQ Infra

The undersigned declares that it is an Interested Party or has power and authority to sign this form of undertaking on behalf of the Interested Party in question. The Interested Party agrees to act, as **[the Respondent, Member, Participant, or Key Individual of the Respondent]**, as the case may be.

The Interested Party hereby recognizes that it has received, read, examined and understood the document entitled “Request for Qualification - Engineering, Procurement and Construction for the infrastructures of the Réseau électrique métropolitain de Montréal”, all of the documents relating to the Project, all of the terms and conditions set out in the document, including all the schedules it contains, and all the other information made available by CDPQ Infra or its representatives in connection with the Request for Qualification. The Interested Party declares that it has obtained and received all the necessary information concerning the nature of the services to be provided and the requirements for the EPC Works.

If the Interested Party is the Respondent or one of its Members, the following paragraph should be added:

The Interested Party hereby recognizes the EPC Contractor’s obligation to respect the financial obligations required upon the signing of the EPC Contract.

The Interested Party hereby recognizes that the Request for Qualification refers, in particular and for information purposes, to a Proposal Security Deposit (Section 3.2), to performance Guarantees during the design and construction period (Section 3.3), to performance Guarantees during the warranty period (Section 3.4), to Parent Company Guarantees (Section 3.5) and to an insurance program (Section 3.6).

By submitting this form of undertaking, duly signed by the Interested Party or his, her or its authorized representative, the Interested Party agrees to be bound by all the terms and conditions of the Request for Qualification and to abide by them.

The Interested Party hereby recognizes and agrees that CDPQ Infra and its staff members, agents, advisors and representatives may verify any information that is contained in the Response and conduct a background investigation in respect of the Interested Party, including checks on the Interested Party’s credit and solvency record, criminal record, litigation or proceedings for bankruptcy or insolvency, tax status and compliance with all applicable tax legislation.

The Interested Party hereby consents to the use and collection of confidential or personal information pertaining to the Interested Party by CDPQ Infra, its staff members, agents, advisors and representatives, for the purpose of assessing the Response that is attached to this form of undertaking, and to the communication of such information to the Persons who are responsible for evaluating the Response, and to the public disclosure of such information in accordance with the provisions of this Request for Qualification and what may be required or permitted by the *Act respecting Access to documents held by public bodies and the Protection of personal information* (CQLR c A-2.1).

Each Interested Party also agrees that CDPQ Infra may communicate the information contained in the Response to the respective agents, representatives, staff members and advisors who assist CDPQ Infra in connection with the Procurement Process.

Each Interested Party acknowledges and agrees that a Process Auditor will ensure that the Request for Qualification process is equitable, transparent and impartial and that the information contained in the Response may be communicated to the Process Auditor or to one of the Process Auditor's employees, representatives or advisors as part of that process to allow the performance of the Process Auditor's duties.

Finally, each Interested Party acknowledges and agrees that a Legal Review Committee will examine any situations that give rise to or could give rise to a conflict of interest or an unwarranted advantage, and will render a decision. The decision of the Legal Review Committee pertaining to a real or apparent, existing or apprehended conflict of interest or an unwarranted advantage in response to a request by CDPQ Infra or a Respondent is final and without appeal. It will be binding upon the Person who requested the decision and all parties, including the Respondents, the Proponents, the Members, the Parent Company of each of the Members, the Participants, the Key Individuals and CDPQ Infra.

Moreover, the Interested Party consents to the communication of any personal information included in the Response to the various provincial organizations mentioned above, for the purposes for which those organizations request the information and that are described above.

Each Interested Party consents to the disclosure of the following information:

- Its name, whether or not the Response of the Respondent to which the Interested Party belongs is selected;
- Where applicable, the fact that the Response has been selected.

Each Interested Party undertakes to comply with the *Lobbying Transparency and Ethics Act* (CQLR c T-11.011) and, if applicable, with the *Code of conduct for Lobbyists* (CQLR c T-11.011, r 2), the implementing regulations and the notices issued by the Lobbyists Commissioner and the Lobbyists Registrar pursuant to the Act. In addition, each Interested Party recognizes and will ensure that any Person subject to the post-employment, ethics and conflict of interest rules created by the laws of Canada or Quebec that are applicable to the members of the Quebec National Assembly, their staff members or Quebec public servants, derives no direct advantage from the Request for Qualification unless that Person has complied with the applicable provisions.

An Interested Party agrees to be bound by and subject to CDPQ Infra's decision with respect to determining whether it:

- Has met the evaluation criteria specified in the Request for Qualification;
- Is considered by CDPQ Infra as a Qualified Respondent;
- Will be invited to take part in the Request for Proposals;
- Is disqualified because of a failure to comply with any of the terms and conditions set out in the Request for Qualification.

Each of the Interested Parties acknowledges that it may not disclose any information (which includes, without limiting the scope of the foregoing, issuing a press release or making any other public announcement) pertaining to the Project, its Response or the Procurement Process to any Person, with the exception of the Persons who are identified in its Response or who took part in its development, without the prior written consent of CDPQ Infra.

The Respondent and each of its Members, Participants and Key Individuals hereby confirm:

- That every Key Individual will be available for the Project (confirmation by the Key Individual personally; by each Member and Participant on behalf of Key Individuals in their respective employment; and by the Respondent on behalf of Key Individuals not employed by either a Member or a Participant);

- He, she or it is not an Associate of or otherwise connected to a Respondent other than **[insert the name of the Respondent here]**;
- He, she or it is not in a real or apparent, existing or apprehended conflict of interest and does not enjoy an unwarranted advantage with respect to CDPQ Infra for the purposes of this Response;
- He, she or it does not have or has not had in its possession confidential information (other than information provided by CDPQ Infra) in connection with the Project, the EPC Works or the Procurement Process.

This undertaking and the related obligations are governed by the laws in force in the province of Quebec. Any Interested Party binding itself pursuant to this form of undertaking attorns irrevocably to the jurisdiction of the courts of the province of Quebec.

Information regarding the Respondent	Answers
Name of Respondent	
The undersigned is (check box)	<input type="checkbox"/> a) a duly authorized representative of the Respondent <input type="checkbox"/> b) a duly authorized representative of a Member of the Respondent <input type="checkbox"/> c) a duly authorized representative of a Participant of the Respondent <input type="checkbox"/> d) a Key Individual or his or her duly authorized representative
Name of the Interested Party	
Address	
Telephone number	
Fax number	
Name of authorized representative, if applicable	
Title	
Signature	
Date and Place of signature	

SCHEDULE 1.2 – LETTER OF INTENT - LETTERS OF CREDIT

[Heading]

[Date]

CDPQ Infra

Project: Request for Qualification for Engineering, Procurement and Construction for the Infrastructures of the *Réseau électrique métropolitain de Montréal (EPC Works)*.

Subject: [Name of respondent]

Dear Sir, Dear Madam,

We have been informed that the respondent identified above wishes to qualify as a potential proponent for the EPC Works.

We have not yet completed an in-depth study of the EPC Works, since the proposal documents are not currently available.

The object of this letter is to confirm that the respondent mentioned above has the ability to obtain irrevocable and unconditional letters of credit for an amount of approximately three hundred million Canadian dollars (C\$300,000,000).

Yours truly,

[Name of Financial Institution]

SCHEDULE 1.3 – LETTER OF INTENT - BOND

[Heading]

[Date]

CDPQ Infra

Project: Request for Qualification for Engineering, Procurement and Construction for the infrastructures of the *Réseau électrique métropolitain de Montréal (EPC Works)*.

Subject: [Name of respondent]

Dear Sir, Dear Madam,

We have been informed that the respondent identified above wishes to qualify as a potential proponent for the EPC Works.

We have not yet completed an in-depth study of the EPC Works, since the proposal documents are not currently available.

The object of this letter is to confirm that the respondent mentioned above has the ability to obtain a performance bond of approximately seventy-five million Canadian dollars (C\$75,000,000).

Yours truly,

[Name of Financial Institution or Insurance Company]

SCHEDULE 1.4 – REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION

REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION FORM

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATION FOR THE EPC CONTRACT

Request number:	
Name of representative:	
Date of request:	
Confidential request:	

Source of request (specify titles, sections and dates, as applicable)	
Information session:	
Document:	
Other:	

Request (one per form)
Answer in the event of a confidential request approved by CDPQ Infra

SCHEDULE 2 – RESPONSE REQUIREMENTS

Table 1 provides an overview of pass/fail and rated evaluation criteria and their potential weights for the Request for Qualification relating to the EPC Works.

Table 1 – Evaluation Criteria for the Request for Qualification

EVALUATION CRITERIA	
	Percentage Weighting
I. Financial Capability	
Financial capability evaluated on a pass/fail basis	Pass / Fail
II. General Requirements: Integrated Project Management, approach and experience	10
III. Design Capacity and Experience	30
1. Team Organization and Experience	10
2. Key Individual Organization and Experience and Depth of Team	5
3. Approach to Key Issues, Risks and Mitigation	15
IV. Construction Capacity and Experience	35
1. Team Organization and Experience	10
2. Key Individual Organization and Experience and Depth of Team	5
3. Approach to Key Issues, Risks and Mitigation	20
V. Construction in an Existing Public Transit Corridor	15
1. Team Organization and Experience	5
2. Approach to Key Issues, Risks and Mitigation	10
VI. Integrating Civil Works and Systems	10
1. Team Organization and Experience	5
2. Approach to Key Issues, Risks and Mitigation	5
Total	100

Eligibility criteria are presented in Section 6.3 of the Request for Qualification.

A summary of the maximum number of pages allowed to present project data sheets, resumés and explanatory texts for each of the evaluation criteria is presented at the end of Table 2 in Schedule 2.

Except for financial capability, which will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis, each Respondent will receive, for each criterion, a score of between zero (0) and one hundred (100). The weighting assigned to each criterion is based on its relative importance. The total score for each Respondent will correspond to the sum of the weighted scores on the evaluation matrix for each criterion.

Notwithstanding the Respondent's total score, failure to achieve 50% of the available points under any one of the categories evaluated (e.g., failure to achieve a score of 50% of the available points in any of the categories in Table 1 of Schedule 2) will preclude the Respondent from being qualified;

I. FINANCIAL CAPABILITY ON A PASS/FAIL BASIS

The Respondent must provide the following documents, on its own behalf and on behalf of each of its Members and Participants and the Parent Company of each of its Members and Participants:

- The audited annual financial statements (3 most recent audited years) and any interim statements that may be available (annual and interim financial statements presented in accordance with IFRS, US GAAP or any other acceptable standard);
- Where available, the most recent credit rating report;
- Where available, any analyst report issued during the last 12-months;
- A letter from a Financial Institution confirming the ability of Respondent to secure and provide Guarantees (letters of credit and bond) in the amounts stated in Schedules 1.2 and 1.3;
- A Parent Company support letter, explicitly stating the Parent Company's willingness to provide a letter of Parent Company Guarantee at the RFP stage;
- A signed letter from the Chief Financial Officer (or equivalent) of each Member and Participant or their Parent Company with a description of any off-balance sheet financing, any outstanding claim that could result in a liability in excess of 5% of the Member's or Participant's net assets and any other known event that could present a consideration for the Member or Participant, not disclosed in the last audited financial statement;
- A signed letter from the Chief Financial Officer (or equivalent) of each Member and Participant, setting out a description of current active projects with a capital value in excess of \$500 million and known projects in excess of \$500 million in capital value that the Member or Participant will be involved in over the next 5 years; and
- Any material information relating to a potential bankruptcy or insolvency.

Evaluation Criteria:

The Respondent's financial capacity will be evaluated on the basis of the following two elements:

- Financial soundness; and
- The ability to obtain the required Guarantees in Schedules 1.2 and 1.3.

If the Applicant has more than one Member and/or Participant, the evaluation will be based on the pro rata participation in the works of each of the Members and Participants, in relation to the aggregate value of all the EPC Works.

The Selection Committee will evaluate the financial soundness of the Respondent as a whole, on the basis of the information provided by the Respondent in its Response, particularly with respect to profitability, indebtedness, investment capacity, changes in financial position, financial obligations and, if applicable, the credit ratings of its Members and Participants.

Financial soundness will be evaluated, in particular, using the following indicators:

- Annual sales;
- Total net assets (total assets - total liabilities);
- Gross margin ((total operating revenue - cost of goods sold)/total operating revenue);
- Debt service coverage ratio (EBITDA² /total debt service);
- Indebtedness (total debt/total equity);
- Working capital (current assets/current liabilities); and
- Ability to assume the Project risks, through working capital or ability to borrow.

² EBITDA means earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation and amortization.

The Response will also be evaluated on the basis of the ability of the Members and Participants responsible for the EPC Works to obtain proofs of the Guarantees (letters of credit and bond) required in Schedules 1.2 and 1.3.

II. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS: INTEGRATED PROJECT MANAGEMENT, APPROACH AND EXPERIENCE

Under the General Requirements, a summary of the key elements and organization of the Respondent as well as its experience and approach to integrated project management must be provided.

In its response, the Respondent must provide:

- An introductory letter:
 - Identifying the composition of the Consortium and/or of the Respondent's team, including a description of the roles of its Members and Participants;
 - Summarizing the key features of the qualifications and advantages of the Respondent, its Members, Participants and Key Individuals and any synergies or complementarities within the Respondent's team; and
 - Identifying the team member who is designated as the Respondent's Representative
- A description of the organization of the Members and Participants, Key Individuals and staff of the Respondent's team, in sufficient detail to understand how the Project will be delivered. In particular, a Respondent must indicate who, amongst the Members, Participants and Key Individuals, will assume responsibility for the management of the Project. Moreover, a Respondent must demonstrate that the person identified has:
 - Relevant and appropriate experience in managing large infrastructure projects of comparable size to the Project, using project management systems;
 - Qualified and experienced resources able to form a homogenous team; and
 - Experience working on large infrastructure projects requiring the integration of design and construction activities.
- Up to three (3) descriptions of infrastructure projects (with a capital value of \$500 million or more) showing the Respondent's or its Members' and Participants' experience:
 - In implementing a large, complex project;
 - In an urban environment;
 - As part of a consortium of several Members and Participants, while ensuring an integrated approach to project delivery across multiple team members.
- These descriptions should include an explanation of the roles and responsibilities assumed by the Members, Participants and Key Individuals in such projects, and the Respondent's integrated approach to the:
 - Management of design and construction activities;
 - Management of risks, schedule and costs;
 - Management of change orders;
 - Document control;
 - Communications with internal and external stakeholders.
- The Respondent's internal decision-making and dispute resolution process;
- The Respondent's approach to managing health, safety and environmental matters; and
- The resumé of the Project Manager who will have responsibility for the day-to-day management of the Project and for ensuring that the Respondent's obligations are fulfilled and for managing the Respondent's relationship with CDPQ Infra and the subcontractors and communicating with stakeholders.

Evaluation Criteria:

The Response will be evaluated on the extent to which it provides a clear and detailed description that satisfies the Project requirements, including:

- The Respondent's organization, the roles and responsibilities of its Members, Participants and Key Individuals, the advantages, synergies and complementarities of the Respondent's team;
- The Respondent's decision-making and conflict resolution processes;
- The proposed approach to managing health and safety and environmental issues; and
- The resumé of the Project Manager.

The Respondent is invited to give precedence in its presentation to projects completed (or at an advanced stage of completion) by its Members and/or Participants, whose scope, complexity and works are comparable to the Project's. The Response will be evaluated on the comparability of the projects, particularly in terms of management of design and construction activities, management of risks, schedule and costs, management of change orders, document control and communications, in accordance with the general requirements noted above. The description must also identify success factors that were implemented in the course of these projects.

