



BIDDERS LIST REVIEW / APPROVAL
Lower Churchill Project

Date Received from SLI: 27-Aug-12

Approval Required Date from NE: 4-Sep-12


CONTRACT #: CH0007

CONTRACT NAME: Construction of Intake and Powerhouse, Spillway and Transition Dams

The following have reviewed the attached recommended Bidders List for CH0007 titled Construction of Intake and Powerhouse, Spillway and Transition Dams

Prepared By:	Name:	Signature:	Date:
SLI - Package CA or Buyer	R. Adamcyk	See attached Package Bidders List Recommendation and EOI/Prequal Results	27-Aug-12
Reviewed By:			
QA Manager	D. Green		29 AUG 2012
Health & Safety Manger	D. Riffe		31 Aug 2012
Environmental Engineering Lead	M. Organ		31-Aug-2012
Approved By:			
Project Manager - MF Facilities & Infrastructure	S. O'Brien		31 Aug 2012
Deputy Project Manager	J. Kean		31-AUG-2012
General Project Manager	R. Power		31-AUG-2012
Supply Chain Manager	P. Hussey		31 Aug 2012

Comments:

 SNC • LAVALIN			Revision 00		Page
	PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION REPORT and RECOMMENDED BIDDERS LIST		Date		
	SLI Doc. No. 505573-CH0007-51BA-0001		27 August-2012		i

Date: 27 August-2012

Lower Churchill Project

Prequalification Evaluation Report- Package CH0007

Prepared by: SNC	Name	Signature
Contract Administrator	R. Adamczyk	<i>R. Adamczyk</i>
Lead Technical Evaluator	L. Payton	<i>L. Payton</i>
Health and Safety Coordinator	<i>[Signature]</i>	
Environmental Coordinator	<i>[Signature]</i>	Michael Nowickow
Quality Coordinator	R. Morrison	<i>[Signature]</i>
Checked by SNC:		
Area Manager	Jac Turcotte	<i>Jac Turcotte</i>
Approved by SNC:		
Procurement Manager	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>
Engineering Manager	Greg Snyder	<i>[Signature]</i>
Health and Safety Manager	Ben Lee	<i>[Signature]</i>
Environmental Manager	Michel Nowickow	<i>[Signature]</i>
Quality Manager	R. Morrison	<i>[Signature]</i>
Component 1 Manager	A. Hadda	<i>[Signature]</i>
Approved by Nalcor;		
Supply Chain Manager		
Nalcor Project Manager		

REVISION LIST

Revision						Remarks
N°	By	Check	Apr.	Apr.	Date	



 SNC • LAVALIN			Revision 00		Page
	PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION REPORT and RECOMMENDED BIDDERS LIST			Date	
	SLI Doc. No. 505573-CH0007-51BA-0001			27 August-2012	ii

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
2. SCOPE OF WORK FOR PACKAGE CH0007	3
3. INVITATION TO PREQUALIFY AND APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED.....	3
4. EVALUATION PLAN	4
5. FINDINGS.....	6
6. RECOMMENDATION	9
7. NALCOR CREDITWORTHINESS REVIEW OF RECOMMENDED COMPANIES.....	9
APPENDICES.....	10

 SNC-LAVALIN		Revision 00		
	PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION REPORT and RECOMMENDED BIDDERS LIST		Date	Page
	SLI Doc. No. 505573-CH0007-51BA-0001		27 August 2012	1

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY


This report presents the results of the prequalification evaluation that has been carried out for package CH0007 – Intake and Powerhouse, Spillway and Transition Dams.

The evaluation team has assessed and ranked the technical, commercial, health and safety, environmental, and quality capabilities of the nine Applicants for prequalification. The Overall Score for each Applicant is listed below.

The team recommends that the five companies/JointVentures that received the highest overall ranking be put on the Bidders List for Package CH0007. These companies met all of the pass/fail criteria. However, this recommendation has been affected by information received on 26 July 2012 with respect to two of the five recommended Applicants: Salini S.p.A has taken control of Impregilo S.p.A.

After further discussions with these two companies, they have confirmed that if both are prequalified, and to prevent a conflict of interest, they will bid as one Joint Venture: Salini/Impregilo/FCC, led by Salini. The team believe that this is an effective solution to the conflict. The Team therefore recommend a Bidders List made up of the four (4) Applicants with the highest Overall Scores: Astaldi S.P.A.; the two Joint Ventures: IKC-ONE, and Aecon/Flatiron/Demathieu & Bard; and the reconstituted Joint Venture of Salini/FCC/Impregilo.


The financial statements of the recommended Applicants have been reviewed by the Treasury and Risk Management Group of Nalcor Energy. The Group has concluded that “from a financial perspective” all recommended companies are “qualified”.