The projects presented will not be evaluated individually, but as an overall demonstration of the Respondent's required experience in the relevant areas. The name of the Respondent, Member or Participant who participated in the completion of the project(s) and its role, responsibilities and participation percentage must be indicated.

III. DESIGN CAPACITY AND EXPERIENCE

The three sections that follow describe the requirements that will evaluate each Respondent's design capacity and experience. Design requirements are divided into three (3) categories. The first category evaluates the Respondent's design team organization and experience. The second category will evaluate the organization, experience and depth of Key Individuals that are part of the Respondent's design team and the third category will evaluate the Respondent's approach to the resolution of key issues, risks and mitigation measures.

1. Team Organization and Experience

In its response, the Respondent must:

- Provide a chart and explanation of the Respondent's organizational structure and the reporting relationships between the Respondent's team's members involved in Project design, their roles and responsibilities;
- Describe up to five (5) projects delivered during the past 15 years using an EPC or DB approach, that demonstrate the experience of the Respondent or its Members and Participants in the following areas:
 - Designing a rail-based public transit system which includes one or more of the following elements: an electric LRT system, a dedicated guideway, a tunnel, operation in an urban setting in close proximity to businesses and residences and construction in an area of heritage / historical value;
 - Designing an LRT, light or heavy metro system in a location with similar weather conditions to those experienced in Montreal;
 - Coordinating design activities to support safety certification and the successful testing and commissioning of a rail-based public transit system;
 - Coordinating and liaising with key external stakeholders, including but not limited to public regulatory and permitting agencies;
 - Working together as an integrated team for the design of a project; and
 - Experience implementing a Quality Control Plan, such as ISO 9001 or similar standards in a comparable transit project;

- Innovative approaches to the design of public transit infrastructure and its integration into an urban environment. The Respondent must also describe any design awards or acknowledgments recognizing innovative aspects of its design for the projects described.

Evaluation Criteria:

The Response will be evaluated on the Respondent's ability to present a clear and detailed description of the Respondent's organizational structure, the reporting relationships between the team members involved in the Project design, the roles and responsibilities of such team members and other related elements.

The Respondent is invited to give precedence in its presentation to projects completed (or at an advanced stage of completion) by its Members and/or Participants, whose scope, complexity and works are comparable to the Project's. The Response will be evaluated on the comparability of the projects, particularly in terms of the scope, complexity, infrastructure and delivery timetable.

The description of the projects must demonstrate that the experience of the proposed team will enable the Respondent to satisfy all the above requirements. The description must also identify success factors that were implemented in the course of these projects and any innovations that are relevant for the Project.

The projects presented will not be evaluated individually, but as an overall demonstration of the Respondent's required experience in the relevant areas. The name of the Respondent, Member or Participant who participated in the completion of the project(s) and its role, responsibilities and participation percentage must be indicated.

2. Key Individual Organization and Experience and Depth of Team

In its response, the Respondent must:

- Describe the internal organization of each Member involved in the design of the Project and the roles and responsibilities of each Key Individual. The description should include an organizational chart detailing the Respondent's internal structure and relevant reporting relationships. Key Individuals presented in this section should have experience working on those projects described in Section III - 1 above. Key Individuals that only played a minor role, or did not work on the projects described in Section III – 1 will not receive full scores;
- Describe the depth of the experience and expertise of Key Individuals available to the Respondent to deliver the Project design according to the requirements. This could include describing the number of individuals and their experience that would be able to replace Key Individuals in design-related functions moving forward. For example, Respondents could describe the number and experience of design managers available to them with similar experience and qualifications as the designated Design Manager that may be offered as a replacement to the Design Manager in the future;
- Describe the proposed approach to ensure the availability of Key Individuals in design-related functions and the replacement of Key Individuals by one or more individuals with equivalent or higher qualifications; and
- Provide resumés for the Design Manager, Systems Integration Manager, Project Controller and Design Quality Manager.

Evaluation Criteria:

The Response will be evaluated on the Respondent's ability to present prior experience that the Key Individuals have acquired in designing LRT or rail-based public transit systems similar to the Project, particularly in terms of scope, complexity, timetable, context and work environment. The evaluation of the Response will include an evaluation of the following:

- The work experience that the person concerned has acquired in a project where he or she assumed a role or responsibilities comparable to the role he or she would have as a Key Individual; and
- The work experience in projects that required EPC delivery methods or, as applicable, other delivery methods that require the integration of design and construction activities.

The Response will also be evaluated on the Respondent's ability to present an approach that demonstrates that it can ensure the availability of Key Individuals in design roles and replace Key Individuals by one or more individuals with equal or higher qualifications.

3. Approach to Key Issues, Risks and Mitigation

In its response, the Respondent must:

- Provide a description of how its design approach will:
 - Ensure schedule and budget adherence. The Respondent must also describe strategies and mitigation measures that would be employed to address any delays in design progress;
 - Contribute to efficient construction of all the infrastructure, particularly the tunnel;
 - Maintain a high-standard of workplace safety;
 - Mitigate the impact of construction on existing contaminated sites along the route;
 - Result in signature station design in line with (eventual) design guidance from CDPQ Infra; and
 - Respect the technical requirements: the Respondent must also describe the strategies and mitigation measures that would be employed to resolve potential design issues.

In its response to the above items, the Respondent must demonstrate how it addressed similar issues using a design approach in other projects. The Respondent must demonstrate how the design approach that will be used for this Project will permit the Project to benefit from experience and lessons learned on other projects.

The Respondent must highlight the use of innovative design approaches to address these key issues and risks:

- Describe any other key design-related issues and risks identified with respect to the Project, how these issues and risks are relevant for the Project and the approach to address or mitigate these issues and risks. Where possible, the Respondent must draw on past experience with managing similar issues and risks in other projects; and
- Describe the design approach that will be used to minimize capital, life cycle and operational costs and Respondents' experience using this approach in similar projects.

Evaluation Criteria:

The Response will be evaluated on the Respondent's ability to present a rigorous and detailed approach, suited to the Project's design work, including identification of the issues, risks and mitigation measures and their management, which must satisfy all the requirements noted above.

The Respondent should preferably provide examples of prior accomplishments in support of the proposed approach, including success factors, or alternatively justify the relevance of the proposed approach.

IV. CONSTRUCTION CAPACITY AND EXPERIENCE

The three sections that follow describe the requirements that will be used to evaluate each Respondent's construction capacity and experience. These requirements are divided into three categories. The first evaluates each Respondent's construction team organization and experience. The second criterion will serve to evaluate the experience of Key Individuals that are part of the construction team and the third criterion will serve to evaluate the Respondent's approach to the resolution of key issues, risks and mitigation measures.

1. Team Organization and Experience

In its response, the Respondent must:

- Provide a chart and explanation of the organizational structure and the reporting relationships between team members involved in the construction of the Project, their roles and responsibilities;
- Describe up to five (5) projects delivered in the past 15 years using an EPC or DB approach that demonstrate the experience of the Respondent or its Members and Participants in the following areas:
 - Building a rail-based public transit system which includes one or more of the following elements: an electric LRT system, a dedicated guideway, a tunnel, operation in an urban setting in close proximity to businesses and residences and construction in an area of heritage / historical value;
 - Building an LRT, a light or heavy metro system in a location with similar weather conditions to those experienced in Montreal;
 - Construction of command centres and maintenance facilities for trains, LRT or metro vehicles in weather conditions comparable to those in Montreal;
 - Construction of stations for an LRT or metro system in an environment with limitations, interfaces with other public transit modes and construction requirements comparable to those of the Project;
 - Building a rail-based public transit system in a dense urban environment – including city centres – while minimizing adverse impacts on business and residents;
 - Maintaining and effectively managing vehicular traffic flow during construction;
 - Coordinating construction work with utilities and public sector agencies and moving public utilities;
 - Experience in implementing communication plans and programs during construction;
 - Coordinating construction activities to support safety certification and the successful testing and commissioning of a rail-based public transit system;
 - Delivering quality projects on time and on-budget;
 - Working together as an integrated team for the construction of a project;
 - Experience implementing a quality control plan, such as ISO 9001 or similar standards in a comparable transit project; and
 - The Respondent must also mention any awards received acknowledging the quality of the construction work.

Evaluation Criteria:

The Response will be evaluated on the Respondent's ability to present a clear and detailed description of the Respondent's organizational structure, the reporting relationships between the team members involved in the Project design, the roles and responsibilities of the team members and other related elements.

The Respondent is invited to give precedence in its presentation to projects completed (or at an advanced stage of completion) by its Members and/or Participants, whose scope, complexity and works are comparable to the Project's. The Response will be evaluated on the comparability of the projects, particularly in terms of the scope, complexity, infrastructure and delivery timetable.

The description of the projects must demonstrate that the experience of the proposed team will enable the Respondent to satisfy all the above requirements. The description must also identify the success factors that were implemented in the course of these projects and any innovations that are relevant for the Project.

The projects presented will not be evaluated individually, but as a whole as a demonstration of the Respondent's experience in the relevant areas. The name of the Respondent, the Member or the Participant who participated in the completion of the project(s) and its role, responsibilities and participation percentage must be indicated.

2. Key Individual Organization and Experience and Depth of Team

In its response, the Respondent must:

- Describe the internal organization of each Member involved in the construction of the Project and the roles and responsibilities of each Key Individual. The description should include an organizational chart detailing the Respondent's internal structure and relevant reporting relationships. Key Individuals presented in this section should have experience working on the projects described by the Respondents in Section IV -1 above. Key Individuals that only played a minor role, or did not work on the projects described in Section IV -1 will not receive full scores;
- Describe the proposed approach to ensure the availability of Key Individuals in construction-related functions over the term of this Project;
- Describe the depth of Key Individuals available to the Respondent to deliver the Project's construction in accordance with the requirements. This could include describing the number and experience of individuals who would be able to replace Key Individuals moving forward. For example, the Respondent can describe the number of construction managers available to it with similar experience and qualifications as the designated Construction Manager and who may be offered as a replacement for the Construction Manager as required; and
- Provide resumés for the Construction Manager, the Construction Quality Manager and the Tunnelling Manager.

Evaluation Criteria:

The Response will be evaluated on the Respondent's ability to present the prior experience of the Key Individuals in the construction of LRT or rail-based public transit systems similar to the Project, particularly in terms of scope, complexity, timetable, context and work environment. The evaluation of the Response will include an evaluation of the following:

- The work experience that the person concerned has acquired in a project where he or she assumed a role or responsibilities comparable to the role he or she would have as a Key Individual; and
- The work experience in projects that required an EPC delivery method or, as applicable, other delivery methods that require the integration of design and construction activities;

The Response will also be evaluated on the extent to which it presents an approach that demonstrates that it can ensure the availability of Key Individuals in design roles and replace Key Individuals by one or more individuals with equal or higher qualifications.

3. Approach to Key Issues, Risks and Mitigation

In its response, the Respondent must:

- Provide a description of how its approach to construction will:
 - Ensure schedule and budget adherence. The Respondent must also describe strategies and mitigation measures that would be employed to address any delays in construction progress;
 - Ensure road safety and effective traffic management during construction;
 - Limit the impact of construction on businesses and residences;
 - Maintain a high-standard of workplace safety;
 - Mitigate the impact of construction on existing contaminated sites along the route; and
 - Respect the technical requirements; the Respondent must also describe the strategies and mitigation measures that would be employed to resolve potential design issues.

In its response to the above, the Respondent must demonstrate how it addressed similar issues in other construction projects. The Respondent must demonstrate how the approach to construction that will be used for this Project benefits from past experience and lessons learned.

The Respondent must highlight the use of innovative approaches to address these key issues and risks.

- Describe its Quality Control Plan during construction;
- Describe its approach to liaising with municipalities, utilities, government agencies and stakeholders;
- Describe its approach to environmental management and the approach to monitoring and implementing commitments and conditions which relate to regulatory obligations;
- Describe any other key construction-related issues and risks identified with respect to the Project, how these issues and risks are relevant for the Project and the approach to mitigate these issues and risks. Where possible, the Respondent must draw on past experience managing similar issues and risks in other projects; and
- Describe the approach to design and construction of stations for an LRT or metro system in an environment with limitations, interfaces with other public transit modes and design requirements comparable to those of the Project.

Evaluation Criteria:

The Response will be evaluated on the Respondent's ability to present a rigorous and detailed approach, suited to the Project construction work, including identification of the issues, risks and mitigation measures and their management, which must satisfy all the requirements noted above.

The Respondent should preferably provide examples of prior accomplishments in support of the proposed approach, including success factors, or alternatively justify the relevance of the proposed approach.

V. CONSTRUCTION IN AN EXISTING PUBLIC TRANSIT CORRIDOR

The sections that follow describe requirements that will be used to evaluate each Respondent's capacity and experience in the construction of a public transit system in an existing transit corridor, where the existing transit system continues to be in operation during construction.

These requirements are divided into two parts that assess the proposed team's experience and organization and approach to construction in an existing public transit corridor, while mitigating the impact of construction on existing transit operations.

1. Team experience and organization

In its response, the Respondent must describe up to three (3) infrastructure projects (with a capital value in excess of \$500 million) that demonstrate the proposed team's experience executing construction work in an existing road or public transit corridor and in an urban environment, where the existing road or transit system continues to be in operation during construction.

Evaluation Criteria

The Respondent is invited to give precedence in its presentation to projects completed (or at an advanced stage of completion) by its Members and/or Participants, whose scope, complexity and works are comparable to the Project's. The Response will be evaluated on the comparability of the projects, particularly in terms of the scope, complexity, infrastructure and delivery timetable.

The description of the projects must demonstrate that the experience of the proposed team will enable the Respondent to satisfy all the above requirements. The description must also identify the success factors that were implemented in the course of these projects.

The projects presented will not be evaluated individually, but as a whole as a demonstration of the Respondent's experience in the relevant areas. The name of the Respondent, the Member or the Participant who participated in the completion of the project(s) and its role, responsibilities and participation percentage must be indicated.

2. **Approach to Key Issues, Risks and Mitigation**

In its response, the Respondent must provide a description of how its approach to design and construction will:

- Ensure the safe operation of the existing rail and bus network during construction;
- Ensure the safety of the workforce in a construction site with ongoing rail and bus operations;
- Minimize the impact on the existing rail and bus network through the efficient phasing and scheduling of construction work;
- Use innovative technical or other measures to minimize the impact on the existing rail and bus network;
- Manage the impact of accommodating ongoing bus and rail operations on the Respondent's construction costs and schedule; and
- Liaise with a public transit authority or other entity to coordinate construction work and transit operations.

In its response to the above, the Respondent must demonstrate how it mitigated the impact of construction on existing transit operations or road traffic in other construction projects and how this experience is applicable to this Project. The Respondent must highlight the use of any innovative approaches that it implemented to address this issue.

The Respondent must limit references to other projects to five (5) projects in this section.

Evaluation Criteria:

The Response will be evaluated on the Respondent's ability to present a rigorous and detailed approach, suited to the Project construction work to be performed in an existing and operating public transit corridor, including identification of the issues, risks and mitigation measures and their management, which must satisfy all the requirements noted above.

The Respondent should preferably provide examples of prior accomplishments in support of the proposed approach, including success factors, or alternatively justify the relevance of the proposed approach.

VI. INTEGRATING CIVIL WORKS AND SYSTEMS

The sections that follow describe requirements that will be used to evaluate each Respondent's capacity and experience with respect to the integration of civil works and Systems. These requirements are divided into two parts that assess the Respondent's team's organization and experience and approach to the resolution of key issues, risks and mitigation measures.

1. Team Organization and Experience

In its response, the Respondent must describe up to three (3) infrastructure projects (with a capital value in excess of \$500 million) that demonstrate the team's design and construction experience integrating civil works and Systems, in a similar context to this Project where the civil works, Rolling Stock and Systems are being procured separately.