 SNC-LAVALIN			Revision 00		Page
	PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION REPORT and RECOMMENDED BIDDERS LIST		Date		
	SLI Doc. No. 505573-CH0007-51BA-0001		27 August 2012		2

	Name	Origin	PC	JV	Overall Score	R
1	IKC-ONE Civil Constructors, a Partnership			X	87.13	R
	• Sponsor: Innu-Kiewit Constructors; a partnership (IKC)	USA		40%		
	• H.J. O'Connell Construction Ltd.	Canada		20%		
	• Neilson Inc.	Canada		20%		
	• EBC Inc.	Canada		20%		
2	Impregilo S.p.A.	Italy	X		85.60	R
3	Astaldi S.P.A.	Italy	X		83.20	R
4	Salini S.p.A.			X	82.46	R
	• Lead: Salini S.p.A	Italy		50%		
	• FCC Construcción, S.A.	Spain		50%		
5	Aecon-Flatiron-Construction Demathieu & Bard – Joint Venture			X	81.29	R
	• Lead: Aecon Constructors,	Canada		40%		
	• Flatiron Constructors Canada Limited	USA		40%		
	• Construction Demathieu & Bard (CDB) Inc.	France		20%		
6	Barnard-Dragados J.V.			X	76.86	
	• Managing Partner: Barnard of Canada, Inc.	USA		50%		
	• Dragados Canada, Inc.	Spain		50%		
	• Pennecon as exclusive subcontractor					
7	Strabag Inc.	Austria	X		76.52	
8	OHL Construction Canada Inc.	Spain	X		72.99	
9	Acciona Infrastructure Canada Inc.	Spain	X		72.54 (F)	

Note: PC means as a Prime Contractor; JV means in Joint Venture; F means failed a criterion; and R means recommended for the Bidders List.

Sections 2 and 3 of this report present background information: respectively the Scope of Work for Package CH0007 and the History of the Invitation to Prequalify. This is followed, in Section 4, by a description of the Evaluation Plan that was the basis of the Evaluation. Section 5 presents the Evaluation Findings and Section 6 the Recommended Bidders List. The report is completed by Section 7, which references the Creditworthiness check that has been made by the Nalcor Treasury and Risk Management Group.

 SNC • LAVALIN		Revision 00		
	PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION REPORT and RECOMMENDED BIDDERS LIST		Date	Page
	SLI Doc. No. 505573-CH0007-51BA-0001		27 August 2012	3

2. SCOPE OF WORK FOR PACKAGE CH0007

Package CH0007 includes:


- Construction of the powerhouse and the intake which includes concreting, steel structure, embedment parts and miscellaneous metals as well as the architectural works related to the envelop of the powerhouse building.
- Construction of the gated spillway including the upstream and downstream permanent bridges and downstream temporary bridge over the gated spillway.
- Construction of the centre and north transition dams.
- Construction of the Powerhouse/Intake separation wall.
- Civil works related to permanent access roads to the powerhouse and to the spillway.
- The fabrication of the conventional vibrated concrete (CVC) (inclusive of the mobilization, installation, operation and dismantlement of the batch plant(s), the fabrication of the aggregates for concrete from blasted rock stockpile and from sand gravel borrows areas, the supply and storage of Portland cement for the fabrication of concrete including Fly Ash and additives, the production of concrete at the batching plant and the quality control at the batch plant and at the pour location.)
- Supply and installation of the spillway electrical building (structure only)

3. INVITATION TO PREQUALIFY AND APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED

The Prequalification Document for Package CH0007 was issued on April 30th 2012

The call for Applications was carried out on two fronts:

- In the first instance, an announcement was inserted in the Journal *International Water Power and Dam Construction* on April 1 2012. Refer to Appendix A.1;
- In the second instance, companies that were known to have a competency in the area of Package CH0007 were invited to prequalify. Companies were identified based on in-house knowledge and by actively reviewing the public data as recorded in the Top Lists of the journal *Engineering News-Record*. A total of 36 companies were contacted. The complete list of companies contacted is as listed in Appendix A.2. In the case of companies that declined to apply but who were particularly attractive – i.e. Bouygues,

 SNC-LAVALIN			Revision 00	
	PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION REPORT and RECOMMENDED BIDDERS LIST		Date	
	SLI Doc. No. 505573-CH0007-51BA-0001		27 August 2012	
				Page
				4

Skanska, and Vinci - follow up contacts were made to encourage the company to reconsider. Despite this additional effort, none of these companies accepted to apply.

Six Clarifications were issued during the prequalification period. One of these clarifications extended the prequalification period.

The period for receipt of Applications was closed on the 29th June 2012.

Nine Applications were received. The Companies submitting are as listed in Appendix A.3.

4. EVALUATION PLAN

4.1 The Plan

The approved Evaluation Plan, as attached in Appendix B, was followed in the evaluation of the Applications.