Evaluation Criteria:

The Respondent is invited to give precedence in its presentation to projects completed (or at an advanced stage of completion) by its Members and/or Participants, whose scope, complexity and works are comparable to the Project's. The Response will be evaluated on the comparability of the projects, particularly in terms of scope, complexity, infrastructure and delivery timetable.

The description of the projects must demonstrate that the experience of the proposed team will enable the Respondent to satisfy all the above requirements. The description must also identify the success factors that were implemented in the course of these projects.

The projects presented will not be evaluated individually, but as a whole as a demonstration of the Respondent's experience in the relevant areas. The name of the Respondent, the Member or the Participant who participated in the completion of the project(s) and its role, responsibilities and participation percentage must be indicated.

2. Approach to Key Issues, Risks and Mitigation

In its response, the Respondent must provide a description of how its approach to design and construction will minimize interface issues and risks with the RSSOM Contractor and support the RSSOM Contractor to ensure the successful testing and commissioning of the Systems. Finally, its construction approach should demonstrate that it is able to manage other civil works and Systems integration issues with the RSSOM Contractor to ensure that the Project is delivered on-time and on-budget.

In its response to the above, the Respondent must demonstrate that it was able to resolve similar issues in past projects and how its experience is applicable to the Project. The Respondent must highlight the use of any innovative approaches that it implemented to resolve such issues.

The Respondent must outline its approach for RAMS (Risk, Availability, Maintainability and Safety) and Environmental management.

The Respondent must limit references to other projects to five (5) projects in this section.

Evaluation Criteria:

The Response will be evaluated on the Respondent's ability to present a rigorous and detailed approach, suited to the Project design and construction work, that will minimize problems and issues associated with the interfaces between the EPC Works and the RSSOM Services and must satisfy all the requirements noted above.

The Respondent should preferably provide examples of prior accomplishments in support of the proposed approach, including success factors, or alternatively justify the relevance of the proposed approach.

VII. MAXIMUM NUMBER OF PAGES PER SECTION

Table 2 presents a summary of the maximum number of pages for each section of a Response.

Table 2 – Summary of the maximum number of pages for each section

Sections	Project data sheet			Resumé			Explanatory text	Total
	Number	Pages per project	Total number of pages	Number of Persons	Pages per resumé	Total number of pages	Number of pages	Number of pages
II. Integrated Project Management, Approach and Experience	3	3	9	1	3	3	5	17
III. Design Capacity and Experience	5	3	15	4	3	12	17	44
1. Team Organization and Experience	5	3	15				5	20
2. Key Individual Organization and Experience and Depth of Team				4	3	12	5	17
3. Approach to Key Issues, Risks and Mitigation							7	7
IV. Construction Capacity and Experience	5	3	15	3	3	9	17	41
1. Team Organization and Experience	5	3	15				5	20
2. Key Individual Organization and Experience and Depth of Team				3	3	9	5	14
3. Approach to Key Issues, Risks and Mitigation							7	7
V. Construction in an Existing Public Transit Corridor	8	3	24				10	34
1. Team Organization and Experience	3	3	9				5	14
2. Approach to Key Issues, Risks and Mitigation	5	3	15				5	20
VI. Integrated Civil Works and Systems	8	3	24				10	34
1. Team Organization and Experience	3	3	9				5	14
2. Approach to Key Issues, Risks and Mitigation	5	3	15				5	20

SCHEDULE 3 – DESCRIPTION OF TECHNICAL FEATURES

1. DESCRIPTION OF THE MAIN PHYSICAL COMPONENTS OF THE PROJECT

The Project infrastructure includes all of the physical components outlined below, with the exception of structures relating to peripheral work and other work not relating to the Project to be specified in the Request for Proposals.

In addition to activities pertaining to the principal and related components referred to below, the Project includes work to maintain traffic flow, temporary work and work to dismantle existing infrastructure as well as all the required materials and equipment.

The principal physical components of the Project are presented for each branch, as contemplated in Figure 1.

2. WESTERN BRANCH

(A) WESTERN BRANCH TO DEUX-MONTAGNES

Conversion of the Deux-Montagnes commuter line into a branch of the REM while maintaining adequate service as the work is being completed:

- Doubling the existing tracks over approximately 18 km;
- Converting the 12 existing stations on the Deux-Montagnes commuter line to REM stations (including Central Station);
- Building a new connecting station between the REM and the Mascouche commuter line;
- Converting each of the 15 existing grade crossings as follows:
 - Raise the track and railroad overpass; or
 - Lower roads and railroad overpasses; or
 - Build a new highway bridge; or
 - Build an LRT overpass; or
 - Discontinue use of grade crossing.
- Making modifications to the Mount Royal Tunnel (approximately 5 km);
- Doubling four rail bridges crossing the Milles-Îles and Des Prairies rivers;
- Doubling two rail bridges crossing Chemin du Bord de l'eau and Chemin d'Oka;
- Doubling the rail bridge crossing the Parc Bois-de-Liesse foot path; and
- Converting the depot and the maintenance facility at the end of the line in Saint-Eustache.

(B) WESTERN BRANCH TO SAINTE-ANNE-DE-BELLEVUE

Along Highway 40, primarily in a medium-density industrial and commercial sector:

- Construction of approximately 16 km of new double tracks, mainly an LRT overpass, including approximately six (6) km within the existing railway right-of-way (Doney Spur) and three (3) highway crossings;
- Construction of a new railway junction between the Sainte-Anne-de-Bellevue and Deux-Montagnes branches;
- Construction of the Highway 13 station, including a park-and-ride facility and a bus terminal;
- Construction of the Des Sources station, including a park-and-ride facility and a bus terminal;
- Construction of the Pointe-Claire station, including a park-and-ride facility and a bus terminal;

- Construction of the Kirkland station, including a park-and-ride facility and possibly a bus terminal; and
- Construction of the Sainte-Anne de Bellevue station, including a park-and-ride facility and a bus terminal.

(C) WESTERN BRANCH TO THE AIRPORT

In a medium-density industrial and commercial sector as well as on ADM territory:

- Construction of approximately five (5) km of new double tracks that may include ground level and raised sections, cut-and-cover constructions and tunnels;
- Construction of a station serving Montréal-Trudeau Airport;
- Construction of a station serving the Technoparc Saint-Laurent; and
- Construction of a new rail junction between the Montréal-Trudeau Airport Branch and the West Island Branch.

3. SOUTH SHORE BRANCH

Densely populated urban area on City of Montreal territory:

- Construction of approximately five (5) km of new double tracks;
- Construction of a station on the central median of Highway 10 on Nuns' Island and a nearby bus terminal;
- Construction of a raised structure in the Griffintown sector, west of the CN rail corridor, to transfer rail traffic on the CN corridor in order to access Central Station;
- Construction of a tunnel approximately three (3) km long (tunnels and cut-and-cover constructions), including two (2) auxiliary evacuation and ventilation structures between Ottawa Street in the Griffintown sector and the Pointe-Saint-Charles business park, near Mel's Studios;
- Construction of a raised structure approximately one (1) km long above the arm of the St. Lawrence River that is between the Island of Montreal and Nuns' Island;
- Construction of a maintenance facility including cut-and-cover access tunnel in the Pointe-Saint-Charles business park sector.

On the new Champlain Bridge:

- Construction of new double tracks over approximately 3 km along the central public transit corridor on the new Champlain Bridge (central bridge span to be built by third parties).

Along Highway 10 on Montreal's South Shore, in a medium-density industrial and commercial sector:

- Construction of approximately six (6) km of new double ground-level tracks in the central median of Highway 10;
- Construction of the Panama station and extension of the existing pedestrian tunnel to the west under the Highway 10 off-ramp towards Taschereau Boulevard;
- Construction of the Panama bus terminal (approximately 30 platforms), an underground park-and-ride facility for approximately 500 vehicles and local road access;
- Modification of existing bridges over Taschereau Boulevard and the on-ramp to westbound Highway 10 via Taschereau Boulevard;
- Construction of a rail overpass above Malo Street, the CN tracks and Leduc Boulevard;
- Redesign of the local road network: Lapinière Boulevard, Malo Street, Leduc Boulevard;
- Deviation of Highway 10 over approximately one (1) km in both directions in the Du Quartier station sector;

- Construction of the Du Quartier station and a footbridge;
- Construction of a raised structure over Highway 10, 0.6 km long to access the South Shore station;
- Construction of the South Shore station in the southern section of the Highway 10/ Highway 30 interchange;
- Construction of a South Shore bus terminal (approximately 20 platforms), park-and-ride facilities for some 3,000 vehicles and local road access;
- Construction of a road link to Highway 10, including an overpass; and
- Construction of a secondary maintenance facility connected to the South Shore station.

SCHEDULE 4 – ACKNOWLEDGMENT

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS – 01_7001



We confirm that we have reviewed the Request for Qualification and wish to submit our Response.

Signature: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

RESPONDENT'S SOLE REPRESENTATIVE*	
Name:	
Company:	
Title:	
Address:	
Tel.:	
Fax:	
Email:	

- Following receipt of the duly completed Acknowledgment, all correspondence concerning the Request for Qualification will be sent only to the Respondent's Representative and only the Respondent's Representative will be authorized to submit requests for clarifications.

Request for Qualification Ref 01-7001

**Engineering, Procurement and
Construction for the Infrastructures
of the *Réseau électrique
métropolitain de Montréal***

**ADDENDUM NO. 1
TO THE REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATION DOCUMENT REF 01-7001
DATED JUNE 28, 2016**

July 14, 2016

Pursuant to Section 5 of the Request for Qualification document, this ADDENDUM No.1 forms an integral part of the Request for Qualification and amends the Request for Qualification in the manner and to the extent indicated herein.

AMENDMENTS TO THE REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATION DOCUMENT

Please take note of the following amendments to the Request for Qualification document, which amendments are underlined.

- In the “Glossary” section of the Request for Qualification document, the definition of the term “RSSOM Services” is deleted and replaced by the following:

RSSOM Services The supply of Rolling Stock, Systems, and operating and regular EPC Infrastructures Maintenance and long-term maintenance services for the Rolling Stock, Systems and related equipment.

- Section 1.1 of the Request for Qualification document is deleted and replaced by the following:

1.1 PURPOSE AND CONTENTS OF THE DOCUMENT

CDPQ Infra has begun planning a world-class integrated electric automated LRT project including a South Shore Branch (the Highway 10/downtown Montreal corridor) and a Western Branch (from downtown Montreal to Montréal-Trudeau Airport, Sainte-Anne-de-Bellevue and Deux-Montagnes).

The Project Procurement Process, following requests for qualifications and the issuance of international requests for proposals, will lead to the signing of major contracts:

- A contract for the infrastructure design and construction work under an Engineering, Procurement and Construction Contract (EPC Contract);
- A contract :
 - for the supply of Rolling Stock, Systems, and associated regular and long term maintenance,
 - for operating services
 - for the regular maintenance of infrastructures excluding major maintenance and assets renewal (RSSOM Contract).

For optimization purposes, one or several additional requests for qualifications and for proposals may also be issued for the performance of construction work packages involving certain peripheral work for the Project.

This Request for Qualification, which relates only to the EPC Contract, aims to qualify Respondents who will be invited to take part in the Request for Proposals and to submit a Proposal for the performance of the EPC Contract.

The Procurement Process does not constitute, directly or indirectly, an offer to enter into a public contract, and does not require CDPQ Infra to enter into a public contract with any party. CDPQ Infra may, at any time, terminate or amend the Procurement Process or the Request for Qualification, in its sole discretion.

- In Section 1.5 of the Request for Qualification document, the table entitled “Table 1 – Procurement and Project Completion Deadlines” is deleted and replaced by the following table:

Table 1 - Procurement and Project Completion Deadlines

Steps	Deadlines
Land reserves order-in-council	May 2016
Public Procurement Notice	May 17, 2016
Information session	June 7, 2016
Request for Qualification for the EPC Contract	June 28, 2016
Request for Qualification for the RSSOM Contract	June 28, 2016
<u>Information session</u>	<u>July 19, 2016</u>
Deadline for sending requests for clarification and for submitting an acknowledgment	August 5, 2016
Deadline for issuing addenda, if applicable	August 12, 2016
Deadline to receive Responses	August 26, 2016
Announcement of Qualified Respondents	To confirm
BAPE public hearings	To confirm
Request for Proposals for the EPC Contract	<u>Fall 2016</u>
Request for Proposals for the RSSOM Contract	<u>Fall 2016</u>
Receipt of Proposals for the EPC Contract	<u>Launch date for the Request for Proposals + 6 months</u>
Receipt of Proposals for the RSSOM Contract	<u>Launch date for the Request for Proposals + 6 months</u>
Tabling of the BAPE report	To confirm
Environmental order-in-council	To confirm
Acquisition of the Deux-Montagnes line	To confirm
Financial close for the EPC Contract and the RSSOM Contract	To confirm
Beginning of work for the EPC Contract and the RSSOM Contract	To confirm
Beginning of commercial service	To confirm



- In Section 2.1 of the Request for Qualification document, the table entitled “Table 2 – Project highlights” is deleted and replaced by the following table:

Table 2 – Project highlights

	SOUTH SHORE BRANCH (Highway 10/Downtown Montreal Corridor)	WESTERN BRANCH (Downtown Montreal to Montréal-Trudeau Airport, Sainte-Anne-de-Bellevue, Deux-Montagnes)
Size	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 km of double tracks • 5 stations • 2 bus terminals • 2 park-and-ride facilities • 1.3 km of new cut-and-cover tunnels and 1.6 km of tunnel in the rock 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 52 km of double tracks • 19 stations (including existing stations) • 7 bus terminals (including existing terminals) • 11 park-and-ride facilities (including existing facilities) • 2.5 km of new tunnel
Chosen technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electric LRT-type cars • Automated driverless system • Platforms approximately 80 m long • Platform screen doors • Power supplied through catenary: 1,500 VDC • Elevators and escalators in stations • Wi-Fi throughout the network 	
Rolling stock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ultimately, a fleet of over 200 cars • Four-car trains at rush hour; two-car trains at off-peak times 	
Operation and regular and long-term maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Automated train operation • Attendants circulating in the trains and stations for information and inspection purposes • Integration of networks and feeder bus service provided by other Operators at the stations • Tickets sold through ARTM vendors and integrated into the Opus card or similar technology • <u>Daily inspection and regular maintenance of rail infrastructure, civil structures and buildings (e.g., rail line foundations and right-of-way, stations, maintenance facilities, storage centres, substations and power cables, park-and-ride facilities, bridges and tunnels)</u> • Regular and long-term maintenance of Rolling Stock, automated train control system, command centre, screen doors and all of the low current and high current systems 	

- In Section 2.4 of the Request for Qualification document, the table entitled “Table 3 – Proposed Division of Responsibilities” is deleted and replaced by the following table:

Table 3 - Proposed Division of Responsibilities

	Design and Construction	Operation and Regular Maintenance	<u>Major Maintenance and Renewal of Assets¹</u>
Civil engineering work			
Rail line foundation	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>

¹ An exhaustive list of the elements included in the maintenance and renewal of assets under CDPQ's responsibility will be communicated to the Proponents in the Request for Proposals documents.