The objective of the evaluation was to identify the five most qualified Applicants, who meet the standards set for prequalification.

In the first stage of the evaluation, the experience, capacity, organization, resources, systems, and record of performance were to be evaluated in each of the following Categories: technical capability; commercial fitness; health and safety record and systems; environmental record and systems and quality systems. Each of these Categories were to be evaluated under the detailed set of elements (or factors) which are identified in Tables 1 to 5 of Appendix B. The weightings to be allocated to each Element were also defined. Maximum score for each Category is 100. After evaluation of the scores for each of five Categories, an Overall Score was to be calculated based on the following weightings:

Technical (T)	Commercial (C)	Health and Safety (H)	Environmental (E)	Quality (Q)
.45	.20	.10	.10	.15

Overall Score = .45 X T Score + .20 X C Score + .10 X H Score + .10 X E Score + .15 X Q Score

Following the calculation of the Overall Scores, each Applicant was to be reviewed for compliance with the pass/fail criteria, which define the minimum standards needed to be

 SNC-LAVALIN			Revision 00		Page
	PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION REPORT and RECOMMENDED BIDDERS LIST		Date		
	SLI Doc. No. 505573-CH0007-51BA-0001		27 August 2012		5


considered for inclusion on the Bidders List. The five Applicants with the highest Overall Scores, who meet all of the pass/fail criteria, defined immediately below, were to be selected for the Bidders List.

Category	Minimum Category Score	Minimum Score for Elements within the Category		Ref. Table (Appendix B)
		Element	Minimum Score	
1. Technical Capability	60	N/A		1
2. Commercial	60			2
		Applicant not involved in Bankruptcy	5	2
		Financial Instruments to Perform	20/20	2
		Lower Churchill Construction Project Benefits	13/25	2
3. Health and Safety	70	N/A		3
4. Environmental	60	N/A		4
5. Quality	60	N/A		5

4.2 Departures From the Plan

During the evaluation, minor adjustments were made in the procedure followed. For example, the technical evaluation used a rating of 95 % when the Applicant's response for an item met all criteria and 100% when it exceeded the requirements, rather than 80% and 100% as mentioned in the Evaluation Plan. Once made, these adjustments were consistently applied.

A more fundamental change was made with respect to a criterion for Joint Ventures. Each partner in a Joint Venture was required to meet the minimum Category score for environment. In one case a partner – Neilson – was not able to meet the requirements. However, given that the managing partner of the Joint Venture (IKC) has a well developed environmental system, and this system is to be used for the entire Joint Venture, the deficiency of Nielson was not treated as a pass/fail impediment.

 SNC-LAVALIN		Revision 00		
	PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION REPORT and RECOMMENDED BIDDERS LIST		Date	Page
	SLI Doc. No. 505573-CH0007-51BA-0001		27 August 2012	6

5. FINDINGS

5.1 Preliminary Comments

The Applicants who are applying (whether as a prime contractor or as the lead contractor in a Joint Venture) are large companies themselves, or have parents that are large groups. Table C.1 gives the rankings of these companies as published in the *Engineering News-Record Top 225 Global Contractors* (by Revenue).

All of the Applicants have been profitable in the last 3 years.

5.2 Summary of the prequalification Evaluation

Table C.2 summarizes the evaluation results. It presents, for each of the nine Applicants, the scores for each Category and the Overall Scores. This Table should be read in conjunction with the commentary in the following Sections 5.3 and 5.4, the detailed scoring Tables in Appendix C.3, and the comments with respect to Individual Applicants under Appendix C.4.

5.3 Pass/Fail Results


With two exceptions, all of the Applicants met all of the pass/fail criteria. The exceptions are:

- The environmental systems of Neilson, a partner in the IKC-ONE Joint Venture, did not meet the pass requirement. However, given that the system of IKC, the lead partner, did pass the requirements and that the system of IKC is to be used by the entire Joint Venture, this should not prevent the Joint Venture from passing.
- Acciona refused to submit information detailing how they would meet the cash flow requirements of the Work, including letters of reference from their bank and surety. Consequently, they have been excluded from the list of possible Applicants for recommendation.

5.4 Summary of the findings :

5.4.1 Joint Venture, IKC-ONE:

Technical: well qualified. Pertinent recent experience, strong team, excellent subcontractors. Excellent depth. Sterling reputation.

 SNC • LAVALIN			Revision 00	
	PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION REPORT and RECOMMENDED BIDDERS LIST		Date	
	SLI Doc. No. 505573-CH0007-51BA-0001		27 August 2012	
			Page	
			7	

Commercial: The weighted Financial Score of this group of 13.7/16 is the highest of the Applicants (Financial Score based on 2 points for each year of profit in 2009 to 2011; 4 points for Debt to Asset Ratio – 4 points for 60%, to 0 for 100% - ; and 6 points for Current Assets to Current Liabilities Ratio – 2 Points for 1 increasing to 6 points for 2.5) .They also have the most experience with respect to working with Inuit populations.