Drainage along the rail line	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>
Conduit for traction system electrical wiring	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>
Conduit for low-voltage electrical wiring	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>
Telecommunications conduit	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>
Foundations and supporting masses for catenary systems	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>
Parking facilities and outdoor lighting	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>
Bus platform and terminal	EPC	<u>By others</u>	<u>By others</u>
Pedestrian crossing	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>
Sidewalk	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>
Modifications to existing infrastructure			
Relocation of utilities	EPC	n/a	<u>n/a</u>
Engineering work			
Bridge, overpass and culvert	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>
Tunnel and related equipment	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>
Underground pedestrian crossing	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>
Buildings			
Stations	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>
Train storage depot	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>
Bungalow for electrical substation	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>
Bus terminal	EPC	<u>By others</u>	<u>By others</u>
Train maintenance facility	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>
LRT command centre building	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>
Superstructures			
Rails	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>
Catenary equipment and system	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>
Sound barriers, security measures and equipment, lighting, etc.	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>
Rolling Stock, Systems and related equipment			
Rolling Stock	RSSOM	RSSOM	<u>RSSOM</u>
Automatic train control system	RSSOM *	RSSOM	<u>RSSOM</u>
LRT command centre equipment	RSSOM	RSSOM	<u>RSSOM</u>
Traction power	EPC	RSSOM	<u>RSSOM</u>
Screen doors	RSSOM *	RSSOM	<u>RSSOM</u>
Telecommunications	RSSOM *	RSSOM	<u>RSSOM</u>
CCTV systems and surveillance equipment and signage	RSSOM *	RSSOM	<u>RSSOM</u>

* Defined and procured by RSSOM Contractor; installed by EPC Contractor.

- In Section 2.8.1 of the Request for Qualification document, the table entitled “Table 5 – Description of EPC and RSSOM Interfaces” is deleted and replaced by the following table:

Table 5 - Description of EPC and RSSOM Interfaces

	Design and Construction	Operation and Regular Maintenance	Major Maintenance and Renewal of Assets	Description of Interfaces Principal Areas (partial list)
Civil engineering work				
Rail line foundation	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>	
Drainage along the rail line	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>	
Conduit for traction system electrical wiring	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>	Rolling Stock: Dimensioning of electrical power and distance between substations
Conduit for low-voltage electrical wiring	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>	Automatic train control system: Dimensioning and number of cables Telecommunications: Dimensioning and number of cables
Telecommunications conduit	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>	Telecommunications: Dimensioning and number of fiber-optic cables
Foundations and supporting masses for catenary system	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>	Rolling Stock: Static and dynamic train features (minimum/maximum pantograph height) and operating range of catenary/pantograph
Parking and outdoor lighting	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>	
Bus platforms and terminal	EPC	<u>By others</u>	<u>By others</u>	Equipment to provide information to passengers of Operators
Pedestrian crosswalk and sidewalk	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>	
Modifications to existing infrastructures				
Relocation of utilities	EPC	n/a	<u>n/a</u>	
Engineering work				
Bridge, overpass and culvert	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>	
Tunnel and related equipment	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>	
Underground pedestrian crossing	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>	

Buildings				
Stations	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>	<p>Rolling Stock: Platform alignment</p> <p>Automatic train control system: Positioning of beacons in stations</p> <p>Screen doors: Position, electrical connection and controls</p> <p>Telecommunications: Installation and connection of fiber-optic backbone, routers and local antennas</p> <p>CCTV systems and surveillance equipment: Number, position, electrical and IT connection of dynamic displays, speakers, microphones, cameras and other sensors</p>
Train storage depot	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>	<p>Rolling Stock: Alignments, cleaning equipment, power and pneumatic supply</p> <p>Automatic train control system: Positioning of beacons in zone to transfer to manual operation</p> <p>Command centre equipment: A work station shared with the train maintenance facility</p> <p>Telecommunications: Installation and connection of fiber-optic backbone, routers and local antennas</p> <p>Workshop design: According to RSSOM needs</p>
Bungalow for electrical substation	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>	<p>Rolling Stock: Dimensioning of electrical power, EMC, distance between substations</p>
Bus terminal	EPC	By others	<u>By others</u>	
Train maintenance facility	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>	<p>Rolling Stock: Alignment, cleaning system for trains, position of pits, drop-table, cleaning equipment, other equipment, electric power and pneumatic supply</p> <p>Automatic train control system: Positioning of beacons in zone to transfer to manual operation</p> <p>Command centre equipment: A work station shared with the train storage depot</p> <p>Telecommunications: Installation</p>

				and connection of fiber-optic backbone, routers and local antennas Workshop design: According to RSSOM needs and train length
LRT command centre building	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>	Command centre equipment: Positions, power connection and work station network (including furniture), screens and servers Telecommunications: Installation and connection of fiber-optic backbone, routers and local antennas Ergonomics: To be determined by the RSSOM Contractor Equipment: For the command centre video wall
Superstructures				
Rails	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>	Rolling Stock: Static and dynamic train features (mass, acceleration, lateral effort, etc.), maximum cant deficiency, ride quality and rail profile Automatic train control system: Position of beacons, track coupling and rail conductivity (return current and rail break detection) Telecommunications: Installation and connection of fiber-optic backbone, routers and local antennas CCTV systems and surveillance equipment: Number, position, electrical power and IT connection for cameras and other intrusion detectors
Catenary equipment and system	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>	Rolling Stock: Electrical power, static and dynamic train features (min/max pantograph height), operating range of catenary/pantograph, pressure and contact quality, arcs
Sound barriers, security measures and equipment, lighting, etc.	EPC	RSSOM	<u>CDPQ Infra</u>	
Rolling Stock, Systems and related equipment				
Rolling Stock	RSSOM	RSSOM	<u>RSSOM</u>	
Automatic train control system	RSSOM *	RSSOM	<u>RSSOM</u>	See above
LRT command centre equipment	RSSOM	RSSOM	<u>RSSOM</u>	

Traction power	EPC	RSSOM	<u>RSSOM</u>	Rolling Stock: Dimensioning of power source, EMC, distance between substations , regeneration capacity and degraded modes Automatic train control system: EMC, harmonics, stray current and interference
Screen doors	RSSOM *	RSSOM	<u>RSSOM</u>	See above
Telecommunications	RSSOM *	RSSOM	<u>RSSOM</u>	See above
CCTV systems and surveillance equipment and signage	RSSOM *	RSSOM	<u>RSSOM</u>	See above

* Defined and procured by RSSOM Contractor; installed by EPC Contractor.

- Section 3.4 of the Request for Qualification document is deleted and replaced by the following:

3.4 PERFORMANCE GUARANTEES DURING THE WARRANTY PERIOD

The EPC Contractor will remain responsible for correcting any defects during a period of two (2) years starting from the date of Substantial Completion of the EPC Infrastructures. The performance bonds required will be specified in the Request for Proposals.

- Section 4.2.2 of the Request for Qualification document is deleted and replaced by the following:

4.2.2 Group of Persons

Various experience, expertise and capabilities will need to be pooled in order to perform the EPC Works. CDPQ Infra is therefore open to receive Responses from Consortiums. In such cases, the Respondent will have to provide a description of the composition and operations of the Consortium, in addition to the roles of its Members, Participants and Key Individuals. The qualified composed Consortium must remain the same during the Request for Proposals stage.

- Section 4.3 of the Request for Qualification document is deleted and replaced by:

4.3 TRANSPARENCY IN THE SELECTION PROCESS

The Public Procurement Notice and the Request for Qualification concerning the Project have been published on SEAO and MERX.

Following review and analysis of the Responses, the following information will be published on CDPQ Infra's website:

- The list of Respondents who have confirmed their interest in submitting a Response by returning the acknowledgment included in Schedule 4;
- The list of Qualified Respondents.

The following information will be published on CDPQ Infra's website after the Request for Proposals documents have been issued:

- The list of Qualified Respondents who received the Request for Proposals documents;
- The list of Proponents who duly signed the Submission Agreement in order to participate in the Request for Proposals;
- The governance and the expected amount of the financial compensation to be paid at the end of the Procurement Process to non-selected Proponents who submitted a compliant Proposal.

The following information will be published on CDPQ Infra's website after the EPC Contract is signed:

- The Request for Proposals documents integrating the criteria and weighting for the evaluation of the Proposals;
- The name of the Selected Proponent, the date of signing of the EPC Contract and the principal Project milestones;
- The Process Auditor's final report.

➤ Section 6.3.2 of the Request for Qualification document is deleted.

➤ The following text formerly found in Section 6.3.2 is inserted as new Section 6.4.1 of the Request for Qualification document immediately before the text "All responses must satisfy the compliance requirements contained in Section 5.6 and Schedule 1.":

6.4.1 Compliance Criteria

All the compliance criteria described below must be met for a Response to be considered admissible. However, omission or error will not lead to the automatic rejection of the Response concerned, provided the Respondent corrects the error or omission to the satisfaction of CDPQ Infra within the time determined by CDPQ Infra, which must be at least two (2) business days following the date on which the Respondent receives a written request to that effect from CDPQ Infra.

The Respondent's Representative and of each of the Respondent's Members and Participants must complete and sign the form of undertaking included in Schedule 1.1. This form must be in French.

A Respondent must provide a certified true excerpt of a resolution, the resolution itself or another document indicating that the Respondent's Representative is authorized to sign the Response on behalf of the Respondent and its Members and Participants.

A Respondent must provide a certified true excerpt of a resolution, the resolution itself or another document authorizing a Respondent's Representative, and of each of its Members and Participants, to sign the form of undertaking included in Schedule 1.1.

A Respondent must disclose the existence and scope of past or pending litigation involving CDPQ Infra or CDPQ or, as the case may be, the Respondent must provide confirmation that no such litigation exists.

A Respondent must provide evidence, from one or more Financial Institutions, that it is able to obtain letters of credit in accordance with the standard form included in Schedule 1.2

- Section 8.2 of the Request for Qualification document is deleted and replaced by the following:

8.2 HIRING OF CERTAIN ADVISORS OR EXPERTS BY A RESPONDENT

CDPQ Infra has retained the services of experts and advisors to provide Project implementation support. These experts and advisors (Ineligible Persons) are the following:

- Business services advisor: KPMG LLP;
- Technical services advisors: CIMA+ general partnership, groupe SETEC, HATCH (previously Hatch Mott MacDonald Ltd.) and groupe SYSTRA;
- Legal advisor: Norton Rose Fulbright Canada LLP and Lavery, de Billy LLP;
- Insurance advisor: AON Parizeau inc.;
- EPC Process Auditor: Mr. Jean Montplaisir (Knowles Consultancy Services Inc.);
- RSSOM Process Auditor: Mr. André Dumais, Eng.

A Respondent, one of its Members, Participants, Key Individuals or the Parent Company of a Member of a Respondent may not use the services of a Person listed above or of an Associate of such a Person to complete tasks or mandates in the context of the Project.

CDPQ Infra may amend the list of Ineligible Persons during the Request for Qualification process.

An affiliate of such Ineligible Person may however be eligible to become a Member of a Respondent or an advisor of a Respondent after obtaining the written consent of CDPQ Infra to that effect. To obtain such consent, the Respondent must make an application for consent to CDPQ Infra through the Official Email Address. Once CDPQ Infra has received the application for consent duly completed by the Respondent, CDPQ Infra will decide, in its sole discretion, but as necessary with the support of the Legal Review Committee, whether there exists a real, perceived or potential conflict of interest and whether it is possible to manage, mitigate or adequately reduce the effect of such conflict. The Respondent will be notified of CDPQ Infra's decision by a letter of consent stating the nature of the consent and the management, mitigation and reduction measures required as a condition of the consent. If an affiliate of an Ineligible Person is deemed to be in a conflict of interest which cannot be managed, mitigated or reduced adequately, CDPQ Infra will add the affiliate to the above list of Ineligible Persons by means of an addendum to the Request for Qualification.

- Schedule 1.3 of the Request for Qualification document is deleted and replaced by the following Schedule:

SCHEDULE 1.3 – LETTER OF INTENT - BOND

Not applicable

- In Schedule 2, the subsection “Evaluation Criteria” of Section II (General Requirements: Integrated Project Management, approach and experience) of the Request for Qualification document is deleted and replaced by the following:

Evaluation Criteria:

The Response will be evaluated on the extent to which it provides a clear and detailed description that satisfies the Project requirements, including:

- The Respondent’s organization, the roles and responsibilities of its Members, Participants and Key Individuals, the advantages, synergies and complementarities of the Respondent’s team;
- The Respondent’s decision-making and conflict resolution processes;
- The proposed approach to managing health and safety and environmental issues; and
- The resumé of the Project Manager.

The Respondent is invited to provide by order of precedence completed projects (or at an advanced stage of completion) by its Members and/or Participants, whose scope, complexity and works are comparable to the Project’s. The Response will be evaluated on the comparability of the projects, particularly in terms of management of design and construction activities, management of risks, schedule and costs, management of change orders, document control and communications, in accordance with the general requirements noted above. The description must also identify success factors that were implemented in the course of these projects.

The presented projects will not be evaluated individually, but on the Respondent’s overall degree of experience in the relevant areas. The name of the Respondent, Member or Participant who participated in the completion of the project(s) and its role, responsibilities and participation percentage must be indicated.

- In Schedule 2, the subsection “Evaluation Criteria” of Section II (General requirements : integrated project management, approach and experience) of the Request for Qualification document is deleted and replaced by the following:

Evaluation Criteria:

The Response will be evaluated on a clear and detailed description of organizational structure, hierarchal links between each member of the team implicated in the project design, roles and responsibilities and other associated elements that satisfies the Project requirements, including:

- The Respondent's organization, the roles and responsibilities of its Members, Participants and Key Individuals, the advantages, synergies and complementarities of the Respondent's team;
- The Respondent's decision-making and conflict resolution processes;
- The proposed approach to managing health and safety and environmental issues; and
- The resume of the Project Manager.

The Respondent is invited to provide by order of precedence completed projects (or at an advanced stage of completion) by its Members and/or Participants, whose scope, complexity and works are comparable to the Project's. The Response will be evaluated on the comparability of the projects, particularly in terms of management of design and construction activities, management of risks, schedule and costs, management of change orders, document control and communications, in accordance with the general requirements noted above. The description must also identify success factors that were implemented in the course of these projects.

The projects presented will not be evaluated individually, but on the Respondent's overall degree of experience in the relevant areas. The name of the Respondent, Member or Participant who participated in the completion of the project(s) and its role, responsibilities and participation percentage must be indicated.

- In Schedule 2, the subsection "Evaluation Criteria" of Section III.1 (Design Capacity and Experience: Team Organization and Experience) of the Request for Qualification document is deleted and replaced by the following:

Evaluation Criteria:

The Response will be evaluated on a clear and detailed description of the Respondent's organizational structure, the reporting relationships between the team members involved in the Project design, the roles and responsibilities of such team members and other related elements.

The Respondent is invited to provide by order of precedence completed projects (or at an advanced stage of completion) by its Members and/or Participants, whose scope, complexity and works are comparable to the Project's. The Response will be evaluated on the comparability of the projects, particularly in terms of the scope, complexity, infrastructure and delivery timetable.

The description of the projects must demonstrate that the experience of the proposed team will enable the Respondent to satisfy all the above requirements. The description must also identify success factors that were implemented in the course of these projects and any innovations that are relevant for the Project.

The presented projects will not be evaluated individually, but on the Respondent's overall degree of experience in the relevant areas. The name of the Respondent, Member or Participant who participated in the completion of the project(s) and its role, responsibilities and participation percentage must be indicated.

- In Schedule 2, the subsection “Evaluation Criteria” of Section III.2 (Design Capacity and Experience: Key Individual Organization and Experience and Depth of Team) of the Request for Qualification document is deleted and replaced by the following:

Evaluation Criteria:

The Response will be evaluated on the degree of prior experience that the Key Individuals have acquired in designing LRT or rail-based public transit systems similar to the Project, particularly in terms of scope, complexity, timetable, context and work environment. The evaluation of the Response will include an evaluation of the following:

- The work experience that the person concerned has acquired in a project where he or she assumed a role or responsibilities comparable to the role he or she would have as a Key Individual; and
- The work experience in projects that required EPC delivery methods or, as applicable, other delivery methods that require the integration of design and construction activities.

The Response will also be evaluated on the basis of an approach that demonstrates that it can ensure the availability of Key Individuals in design roles and the replacement of Key Individuals by one or more individuals with equal or higher qualifications.

- In Schedule 2, the subsection “Evaluation Criteria” of Section III.3 (Design Capacity and Experience: Approach to Key Issues, Risk and Mitigation) of the Request for Qualification document is deleted and replaced by the following:

Evaluation Criteria:

The Response will be evaluated on the basis of a rigorous and detailed approach, suited to the Project’s design work, including identification of the issues, risks and mitigation measures and their management, which must satisfy all the requirements noted above.

The Respondent should preferably provide examples of prior accomplishments in support of the proposed approach, including success factors, or alternatively justify the relevance of the proposed approach.

- In Schedule 2, the subsection “Evaluation Criteria” of Section IV.1 (Construction Capacity and Experience: Team Organization and Experience) of the Request for Qualification document is deleted and replaced by the following:

Evaluation Criteria:

The Response will be evaluated on a clear and detailed description of the Respondent’s organizational structure, the reporting relationships between the team members involved in the Project construction, the roles and responsibilities of the team members and other related elements.

The Respondent is invited to provide by order of precedence completed projects (or at an advanced stage of completion) by its Members and/or Participants, whose scope, complexity and works are comparable to the Project’s. The Response will be evaluated on the comparability of the projects, particularly in terms of the scope, complexity, infrastructure and delivery timetable.

The description of the projects must demonstrate that the experience of the proposed team will enable the Respondent to satisfy all the above requirements. The description must also

identify the success factors that were implemented in the course of these projects and any innovations that are relevant for the Project.

The presented projects will not be evaluated individually, but on the Respondent's overall degree of experience in the relevant areas. The name of the Respondent, the Member or the Participant who participated in the completion of the project(s) and its role, responsibilities and participation percentage must be indicated.

- In Schedule 2, the subsection “Evaluation Criteria” of Section IV.2 (Construction Capacity and Experience: Key Individual Organization and Experience and Depth of Team) of the Request for Qualification document is deleted and replaced by the following:

Evaluation Criteria:

The Response will be evaluated on the degree of the Key Individuals in the construction of LRT or rail-based public transit systems similar to the Project, particularly in terms of scope, complexity, timetable, context and work environment. The evaluation of the Response will include an evaluation of the following:

- The work experience that the person concerned has acquired in a project where he or she assumed a role or responsibilities comparable to the role he or she would have as a Key Individual; and
- The work experience in projects that required an EPC delivery method or, as applicable, other delivery methods that require the integration of design and construction activities;

The Response will also be evaluated on an approach that demonstrates that it can ensure the availability of Key Individuals in design roles and the replacement of Key Individuals by one or more individuals with equal or higher qualifications.

- In Schedule 2, the subsection “Evaluation Criteria” of Section IV.3 (Construction Capacity and Experience: Approach to Key Issues, Risks and Mitigation) of the Request for Qualification document is deleted and replaced by the following:

Evaluation Criteria:

The Response will be evaluated on the basis of a rigorous and detailed approach, suited to the Project construction work, including identification of the issues, risks and mitigation measures and their management, which must satisfy all the requirements noted above.

The Respondent should preferably provide examples of prior accomplishments in support of the proposed approach, including success factors, or alternatively justify the relevance of the proposed approach.

- In Schedule 2, in the subsection “Evaluation Criteria” of Section V.1 (Construction of an Existing Public Transit Corridor – Team Experience and Organization) of the Request for Qualification document, the text is deleted and replaced by the following:

Evaluation Criteria:

The Respondent is invited to provide by order of precedence completed projects (or at an advanced stage of completion) by its Members and/or Participants, whose scope and complexity are comparable to the Project's. The Response will be evaluated on the

comparability of the projects, particularly in terms of the scope, complexity, infrastructure and delivery timetable.

The description of the projects must demonstrate that the organization and experience of the proposed team will enable the Respondent to satisfy all the above requirements. The description must also identify the success factors that were implemented in the course of these projects.

The presented projects will not be evaluated individually, but on the Respondent's overall degree of experience in the relevant areas. The name of the Respondent, the Member or the Participant who participated in the completion of the project(s) and its role, responsibilities and participation percentage must be indicated.

- In Schedule 2, the subsection “Evaluation Criteria” of Section V.2 (Construction in an Existing Public Transit Corridor: Approach to Key Issues, Risks and Mitigation) of the Request for Qualification document is deleted and replaced by the following:

Evaluation Criteria:

The Response will be evaluated on the basis of a rigorous and detailed approach, suited to the Project construction work to be performed in an existing and operating public transit corridor, including identification of the issues, risks and mitigation measures and their management, which must satisfy all the requirements noted above.

The Respondent should preferably provide examples of prior accomplishments in support of the proposed approach, including success factors, or alternatively justify the relevance of the proposed approach.

- In Schedule 2, in the subsection “Evaluation Criteria” of Section VI.1 (Integrating Civil Works and Systems – Team Organization and Experience) of the Request for Qualification document, the text is deleted and replaced by the following

Evaluation Criteria:

The Respondent is invited to provide by order of precedence completed projects (or at an advanced stage of completion) by its Members and/or Participants, whose scope, complexity and works are comparable to the Project's. The Response will be evaluated on the comparability of the projects, particularly in terms of scope, complexity, infrastructure and delivery timetable.

The description of the projects must demonstrate that the organization and experience of the proposed team will enable the Respondent to satisfy all the above requirements. The description must also identify the success factors that were implemented in the course of these projects.

The presented projects will not be evaluated individually, but on the Respondent's overall degree of experience in the relevant areas. The name of the Respondent, the Member or the Participant who participated in the completion of the project(s) and its role, responsibilities and participation percentage must be indicated.

- In Schedule 2, the subsection “Evaluation Criteria” of Section VI.2 (Integrating Civil Works and Systems: Approaches to Key Issues, Risks and Mitigation) of the Request for Qualification document is deleted and replaced by the following:

Evaluation Criteria:

The Response will be evaluated on the basis of a rigorous and detailed approach, suited to the Project design and construction work, that will minimize problems and issues associated with the interfaces between the EPC Works and the RSSOM Services and must satisfy all the requirements noted above.

The Respondent should preferably provide examples of prior accomplishments in support of the proposed approach, including success factors, or alternatively justify the relevance of the proposed approach.

Request for Qualification Ref 01-7001

**Engineering, Procurement and
Construction for the Infrastructures
of the *Réseau électrique
métropolitain de Montréal***

**ADDENDUM NO. 2
TO THE REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATION DOCUMENT REF 01-7001
DATED JUNE 28, 2016**

July 27, 2016

Pursuant to Section 5 of the Request for Qualification document, this ADDENDUM No.2 forms an integral part of the Request for Qualification and amends the Request for Qualification in the manner and to the extent indicated herein.

AMENDMENTS TO THE REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATION DOCUMENT

Please take note of the following amendments to the Request for Qualification document, which amendments are underlined.

- In Section 1.5 of the Request for Qualification document, the table entitled “Table 1 – Procurement and Project Completion Deadlines” is deleted and replaced by the following table:

Table 1 - Procurement and Project Completion Deadlines

Steps	Deadlines
Land reserves order-in-council	May 2016
Public Procurement Notice	May 17, 2016
Information session	June 7, 2016
Request for Qualification for the EPC Contract	June 28, 2016
Request for Qualification for the RSSOM Contract	June 28, 2016
Information session	July 19, 2016
Deadline for sending requests for clarification and for submitting an acknowledgment	<u>September 2, 2016</u>
Deadline for issuing addenda, if applicable	<u>September 9, 2016</u>
Deadline to receive Responses	<u>September 23, 2016</u>
Announcement of Qualified Respondents	To confirm
BAPE public hearings	To confirm
Request for Proposals for the EPC Contract	Fall 2016
Request for Proposals for the RSSOM Contract	Fall 2016
Receipt of Proposals for the EPC Contract	Launch date for the Request for Proposals + 6 months
Receipt of Proposals for the RSSOM Contract	Launch date for the Request for Proposals + 6 months
Tabling of the BAPE report	To confirm
Environmental order-in-council	To confirm
Acquisition of the Deux-Montagnes line	To confirm
Financial close for the EPC Contract and the RSSOM Contract	To confirm
Beginning of work for the EPC Contract and the RSSOM Contract	To confirm
Beginning of commercial service	To confirm

- In Section 5 of the Request for Qualification document, the last paragraph of the text preceding Section 5.1 is deleted and replaced by the following:

The Respondent must confirm its interest in submitting a Response by completing the acknowledgment contained in Schedule 4 and returning it to the email address indicated in Section 5.2 by the deadline of September 2, 2016 at 3 PM, Montreal time. The Respondent must indicate on the acknowledgment the name of the Respondent's Representative, who will be the only person authorized to contact and to send requests for clarification to CDPO Infra. CDPO Infra will address all communications relating to the Request for Qualification duly submitted to the Respondent's Representative.

- In Section 5.1 of the Request for Qualification document, the sixth (6th) paragraph is deleted and replaced by the following:

The deadline for submitting a Response is:

Friday, September 23, 2016, at 3 PM, Montreal time.

- In Section 5.4 of the Request for Qualification document, the first (1st) paragraph is deleted and replaced by the following:

Any requests for clarification or questions concerning the Request for Qualification must be submitted to CDPO Infra's representative through the Official Email Address on or after the date on which the Request for Qualification is issued. The deadline for making a request for clarification is September 2, 2016, 3 PM, Montreal time. Requests for clarification submitted must be formulated in accordance with the template included in Schedule 1.4.

- Section 5.8 of the Request for Qualification document is deleted and replaced by the following:

5.8 FORM OF UNDERTAKING

The Respondent must submit through the Official Email Address the form of undertaking presented in Schedule 1.1, duly signed by the Respondent no later than September 23, 2016. Any Respondent that fails to submit the form of undertaking will be unable to submit a request for clarification or to obtain access to the answers provided and will be unable to participate in the Request for Proposals process.

- In Schedule 2, the fourth (4th) bullet point of the text in Section I (Financial Capability on a Pass/Fail Basis) of the Request for Qualification document is deleted and replaced by the following:

- A letter from a Financial Institution confirming the ability of Respondent to secure and provide the letters of credit in the amount stated in Schedule 1.2;

- In Schedule 2, the first (1st) paragraph of the subsection "Evaluation Criteria" of Section I (Financial Capability on a Pass/Fail Basis) of the Request for Qualification document is deleted and replaced by the following:

The Respondent's financial capacity will be evaluated on the basis of the following two elements:

- Financial soundness; and
 - The ability to obtain the letters of credit required in Schedule 1.2.
- In Schedule 2, the last paragraph of the subsection “Evaluation Criteria” of Section I (Financial Capability on a Pass/Fail Basis) of the Request for Qualification document is deleted and replaced by the following:
- The Response will also be evaluated on the basis of the ability of the Members and Participants responsible for the EPC Works to obtain the letters of credit required in Schedule 1.2.
- In Schedule 2, the first (1st) bullet point of the text preceding the subsection “Evaluation Criteria” of Section III.2 (Design Capacity and Experience: Key Individual Organization and Experience and Depth of Team) of the Request for Qualification document is deleted and replaced by the following:
- Describe the internal organization of each Member or Participant involved in the design of the Project and the roles and responsibilities of each Key Individual. The description should include an organizational chart detailing the Respondent's internal structure and relevant reporting relationships. Key Individuals presented in this section should have experience working on those projects described in Section III - 1 above. Key Individuals that only played a minor role, or did not work on the projects described in Section III – 1 will not receive full scores;

Request for Qualification Ref 01-7001

**Engineering, Procurement and
Construction for the Infrastructures
of the *Réseau électrique
métropolitain de Montréal***

**ADDENDUM NO. 3
TO THE REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATION DOCUMENT REF 01-7001
DATED JUNE 28, 2016**

August 3, 2016

Pursuant to Section 5 of the Request for Qualification document, this ADDENDUM No.3 forms an integral part of the Request for Qualification and amends the Request for Qualification in the manner and to the extent indicated herein.

AMENDMENTS TO THE REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATION DOCUMENT

Please take note of the following amendments to the Request for Qualification document, which amendments are underlined.

- In the table of contents of the Request for Qualification document, the following text is added after the reference to Schedule 4 – Acknowledgment.

SCHEDULE 5 – EVALUATION MATRIX..... 64

- In Section 1.4 of the Request for Qualification document, the last paragraph is deleted and replaced by the following:

The Response guidelines, as well as the eligibility and evaluation criteria, are outlined in Sections 5 and 6 and Schedule 5 of this Request for Qualification.

- In Section 4.1 of the Request for Qualification document, the second (2nd) bullet point is deleted and replaced by the following:

- This Request for Qualification, issued on SEAO and MERX, where up to a maximum of three (3) Qualified Respondents will be invited to participate in the Request for Proposals targeting the EPC Works. The guidance for Responses, as well as the eligibility and evaluation criteria for Responses are described in Sections 5 and 6 and Schedule 5 of this document;

- In Section 5.6 of the Request for Qualification document, the first paragraph is deleted and replaced by the following:

Evaluation committees are responsible for analyzing and evaluating Responses using the criteria and weighting defined in Section 6 and Schedule 5 of this Request for Qualification and making recommendations to CDPQ Infra's Selection Committee concerning the qualification of Respondents. It is essential for Respondents to provide precise and ordered answers to the criteria and to indicate, for each criterion, why they are qualified to perform the EPC Works. The Response should address clearly and in sufficient depth the items that are included in the evaluation criteria against which the Response will be evaluated.

- In Section 6.5 of the Request for Qualification document, the third (3rd) paragraph after Table 8 is deleted and replaced by the following:

Each evaluation criterion in Table 8 above is broken down into evaluation sub-criteria, which are presented in the evaluation matrix in Schedule 5 of this Request for Qualification. For each sub-criterion, each Respondent will receive a score of 0 (corresponding to 0%), 1 (corresponding to 30%), 2 (corresponding to 50%), 3 (corresponding to 80%) or 4 (corresponding to 100%), based on the definition that best corresponds to its evaluation from the definitions presented in Table 1 in Schedule 5 of this Request for Qualification. The weighting assigned to each criterion and sub-criterion is based on its relative importance. For an evaluation criterion and for a Response, the total score will correspond to the sum of the weighted scores on the evaluation matrix for each sub-criterion.

- In Schedule 1.2, the second (2nd) paragraph of the body of the letter is modified and replaced by the following:

We have not yet completed an in-depth study of the RSSOM Services, since the proposal documents are not currently available. Please also note that [name of the financial institution] is not legally bound to provide credit facilities.

- In Schedule 2 of the Request for Qualification document, the third (3rd) paragraph after Table 1 is deleted and replaced by the following:

Each evaluation criterion in Table 1 of this Schedule is broken down into evaluation sub-criteria, which are presented in the evaluation matrix in Schedule 5 of this Request for Qualification. Except for financial capability, which will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis, for each sub-criterion, each Respondent will receive, a score of 0 (corresponding to 0%), 2 (corresponding to 50%), 3 (corresponding to 80%) or 4 (corresponding to 100%), based on the definition that best corresponds to its evaluation from the definitions presented in Table 1 in Schedule 5. The weighting assigned to each criterion and sub-criterion is based on its relative importance. For an evaluation criterion and for a Response, the total score will correspond to the sum of the weighted scores on the evaluation matrix for each sub-criterion.

- In Schedule 2 – Section VI.2, the third (3rd) paragraph is deleted and replaced by the following:

The Respondent must outline its approach to risk management, human resource availability, operational continuity and environmental protection.”

- After Schedule 4 of the Request for Qualification document, the following text is added as Schedule 5 :

SCHEDULE 5 – EVALUATION MATRIX

Schedule 5 presents the evaluation matrix that will be used to structure the evaluation process for Responses to the Request for Qualification for the performance of the EPC Works. Schedule 5 is organized into the following sections:

- Section I presents the evaluation process and principles;

- Section II provides an evaluation summary, including the criteria, the sub-criteria and the weighting assigned to each criterion and sub-criterion;
- Section III presents the evaluation matrix and its components, including:
 - The criterion to be evaluated and the weighting assigned to the criterion;
 - The RFQ requirements, as presented in the Request for Qualification and updated through the issuance of addenda;
 - The RFQ evaluation criteria, as presented in the Request for Qualification and updated through the issuance of addenda;
 - The elements sought and, if applicable, bonus elements that will be considered for the purposes of the evaluation of each sub-criterion; and
 - The weighting assigned to each evaluation sub-criterion

I. EVALUATION PROCESS AND PRINCIPLES

The following process and principles will be followed for the technical evaluation of each of the sub-criteria presented in Section II *Evaluation Summary* and Section III *Evaluation Matrix* of this Schedule 5:

- The evaluator shall assign a score of 0 (corresponding to 0%), 1 (corresponding to 30%), 2 (corresponding to 50%), 3 (corresponding to 80%) or 4 (corresponding to 100%), based on the definition that best corresponds to its evaluation from the definitions in **Table 1** below;
- If all of the elements sought are presented in the Response, to the evaluator's satisfaction, a minimum score of 3 (80%) shall be awarded for the evaluated sub-criterion;
- If the elements presented by a Respondent exceed the evaluator's expectations, the evaluator may award the highest score of 4 (100%);
- If the elements presented by a Respondent do not fully satisfy the RFQ requirements, the evaluator may assign a score lower than 3, i.e. 2 (50%), 1 (30%) or 0 (0%).

Tableau 1 – Scores and Corresponding Definitions

Scores	Corresponding Definitions
4 (100%)	Far exceeds the elements sought Excellent and complete understanding of the requirements Excellent probability of success in carrying out the contract
3 (80%)	Contains all of the elements sought Good and complete understanding of the requirements High probability of success in carrying out the contract
2 (50%)	Partially meets the elements sought (but without compromising its capacity to deliver) Good understanding of the requirements Fair to good probability of success in carrying out the contract
1 (30%)	Partially meets the elements sought, compromising its ability to deliver Moderate understanding of the requirements Low probability of success in carrying out the contract
0 (0%)	Does not meet the elements sought Poor understanding of the requirements Very low probability of success in carrying out the contract

II. EVALUATION SUMMARY

Technical evaluation criteria and sub-criteria (Note: The criteria and sub-criteria in the list below are in abridged form; a detailed description is provided in the following pages.)	Weighting
II. General Requirements: Integrated Project Management, Approach and Experience	10
<i>Introductory letter, organization of the Members, decision-making, dispute resolution, health, safety and the environment</i>	2
<i>Resumé of the Project Manager</i>	2
<i>Project descriptions</i>	6
III. Design Capacity and Experience	30
1. Team Organization and Experience	10
<i>Organizational chart and structure</i>	2
<i>Project descriptions</i>	8
2. Key Individual Organization and Experience and Depth of Team	5
<i>Internal organization, depth and availability of Key Individuals</i>	3
<i>Resumés (4)</i>	2
3. Approach to Key Issues, Risks and Mitigation	15
<i>Design approach, strategies and mitigation measures</i>	7
<i>Approach to address key issues and risks</i>	8
IV. Construction Capacity and Experience	35
1. Team Organization and Experience	10
<i>Organizational chart and structure</i>	2
<i>Project descriptions</i>	8
2. Key Individual Organization and Experience and Depth of Team	5
<i>Internal organization, depth and availability of Key Individuals</i>	3
<i>Resumés (3)</i>	2
3. Approach to Key Issues, Risks and Mitigation	20
<i>Construction approach, strategies and mitigation measures</i>	8
<i>Approach to address key issues and risks</i>	12
V. Construction in an Existing Public Transit Corridor	15
1. Team experience and organization	5
<i>Project descriptions</i>	5
2. Approach to Key Issues, Risks and Mitigation	10
<i>Approach</i>	5
<i>Descriptions of past experiences</i>	5
VI. Integrating Civil Works and Systems	10
1. Team Organization and Experience	5
<i>Project descriptions</i>	5
2. Approach to Key Issues, Risks and Mitigation	5
<i>Approach</i>	3
<i>Descriptions of past experiences</i>	2
Total Points	100

III. EVALUATION MATRIX

II. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS: INTEGRATED PROJECT MANAGEMENT, APPROACH AND EXPERIENCE: 10%

Sub-Criterion(ia)	Weighting	RFQ Requirements	RFQ Evaluation Criteria	Elements Sought	Weighting %
NA	10%	<p><u>Introductory Letter, Organization of the Members, Decision-Making, Dispute Resolution, Health, Safety and the Environment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An introductory letter: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Identifying the composition of the Consortium and/or of the Respondent's team, including a description of the roles of its Members and Participants; – Summarizing the key features of the qualifications and advantages of the Respondent, its Members, Participants and Key Individuals and any synergies or complementarities within the Respondent's team; and – Identifying the team member who is designated as the Respondent's Representative • A description of the organization of the Members and Participants, Key Individuals and staff of the Respondent's team, in sufficient detail to understand how the Project will be delivered. In particular, a Respondent must indicate who, amongst the Members, Participants and Key Individuals, will assume responsibility for the management of the Project. Moreover, a Respondent must demonstrate that the person identified has: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Relevant and appropriate experience in managing large infrastructure projects of comparable size to the Project, using project management systems; – Qualified and experienced resources able to form a homogenous team; and – Experience working on large infrastructure projects requiring the integration of design and construction activities. • The Respondent's internal decision-making and dispute resolution process; • The Respondent's approach to managing health, safety and environmental matters; 	<p>The Response will be evaluated on the extent to which it provides a clear and detailed description that satisfies the Project requirements, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Respondent's organization, the roles and responsibilities of its Members, Participants and Key Individuals, the advantages, synergies and complementarities of the Respondent's team; • The Respondent's decision-making and conflict resolution processes; • The proposed approach to managing health and safety and environmental issues. 	<p><u>Elements Sought:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description/Explanation of the Respondent's organization and justification of its appropriateness for the Project • Clear description of the qualifications, roles and responsibilities of each Member, Participant and Key Individuals (including the Project Manager) • Demonstration of the synergies and complementarities within the Respondent's team, including jointly carrying out past projects and the ability to form a homogenous team • Relevance of the proposed organizational/operational structure • Identification of the Respondent's representative • Demonstration of the Respondent's experience and depth with respect to the RFQ requirements (management of projects of comparable size; use of project management systems; integration of design and construction activities; health, safety and environment; and decision-making and dispute resolution) <p><u>Bonus Elements:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience in systems installation and integration as an EPC Supplier 	2

Sub-Criterion(ia)	Weighting	RFQ Requirements	RFQ Evaluation Criteria	Elements Sought	Weighting %
		<p><u>Resumé of the Project Manager</u></p> <p>The resumé of the Project Manager who will have responsibility for the day-to-day management of the Project and for ensuring that the Respondent's obligations are fulfilled and for managing the Respondent's relationship with CDPQ Infra and the subcontractors and communicating with stakeholders.</p>	<p>The Response will be evaluated on the level of experience of the Project Manager</p>	<p><u>Elements Sought:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 years of experience in carrying out and managing major rail and/or road and/or passenger transportation infrastructure projects • 5 years of experience in carrying out and managing major rail and/or road and/or passenger transportation infrastructure projects in the role of project manager • Participation as project manager in at least 1 LRT project • Academic background in engineering • At least 1 year of seniority in the Respondent's company relative to the submission date • Participation as project manager in at least 2 of the projects described in Sections II to VI. Alternatively, if his/her participation is limited to 1 project described in Sections II to VI, a clear description of another comparable project may be presented in his/her resumé • Demonstration of work experience on major infrastructure projects requiring the integration of design and construction activities and the use of project management systems • Clear description of the responsibilities assumed on comparable projects described in the projects presented in Sections II to VI or in his/her resumé, including day-to-day management of the project and relations with the client and the various stakeholders <p><u>Bonus Elements:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstration of past experiences working with several Members, Participants, Key Individuals and stakeholders • Specific experience in managing risks related to health, safety and the environment 	<p>2</p>

Sub-Criterion(ia)	Weighting	RFQ Requirements	RFQ Evaluation Criteria	Elements Sought	Weighting %
		<p><u>Project Descriptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to three (3) descriptions of infrastructure projects (with a capital value of \$500 million or more) showing the Respondent's or its Members' and Participants' experience: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – In implementing a large, complex project; – In an urban environment; – As part of a consortium of several Members and Participants, while ensuring an integrated approach to project delivery across multiple team members. • These descriptions should include an explanation of the roles and responsibilities assumed by the Members, Participants and Key Individuals in such projects, and the Respondent's integrated approach to the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Management of design and construction activities; – Management of risks, schedule and costs; – Management of change orders; – Document control; – Communications with internal and external stakeholders. 	<p>The Respondent is invited to give precedence in its presentation to projects completed (or at an advanced stage of completion) by its Members and/or Participants, whose scope, complexity and works are comparable to the Project's. The Response will be evaluated on the comparability of the projects, particularly in terms of management of design and construction activities, management of risks, schedule and costs, management of change orders, document control and communications, in accordance with the general requirements noted above. The description must also identify success factors that were implemented in the course of these projects.</p> <p>The projects presented will not be evaluated individually, but as an overall demonstration of the Respondent's required experience in the relevant areas. The name of the Respondent, Member or Participant who participated in the completion of the project(s) and its role, responsibilities and participation percentage must be indicated.</p>	<p><u>Elements Sought:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of comparable infrastructure projects of \$500 million or more, carried out during the last 15 years or at an advanced stage of completion, that have many or all of the following characteristics: LRT-type project, complexity, e.g. electrification, schedule, risk management, urban environment, DB or other form of PPP; integrated approach involving multiple team members • <i>Note: "At an advanced stage of completion" refers to a situation where at least 50% of the work has been completed</i> • Description of 2 LRT projects • Identification of the success factors for the described projects • Demonstration that the described projects are comparable in terms of DB activities, risk management, schedule, change order management, document control and communication • Clear and detailed description of the roles and responsibilities assumed by the Members, Participants and Key Individuals, on described comparable projects and indication of the participation % for each one • Participation of multiple Members, Participants and Key Individuals on the described project(s). <p><u>Bonus Elements:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of more than one comparable project with a capital value in excess of \$3 billion 	6

II. DESIGN CAPACITY AND EXPERIENCE: 30%

Sub-Criterion(ia)	Weighting	RFQ Requirements	RFQ Evaluation Criteria	Elements Sought	Weighting %
1- Team Organization and Experience	10%	<p><u>Organizational Chart and Structure</u></p> <p>Provide a chart and explanation of the Respondent's organizational structure and the reporting relationships between the Respondent's team's members involved in Project design, their roles and responsibilities;</p>	<p>The Response will be evaluated on the Respondent's ability to present a clear and detailed description of the Respondent's organizational structure, the reporting relationships between the team members involved in the Project design, the roles and responsibilities of such team members and other related elements.</p>	<p><u>Elements Sought:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description/Explanation of the benefits, synergies and complementarities of the Respondent's proposed organizational/operational structure and/or a justification of its appropriateness for the Project • Identification of the reporting relationships between the members of the Project design team and a justification of their appropriateness for Project • Description/Explanation of the Respondent's organizational/operational structure, including a clear description of the roles and responsibilities of each team member, and justification of its appropriateness for the Project 	2
		<p><u>Project Descriptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe up to five (5) projects delivered during the past 15 years using an EPC or DB approach, that demonstrate the experience of the Respondent or its Members and Participants in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Designing a rail-based public transit system which includes one or more of the following elements: an electric LRT system, a dedicated guideway, a tunnel, operation in an urban setting in close proximity to businesses and residences and construction in an area of heritage / historical value; – Designing an LRT, light or heavy metro system in a location with similar weather conditions to those experienced in Montreal; – Coordinating design activities to support safety certification and the successful testing and commissioning of a rail-based public transit system; – Coordinating and liaising with key external stakeholders, including but not limited to public regulatory and permitting agencies; – Working together as an integrated team for the design of a project; – Experience implementing a Quality Control Plan, such as ISO 9001 or similar standards in a comparable transit project; and – Innovative approaches to the design of public transit infrastructure and its integration into an urban environment. The 	<p>The Respondent is invited to provide by order of precedence completed projects (or at an advanced stage of completion) by its Members and/or Participants, whose scope, complexity and works are comparable to the Project's. The Response will be evaluated on the comparability of the projects, particularly in terms of the scope, complexity, infrastructure and delivery timetable.</p> <p>The description of the projects must demonstrate that the experience of the proposed team will enable the Respondent to satisfy all the above requirements. The description must also identify success factors that were implemented in the course of these projects and any innovations that are relevant for</p>	<p><u>Elements Sought:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of comparable infrastructure projects (in terms of size, complexity and schedule) carried out during the last 15 years or at an advanced stage of completion, that meets many or all of the requirements indicated in the <i>RFQ Requirements</i> column <i>Note: "At an advanced stage of completion" refers to a situation where at least 50% of the work has been completed</i> • Description of at least 2 LRT projects • Description of at least 2 projects demonstrating the experience of the Respondent or its Members and Participants, with respect to the following critical factors: electric LRT, tunnels, urban environment, weather conditions, testing and commissioning, challenges related to the environment and issues relating to site access • Identification of success factors and innovations for the described projects • Clear and detailed description of the roles and responsibilities assumed by the Members, Participants and Key Individuals, on described comparable projects, specifying the participation % for each one • Significant participation of multiple Members, Participants and Key Individuals in the described project(s) <p><u>Bonus Elements:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of more than one comparable project with a capital value in excess of \$3 billion • If the Respondent demonstrates significant participation and the required experience 	8

Sub-Criterion(ia)	Weighting	RFQ Requirements	RFQ Evaluation Criteria	Elements Sought	Weighting %
		Respondent must also describe any design awards or acknowledgments recognizing innovative aspects of its design for the projects described.	the Project. The presented projects will not be evaluated individually, but on the Respondent's overall degree of experience in the relevant areas. The name of the Respondent, Member or Participant who participated in the completion of the project(s) and its role, responsibilities and participation percentage must be indicated.	in 2 projects with a capital value in excess of \$3 billion, it will be awarded bonus points	
2- Key Individual Organization and Experience and Depth of Team	5%	<p><u>Internal Organization, Depth and Availability of Key Individuals</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe the internal organization of each Member involved in the design of the Project and the roles and responsibilities of each Key Individual. The description should include an organizational chart detailing the Respondent's internal structure and relevant reporting relationships. Key Individuals presented in this section should have experience working on those projects described in Section III - 1 above. Key Individuals that only played a minor role, or did not work on the projects described in Section III – 1 will not receive full scores; Describe the depth of the experience and expertise of Key Individuals available to the Respondent to deliver the Project design according to the requirements. This could include describing the number of individuals and their experience that would be able to replace Key Individuals in design-related functions moving forward. For example, Respondents could describe the number and experience of design managers available to them with similar experience and qualifications as the designated Design Manager that may be offered as a replacement to the Design Manager in the future; Describe the proposed approach to ensure the availability of Key Individuals in design-related functions and the replacement of Key Individuals by one or more individuals with equivalent or higher qualifications; 	<p>The Response will be evaluated on the degree of prior experience that the Key Individuals have acquired in designing LRT or rail-based public transit systems similar to the Project, particularly in terms of scope, complexity, timetable, context and work environment. The evaluation of the Response will include an evaluation of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The work experience that the person concerned has acquired in a project where he or she assumed a role or responsibilities comparable to the role he or she would have as a Key Individual; and The work experience in projects that required EPC delivery methods or, as 	<p><u>Elements Sought:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description/Explanation of the Respondent's internal organization, including the existing reporting relationships, justification of its appropriateness for the Project Description/Explanations of the internal organization of each Member involved in the design of the Project and justification of its appropriateness for the Project Clear description of the qualifications, experience/expertise, roles and responsibilities of each of the Key Individuals Demonstration of the participation of the Key Individuals in design roles on at least 2 projects presented in the preceding Section III – 1, or, alternatively, prior experience in designing LRT or rail-based public transit systems similar to the project relating to the EPC Works or other mode requiring the integration of DB activities Demonstration of the Respondent's experience and depth, including identifying and presenting the qualifications of at least 2 individuals that may be offered as a replacement for each of the Key Individuals in design roles Proposed approach and undertaking of the Respondent and its Members and Participants to ensure the availability of the Key Individuals in design roles <p><u>Bonus Elements:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation of more than 2 individuals that may be offered as replacements for each of the Key Individual in design roles 	3

Sub-Criterion(ia)	Weighting	RFQ Requirements	RFQ Evaluation Criteria	Elements Sought	Weighting %
		<p>Resumé</p> <p>Provide resumé for the Design Manager, Systems Integration Manager, Project Controller and Design Quality Manager.</p>	<p>applicable, other delivery methods that require the integration of design and construction activities.</p> <p>The Response will also be evaluated on the basis of an approach that demonstrates that it can ensure the availability of Key Individuals in design roles and the replacement of Key Individuals by one or more individuals with equal or higher qualifications.</p>	<p>4 resumé must be evaluated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design Manager • Systems Integration Manager • Project Controller • Design Quality Manager <p>Elements Sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic background in engineering or equivalent, depending on the position involved • 20 years of experience in carrying out and managing major rail and/or road and/or passenger transportation infrastructure projects • 15 years of experience in carrying out and managing major rail and/or road and/or passenger transportation infrastructure projects in a similar role • Participation in a similar role in at least 1 LRT project • Participation in a similar role in at least 1 comparable project carried out in EPC or other mode requiring the integration of design and construction activities • Participation in a similar role in at least 2 of the projects described in Sections II to VI. Alternatively, if his/her participation is limited to 1 project described in Sections II to VI, a clear description of another comparable project may be presented in his/her resumé • Clear description of the responsibilities assumed on comparable projects described in the projects presented in Sections II to VI or in his/her resumé <p>Bonus Elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstration of past experience working with one or more Members, Participants, Key Individuals and stakeholders 	2

Sub-Criterion(ia)	Weighting	RFQ Requirements	RFQ Evaluation Criteria	Elements Sought	Weighting %
3- Approach to Key Issues, Risks and Mitigation	15%	<p><u>Design Approach, Strategies and Mitigation Measures</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a description of how its design approach will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Ensure schedule and budget adherence. The Respondent must also describe strategies and mitigation measures that would be employed to address any delays in design progress; – Contribute to efficient construction of all the infrastructure, particularly the tunnel; – Maintain a high-standard of workplace safety; – Mitigate the impact of construction on existing contaminated sites along the route; – Result in signature station design in line with (eventual) design guidance from CDPQ Infra; and – Respect the technical requirements. • The Respondent must also describe the strategies and mitigation measures that would be employed to resolve potential design issues. • In its response to the above items, the Respondent must demonstrate how it addressed similar issues using a design approach in other projects. The Respondent must demonstrate how the design approach that will be used for this Project will permit the Project to benefit from experience and lessons learned on other projects. 	<p>The Response will be evaluated on the Respondent's ability to present a rigorous and detailed approach, suited to the Project's design work, including identification of the issues, risks and mitigation measures and their management, which must satisfy all the requirements noted above.</p> <p>The Respondent should preferably provide examples of prior accomplishments in support of the proposed approach, including success factors, or alternatively justify the relevance of the proposed approach.</p>	<p><u>Elements Sought:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstration of a clear understanding of all of the issues and risks identified in the <i>RFQ Requirements</i> column • Description of a rigorous and detailed approach, suited to the Project, enabling the mitigation and management of all of the issues and risks identified in the <i>RFQ Requirements</i> column • Demonstration of a cost and schedule tracking method • Demonstration of past experiences of the Respondent and its Members and Participants, during which such a design approach was used successfully, including the identification of the related success factors <p><u>Bonus Elements:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other evidence in support of the proposed approach (e.g. brief project descriptions, descriptions of past experiences, learned and tested lessons, etc.) 	7
		<p><u>Approach to Address Key Issues and Risks</u></p> <p>The Respondent must highlight the use of innovative design approaches to address these key issues and risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe any other key design-related issues and risks identified with respect to the Project, how these issues and risks are relevant for the Project and the approach to address or mitigate these issues and risks. Where possible, the Respondent must draw on past experience with managing similar issues and risks in other projects; and • Describe the design approach that will be used to minimize capital, life cycle and operational costs and Respondents' experience using this approach in similar projects. 		<p><u>Elements Sought:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification and demonstration of a clear understanding of other design-related issues and risks • Description of a rigorous approach, suited to the Project, enabling the mitigation and management of all of the other design-related issues and risks identified in the preceding point • Demonstration of a design approach making it possible to minimize capital, operating and major maintenance costs over the life cycle of the Project • Demonstration of past experiences of the Respondent and its Members and Participants, during which such the design approach described in the previous point was used successfully, including the identification of the related success factors 	8

Sub-Criterion(ia)	Weighting	RFQ Requirements	RFQ Evaluation Criteria	Elements Sought	Weighting %
				<p>Bonus Elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other evidence in support of the proposed approach (e.g. brief project descriptions, descriptions of past experiences, learned and tested lessons, etc.) 	

IV. CONSTRUCTION CAPACITY AND EXPERIENCE: 35%

Sub-Criterion(ia)	Weighting	RFQ Requirements	RFQ Evaluation Criteria	Elements Sought	Weighting %
1- Team Organization and Experience	10%	<p>Organizational Chart and Structure</p> <p>Provide a chart and explanation of the organizational structure and the reporting relationships between team members involved in the construction of the Project, their roles and responsibilities;</p>	<p>The Response will be evaluated on a clear and detailed description of the Respondent's organizational structure, the reporting relationships between the team members involved in the Project design, the roles and responsibilities of the team members and other related elements.</p>	<p>Elements Sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed description/Explanation of the benefits, synergies and complementarities of the Respondent's organizational/operational structure and/or a justification of its appropriateness for the Project Identification of the reporting relationships between the members of the Project construction team and a justification of their appropriateness for the Project Detailed description/Explanation of the Respondent's organizational/operational structure, including a clear description of the roles and responsibilities of each team member, and justification of its appropriateness for the Project 	2
		<p>Project Descriptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe up to five (5) projects delivered in the past 15 years using an EPC or DB approach that demonstrate the experience of the Respondent or its Members and Participants in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building a rail-based public transit system which includes one or more of the following elements: an electric LRT system, a dedicated guideway, a tunnel, operation in an urban setting in close proximity to businesses and residences and construction in an area of heritage / historical value; Building an LRT, a light or heavy metro system in a location with similar weather conditions to those experienced in Montreal; Construction of command centres and maintenance facilities for trains, LRT or metro vehicles in weather conditions comparable to those in Montreal; Construction of stations for an LRT or metro system in an environment with limitations, interfaces with other public transit modes and construction requirements comparable to those of the 	<p>The Respondent is invited to provide by order of precedence completed projects (or at an advanced stage of completion) by its Members and/or Participants, whose scope, complexity and works are comparable to the Project's. The Response will be evaluated on the comparability of the projects, particularly in terms of the scope, complexity, infrastructure and delivery timetable.</p> <p>The description of the projects must demonstrate that the experience of the proposed team will enable the</p>	<p>Elements Sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of comparable infrastructure projects (in terms of size, complexity, work and schedule) carried out during the last 15 years or at an advanced stage of completion, that meet many or all of the requirements indicated in the <i>RFQ Requirements column</i> Note: "At an advanced stage of completion" refers to a situation where at least 50% of the work has been completed Description of at least 2 LRT projects Description of at least 2 projects demonstrating the experience of the Respondent or its Members and Participants, with respect to the following critical factors: electric LRT, tunnels, command and train maintenance centre, urban environment, weather conditions, testing and commissioning, traffic management, challenges related to the environment and issues relating to site access Identification of success factors and innovations for the described projects Clear description of the roles and responsibilities assumed by the Members, Participants and Key Individuals, on described comparable projects, specifying the 	8

Sub-Criterion(ia)	Weighting	RFQ Requirements	RFQ Evaluation Criteria	Elements Sought	Weighting %
		<p>Project;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Building a rail-based public transit system in a dense urban environment – including city centres – while minimizing adverse impacts on business and residents; - Maintaining and effectively managing vehicular traffic flow during construction; - Coordinating construction work with utilities and public sector agencies and moving public utilities; - Experience in implementing communication plans and programs during construction; - Coordinating construction activities to support safety certification and the successful testing and commissioning of a rail-based public transit system; - Delivering quality projects on time and on-budget; - Working together as an integrated team for the construction of a project; - Experience implementing a quality control plan, such as ISO 9001 or similar standards in a comparable transit project; and - The Respondent must also mention any awards received acknowledging the quality of the construction work. 	<p>Respondent to satisfy all the above requirements. The description must also identify the success factors that were implemented in the course of these projects and any innovations that are relevant for the Project.</p> <p>The presented projects will not be evaluated individually, but on the Respondent's overall experience in the relevant areas. The name of the Respondent, the Member or the Participant who participated in the completion of the project(s) and its role, responsibilities and participation percentage must be indicated.</p>	<p>participation % for each one</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant participation of multiple Members, Participants and Key Individuals in the described project(s) <p>Bonus Elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of more than one comparable project with a capital value in excess of \$3 billion • If the Respondent demonstrates significant participation and the required experience in 2 projects with a capital value in excess of \$3 billion, it will be awarded bonus points 	
<p>2- Key Individual Organization and Experience and Depth of Team</p>	<p>5%</p>	<p>Internal Organization, Depth and Availability of Key Individuals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the internal organization of each Member involved in the construction of the Project and the roles and responsibilities of each Key Individual. The description should include an organizational chart detailing the Respondent's internal structure and relevant reporting relationships. Key Individuals presented in this section should have experience working on the projects described by the Respondents in Section IV -1 above. Key Individuals that only played a minor role, or did not work on the projects described in Section IV -1 will not receive full scores; • Describe the depth of Key Individuals available to the Respondent to deliver the Project's construction in accordance with the requirements. This could include describing the number and experience of individuals who would be able to replace Key Individuals moving forward. For example, the Respondent can describe the number of construction managers available to it with similar experience and qualifications as the designated Construction Manager and who may be offered as a replacement for the 	<p>The Response will be evaluated on the degree of prior experience that the Key Individuals have acquired in the construction of LRT or rail-based public transit systems similar to the Project, particularly in terms of scope, complexity, timetable, context and work environment. The evaluation of the Response will include an evaluation of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The work experience that the person concerned has acquired in a project where he or she assumed a role or responsibilities comparable to the role he or she would have 	<p>Elements Sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description/Explanation of the Respondent's internal organization, including the existing reporting relationships, justification of its appropriateness for the Project • Description/Explanations of the internal organization of each Member involved in construction and justification of its appropriateness for the Project • Clear description of the qualifications, experience/expertise, roles and responsibilities of each of the Key Individuals • Demonstration of the participation of the Key Individuals in construction roles on at least 2 projects presented in Section IV – 1, or, alternatively, prior experience in building LRT or rail-based public transit systems similar to the project relating the EPC Works or other mode requiring the integration of DB activities • Demonstration of the Respondent's experience and depth, including identifying and presenting the qualifications of at least 2 individuals that may be offered as a replacement for each of the Key Individuals in construction roles • Proposed approach and undertaking of the Respondent and its Members and Participants to ensure the availability of the Key Individuals in construction roles 	<p>3</p>

Sub-Criterion(ia)	Weighting	RFQ Requirements	RFQ Evaluation Criteria	Elements Sought	Weighting %
		<p>Construction Manager as required; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe the proposed approach to ensure the availability of Key Individuals in construction-related functions over the term of this Project; 	<p>as a Key Individual;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The work experience in projects that required an EPC delivery method or, as applicable, other delivery methods that require the integration of design and construction activities. <p>The Response will also be evaluated on an approach that demonstrates that it can ensure the availability of Key Individuals in construction roles and the replacement of Key Individuals by one or more individuals with equal or higher qualifications.</p>	<p>Bonus Elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation of more than 2 individuals that may be offered as replacements for each of the Key Individual in construction roles 	
		<p>Resumé</p> <p>Provide resumé for the Construction Manager, the Construction Quality Manager and the Tunnelling Manager.</p>		<p>3 resumé must be evaluated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction Manager Construction Quality Manager Tunnelling Manager <p>Elements Sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20 years of experience in carrying out and managing major rail and/or road and/or passenger transportation infrastructure projects 15 years of experience in carrying out and managing major rail and/or road and/or passenger transportation infrastructure projects in a similar role Participation in a similar role in at least 1 LRT project Participation in a similar role in at least 1 comparable project carried out in EPC or other mode requiring the integration of DB activities Participation in a similar role in at least 2 projects requiring the construction of a tunnel Participation in a similar role in at least 2 of the projects described in Sections II to VI. Alternatively, if his/her participation is limited to 1 project described in Sections II to VI, a clear description of another comparable project may be presented in his/her resumé 	2

Sub-Criterion(ia)	Weighting	RFQ Requirements	RFQ Evaluation Criteria	Elements Sought	Weighting %
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear description of the responsibilities assumed on comparable projects described in the projects presented in Sections II to VI or in his/her resumé <p>Bonus Elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstration of past experience working with one or more Members, Participants, Key Individuals and stakeholders 	
3- Approach to Key Issues, Risks and Mitigation Measures	20%	<p>Design Approach, Strategies and Mitigation Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a description of how its approach to construction will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Ensure schedule and budget adherence. The Respondent must also describe strategies and mitigation measures that would be employed to address any delays in construction progress; – Ensure road safety and effective traffic management during construction; – Limit the impact of construction on businesses and residences; – Maintain a high-standard of workplace safety; – Mitigate the impact of construction on existing contaminated sites along the route; and – Respect the technical requirements. • The Respondent must also describe the strategies and mitigation measures that would be employed to resolve potential construction issues. 	<p>The Response will be evaluated on the basis of a rigorous and detailed approach, suited to the Project construction work, including identification of the issues, risks and mitigation measures and their management, which must satisfy all the requirements noted above.</p> <p>The Respondent should preferably provide examples of prior accomplishments in support of the proposed approach, including success factors, or alternatively justify the relevance of the proposed approach.</p>	<p>Elements Sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstration of a clear understanding of all of the issues and risks identified in the <i>RFQ Requirements</i> column • Description of a rigorous and detailed approach, suited to the Project, enabling the mitigation and management of all of the issues and risks identified in the <i>RFQ Requirements</i> column • Demonstration of a cost and schedule tracking method • Demonstration of past experiences of the Respondent and its Members and Participants, during which such a construction approach was used successfully, including the identification of the related success factors <p>Bonus Elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other evidence in support of the proposed approach (e.g. brief project descriptions, descriptions of past experiences, learned and tested lessons, etc.) 	8
		<p>Approach to Addressing Key Issues and Risks</p> <p>The Respondent must highlight the use of innovative approaches to address these key issues and risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe its Quality Control Plan during construction; • Describe its approach to liaising with municipalities, utilities, government agencies and stakeholders; • Describe its approach to environmental management and the approach to monitoring and implementing commitments and conditions which relate to regulatory obligations; • Describe any other key construction-related issues and risks identified with respect to the Project, how these issues and risks are relevant for the Project and the approach to mitigate these issues and risks. Where possible, the Respondent must draw on past 		<p>Elements Sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification and demonstration of a clear understanding of other construction-related issues and risks • Description of a rigorous approach, suited to the Project, enabling the mitigation and management of all of the other construction-related issues and risks identified in the preceding point and in the <i>RFQ Requirements</i> column • Demonstration of past experiences of the Respondent and its Members and Participants, during which such the construction approach described in the previous point used successfully, including the identification of the related success factors • Identification of innovations to the proposed approach and their impact on the mitigation and management of Project issues and risks 	12

Sub-Criterion(ia)	Weighting	RFQ Requirements	RFQ Evaluation Criteria	Elements Sought	Weighting %
		<p>experience managing similar issues and risks in other projects; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe the approach to design and construction of stations for an LRT or metro system in an environment with limitations, interfaces with other public transit modes and design requirements comparable to those of the Project. 		<p>Bonus Elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other evidence in support of the proposed approach (e.g. brief project descriptions, descriptions of past experiences, learned and tested lessons, etc.) 	

V. CONSTRUCTION IN AN EXISTING PUBLIC TRANSIT CORRIDOR: 15%

Sub-Criterion(ia)	Weighting	RFQ Requirements	RFQ Evaluation Criteria	Elements Sought	Weighting %
1-Team Organization and Experience	5%	<p>Project Descriptions</p> <p>In its response, the Respondent must describe up to three (3) infrastructure projects (with a capital value in excess of \$500 million) that demonstrate the proposed team's experience executing construction work in an existing road or public transit corridor and in an urban environment, where the existing road or transit system continues to be in operation during construction.</p>	<p>The Respondent is invited to provide by order of precedence completed projects (or at an advanced stage of completion) by its Members and/or Participants, whose scope, complexity and works are comparable to the Project's. The Response will be evaluated on the comparability of the projects, particularly in terms of the scope, complexity, infrastructure and delivery timetable.</p> <p>The description of the projects must demonstrate that the organization and experience of the proposed team will enable the Respondent to satisfy all the above requirements. The description must also identify the success factors that were implemented in the course of these projects.</p>	<p>Elements Sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of comparable infrastructure projects of \$500 million or more, carried out during the last 15 years or at an advanced stage of completion, that demonstrate the experience of the Respondent and its Members and Participants in the performance of the construction work in an existing and operational road or public transit corridor and in an urban environment. <i>Note: "At an advanced stage of completion" refers to a situation where at least 50% of the work has been completed</i> Description of 2 LRT projects Identification of the success factors for the described projects including a demonstration that disruptions to the existing public transit system were minimized Demonstration that the described projects are comparable in terms of DB activities, risk management, risk management and schedule Clear description of the roles and responsibilities assumed by the Members, Participants and Key Individuals, on described comparable projects and indication of the participation % for each one Participation of multiple Members, Participants and Key Individuals in the described project(s). <p>Bonus Elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completion of more than one comparable project with a capital value in excess of \$3 billion 	5

Sub-Criterion(ia)	Weighting	RFQ Requirements	RFQ Evaluation Criteria	Elements Sought	Weighting %
			<p>The presented projects presented will not be evaluated individually, but on the Respondent's overall experience in the relevant areas. The name of the Respondent, the Member or the Participant who participated in the completion of the project(s) and its role, responsibilities and participation percentage must be indicated.</p>		
<p>2- Approach to Key Issues, Risks and Mitigation</p>	<p>10%</p>	<p>Approach</p> <p>In its response, the Respondent must provide a description of how its approach to design and construction will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure the safe operation of the existing rail and bus network during construction; • Ensure the safety of the workforce in a construction site with ongoing rail and bus operations; • Minimize the impact on the existing rail and bus network through the efficient phasing and scheduling of construction work; • Use innovative technical or other measures to minimize the impact on the existing rail and bus network; • Manage the impact of accommodating ongoing bus and rail operations on the Respondent's construction costs and schedule; • Liaise with a public transit authority or other entity to coordinate construction work and transit operations. 	<p>The Response will be evaluated on the basis of a rigorous and detailed approach suited to the Project construction work to be performed in an existing and operating public transit corridor, including identification of the issues, risks and mitigation measures and their management, which must satisfy all the requirements noted above.</p> <p>The Respondent should preferably provide examples of prior accomplishments in support of the proposed approach, including success factors, or alternatively justify the relevance of the proposed approach.</p>	<p>Elements Sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstration of clear understanding of all of the issues and risks identified in the <i>RFQ Requirements</i> column • Description of a rigorous approach, suited to the Project, enabling the mitigation and management of the issues and risks identified in the <i>RFQ Requirements</i> column <p>Bonus Elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of particular issues/challenges encountered in carrying out system installation work and description of the approach used to address issues/challenges 	<p>5</p>

Sub-Criterion(ia)	Weighting	RFQ Requirements	RFQ Evaluation Criteria	Elements Sought	Weighting %
		<p><u>Examples from Past Experience</u></p> <p>In its response to the above, the Respondent must demonstrate how it mitigated the impact of construction on existing transit operations or road traffic in other construction projects and how this experience is applicable to this Project. The Respondent must highlight the use of any innovative approaches that it implemented to address this issue.</p> <p>The Respondent must limit references to other projects to five (5) projects in this section.</p>		<p><u>Elements Sought:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description/Demonstration of 3 prior experiences of the Respondent or its Members or Participants (reference to no more than 5 projects), during with a similar DB approach to the one proposed was successfully used to mitigate the impact of construction on existing transit operations or road traffic, including the identification of the related success factors • Demonstration of how the lessons learned from past experience are relevant for the Project • Identification of one or more innovative approaches used on past projects and/or proposed for the performance of the EPC Works that could be used to mitigate the impact of construction on existing public transit operations and road traffic <p><u>Bonus Elements:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the Candidate presents more than 3 relevant past experiences, the score will be increased 	5

VI. INTEGRATING CIVIL WORKS AND SYSTEMS: 10%

Sub-Criterion(ia)	Weighting	RFQ Requirements	RFQ Evaluation Criteria	Elements Sought	Weighting %
<p>1-Team Organization and Experience</p>	<p>5%</p>	<p><u>Project Descriptions</u></p> <p>In its response, the Respondent must describe up to three (3) infrastructure projects (with a capital value in excess of \$500 million) that demonstrate the team's design and construction experience integrating civil works and Systems, in a similar context to this Project where the civil works, Rolling Stock and Systems are being procured separately.</p>	<p>The Respondent is invited to provide by order of precedence completed projects (or at an advanced stage of completion) by its Members and/or Participants, whose scope, complexity and works are comparable to the Project's. The Response will be evaluated on the comparability of the projects, particularly in terms of scope, complexity, infrastructure and delivery timetable.</p> <p>The description of the projects must demonstrate that the organization and experience of the proposed team will enable the Respondent to satisfy all the above requirements. The description must also identify the success factors that were implemented in the course of these projects.</p> <p>The presented projects will not be evaluated individually, but on the Respondent's overall degree of experience in the relevant areas. The name of the Respondent, the Member or the Participant who participated in the completion of the project(s) and its role, responsibilities and participation percentage must be indicated.</p>	<p><u>Elements Sought:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of comparable infrastructure projects of \$500 million or more, carried out during the last 15 years or at an advanced stage of completion, that demonstrate the experience of the Respondent and its Members and Participants in integrating civil works and systems within a similar context to the Project, where the civil works, rolling stock and systems are being procured separately. • <i>Note: "At an advanced stage of completion" refers to a situation where at least 50% of the work has been completed</i> • Descriptions of 2 LRT projects • Identification of the success factors for the described projects • Demonstration that the described projects are comparable in terms of DB activities, risk management and schedule • Clear and detailed description of the roles and responsibilities assumed by the Members, Participants and Key Individuals, on described comparable projects and indication of the participation % for each one • Participation of multiple Members, Participants and Key Individuals in the described project(s). <p><u>Bonus Elements:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of more than one comparable project with a capital value in excess of \$3 billion 	<p>5</p>

Sub-Criterion(ia)	Weighting	RFQ Requirements	RFQ Evaluation Criteria	Elements Sought	Weighting %
2-Approach to Key Issues, Risks and Mitigation	5%	<p><u>Approach</u></p> <p>In its response, the Respondent must provide a description of how its approach to design and construction will minimize interface issues and risks with the RSSOM Contractor and support the RSSOM Contractor to ensure the successful testing and commissioning of the Systems. Finally, its construction approach should demonstrate that it is able to manage other civil works and Systems integration issues with the RSSOM Contractor to ensure that the Project is delivered on-time and on-budget.</p> <p>The Respondent must outline its approach for RAMS (Risk, Availability, Maintainability and Safety) and Environmental management.</p>	<p>The Response will be evaluated on the basis of a rigorous and detailed approach, suited to the Project design and construction work, that will minimize problems and issues associated with the interfaces between the EPC Works and the RSSOM Services and must satisfy all the requirements noted above.</p> <p>The Respondent should preferably provide examples of prior accomplishments in support of the proposed approach, including success factors, or alternatively justify the relevance of the proposed approach</p>	<p><u>Elements Sought:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstration of clear understanding of all of the issues and risks identified in the <i>RFQ Requirements</i> column including interface issues with the RSSOM Supplier, the support to be provided to the RSSOM Supplier for Systems integration, testing and commissioning • Description of a rigorous approach, suited to the Project, enabling the mitigation and management of all of the issues and risks identified in the <i>RFQ Requirements</i> column and on-time and on-budget delivery of the Project. <p><u>Bonus Elements:</u></p> <p>Description of particular issues/challenges encountered in carrying out systems integration work in civil works and description of the approach used to address issues/challenges</p>	3
		<p><u>Examples from Past Experience</u></p> <p>In its response to the above, the Respondent must demonstrate that it was able to resolve similar issues in past projects and how its experience is applicable to the Project. The Respondent must highlight the use of any innovative approaches that it implemented to resolve such issues.</p> <p>The Respondent must limit references to other projects to five (5) projects in this section.</p>		<p><u>Elements Sought:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description/Demonstration of 3 past experiences of the Respondent or its Members or Participants (reference to no more than 5 projects), during which a similar DB approach to the one proposed was successfully used to minimize the problems and issue relating to the interfaces between the EPC Works and the RSSOM Services. • Demonstration of how the lesson learned from past experiences are relevant for the Project • Identification of one or more innovative approaches used in connection with past and/or proposed experiences <p><u>Bonus Elements:</u></p> <p>If the Respondent present more than 3 past experiences, the score will be increased</p>	2

Request for Qualification Ref 01-7001

**Engineering, Procurement and
Construction for the Infrastructures
of the *Réseau électrique
métropolitain de Montréal***

**ADDENDUM NO. 4
TO THE REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATION DOCUMENT REF 01-7001
DATED JUNE 28, 2016**

September 9, 2016

Pursuant to Section 5 of the Request for Qualification document, this ADDENDUM No. 4 forms an integral part of the Request for Qualification and amends the Request for Qualification in the manner and to the extent indicated herein.

AMENDMENTS TO THE REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATION DOCUMENT

Please take note of the following amendments to the Request for Qualification document, which amendments are underlined.

- In Section 5 of the Request for Qualification document, the following text is added immediately before Section 5.1.

CDPQ Infra requests, without limiting the generality of the requirements of a similar nature set forth in the Request for Qualification, that each Respondent:

- not use "Réseau Électrique Métropolitain" or its acronyms "R.E.M." and "REM" in the name of a company created by the Respondent or otherwise in a legal name used by the Respondent, and ensure that its Members, Participants, partners and subcontractors do likewise;
- limit the use of the expression "Réseau Électrique Métropolitain" and its acronyms "R.E.M." and "REM" to internal exchanges or exchanges with current or potential Members, Participants, Key Individuals, partners and subcontractors for the sole purpose of referring to the electric transit system; and
- not use, under any circumstances, "Réseau Électrique Métropolitain" or its acronyms "R.E.M." and "REM" in any public communications.

- The text in Section 5.1 of the Request for Qualification document is deleted and replaced by the following:

Respondents must submit all required documentation under the Request for Qualification in a sealed envelope or package with the following indications:

- In the upper left-hand corner, the sender's name and return address;
- In the upper right-hand corner, the indication STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL;
- In the central section: the addressee and the following address:

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATION 01-7001: ENGINEERING, PROCUREMENT AND
CONSTRUCTION OF INFRASTRUCTURES
RÉSEAU ÉLECTRIQUE MÉTROPOLITAIN DE MONTRÉAL Project
CDPQ Infra inc.
Attention: Procurement Department
440 René Lévesque Boulevard West
Suite 350, 3rd Floor
Montreal, Quebec H2Z 1V7

Respondents must request a signed acknowledgment of receipt indicating the date and time of submission of their Response.

Responses will be received from 9 a.m. (Montreal time) until 4 p.m. (Montreal time) on September 23, 2016.

Note: The offices will not be open prior to the date and time indicated above.

CDPQ Infra reserves the right, in its sole discretion, to extend the deadline for submitting a Response by way of an addendum no less than five (5) business days before the deadline for submitting a Response.

CDPQ Infra may in no way be held liable for delays that may be caused by the methods used by Respondents to send their Responses. Any Response received after the deadline for submitting Responses will be refused and returned unopened to the Respondent. Responses sent electronically or by fax will not be accepted.

The Response must be valid for at least 120 Days from the expiry of the Qualification Period.

- In Section 5.6 of the Request for Qualification document, the first (1st) bullet point is deleted and replaced by the following text:
 - Responses and any related documents must be in French if the Respondent has an establishment in Quebec, except financial statements, annual reports and credit rating reports as described in Section I of Schedule 2, and certified excerpts of resolutions or other documents authorizing the signing of the Response and the forms of undertaking, which may be in French or English;

- In Section 6.3.1 of the Request for Qualification document, the third (3rd) bullet point is deleted and replaced by the following text:
 - Provide an attestation by Revenu Québec delivered no earlier than 90 days before the deadline for submitting Responses (confirming that the returns and reports required under Quebec tax laws have been filed and that there is no overdue account under such laws) or, alternatively, an attestation that there is no establishment in Quebec;

- In Section 6.5 of the Request for Qualification document, the following text is added immediately after the third (3rd) paragraph following Table 8 – Evaluation Criteria - RFQ:
 - In cases where the elements presented by a Respondent exceed the evaluator's expectations but do not justify a higher score, the evaluator may award such higher score if the Respondent presents the elements listed in the bonus elements section. The bonus elements are to be taken into account only if the evaluator determines that the Respondent's score is between two levels upon completing the analysis of the elements sought, and the evaluator may only award the next score immediately up from the initial score.

- In Schedule 2 of the Request for Qualification document, the following text is added after the third (3rd) paragraph following Table 1 - Evaluation Criteria for the Request for Qualification:
 - In cases where the elements presented by a Respondent exceed the evaluator's expectations but do not justify a higher score, the evaluator may award such higher score if the Respondent presents the elements listed in the bonus elements section. The bonus elements are to be taken into account only if the evaluator determines that the Respondent's score is between two levels upon completing the analysis of the elements sought, and the evaluator may only award the next score immediately up from the initial score.

- In Schedule 5 of the Request for Qualification document, the fourth (4th) indent under the third bullet point is deleted and replaced by the following:
 - The elements sought will be considered for the purposes of the evaluation of each sub-criterion; and

- In Section VI.2 of Schedule 2, the third (3rd) paragraph is deleted and replaced by the following:
 - The Respondent must outline its approach in terms of risk management, workforce availability, continuity of operations, safety and the environment.