5.4.2 Impregilo:

Technical: (Very) large international contractor with pertinent recent experience. Has done Hydro work under similar conditions to LCP. Excellent depth.

Commercial: The Financial Score of 11.0/16 is in the median range.

5.4.3 Astaldi:

Technical: Large international contractor with pertinent experience on similar projects. Good site organization. Clear on portions he would sub-contract.

Commercial: Financial Score of 10.3/16 is just above the lowest quartile (Q1) for the Applicants. A credit worthiness check would be in order prior to addition to the Bidders List.

5.4.4 Joint Venture, Aecon:

Technical: Big Canadian firm tied in with experienced subcontractors. Experience with similar work under northern conditions. Not as big as the previous but technically capable.

Commercial: Financial Score for this JV is 11.65/16.


5.4.5 Joint Venture, Salini:

Technical: Large international firm with mega project experience. Pertinent powerhouse and gated spillway experience. Has identified some local subcontractors and has cold weather experience in Russia albeit not Hydro.

Commercial: The financial Score of 9.98/16 has been lowered by the score of partner FCC (9.27). Additional credit worthiness checking should be performed.

5.4.6 Strabag:

Technical: Although a large international contractor with powerhouse experience several shortcomings in the documentation presented lowered their score. The team presented had little or no powerhouse experience. They did not have any experience

 SNC • LAVALIN			Revision 00	
	PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION REPORT and RECOMMENDED BIDDERS LIST		Date	
	SLI Doc. No. 505573-CH0007-51BA-0001		27 August 2012	
			Page	8

in cold weather concreting, at least not anywhere near the climatic extremes we are talking about. Identification of work to be subcontracted was skimpy although not a main contributing factor to a lower score.

Commercial: Financial Score of 11.60.

5.4.7 Joint Venture, Barnard:

Technical: Barnard has little or no powerhouse experience although their subcontractor (Pennecon) does. The team presented is very weak in this matter. Experience in large batch plant operations is weaker than the leaders as is that in extreme cold weather concreting. Also scored low on clarity of subcontracting strategy. Given that Barnard are bidding on excavation contract CH0006, and that there was thus the possibility of having one contractor for both CH0006 and CH0007 (eliminating an interface), the Barnard team was invited to submit any additional information that would strengthen their Application. The additional information provided however, did not result in a change in the evaluation.

Commercial: Financial Score of 11.65. ; weighting of Barnard (16) and Dragados (7.3). Additional credit worthiness checking would be indicated for Dragados.

5.4.8 OHL:


Technical: OHL scores relatively low on contracts of a similar nature and complexity. They are at the low end on the depth and experience of site organization. They do not really have cold weather concreting experience and have not demonstrated understanding of the subject.

Commercial: Financial Score of 7.4. Additional credit worthiness checking would be indicated.

5.4.9 Acciona:

Technical: Very low on projects of similar nature and complexity. Little powerhouse experience and a team with little or no experience in that field. Low scores in some other areas but not with significant weighting.

Commercial: Financial Score of 10.91. Acciona refused to provide Letters of reference from their bank and their surety. They have thus failed to meet the minimum criterion as listed in Section 4.1.

 SNC • LAVALIN		Revision 00		
	PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION REPORT and RECOMMENDED BIDDERS LIST		Date	Page
	SLI Doc. No. 505573-CH0007-51BA-0001		27 August 2012	9

6. RECOMMENDATION


- 6.1 In accordance with the Evaluation Plan, the evaluation team recommend the Applicants with the five highest Overall Scores, who have met the pass/fail criteria. These are listed in Appendix D.
- 6.2 On 26 July 2012, the team were informed that Salini S.p.A. had taken control of Impregilo S.p.A; thus presenting a conflict of interest if both companies are added to the Bidders List. Salini and Impregilo have confirmed that if they are both on the Bidders List, they will form a Joint Venture – Salini/FCC/Impregilo, led by Salini. The team believe that this represents an effective solution to the conflict; the team therefore recommend that the Bidders List be made up of four Bidders: Astaldi acting as a prime contractor, and the three Joint Ventures: IKC-ONE, Aecon/Flatiron/Demathieu & Bard, and Salini/FCC/Impregilo.
- 6.3 To further ensure that none of the four recommended Bidders change their minds after being included in the Bidders List, we recommend that Nalcor should visit each of these companies during the initial phase of the bidding period. The objective of the visits should be to make a final confirmation the companies will submit proposals if selected.

7. NALCOR CREDITWORTHINESS REVIEW OF RECOMMENDED COMPANIES

Copies of the Applications for prequalification and the accompanying financial statements of each of the recommended companies, were supplied to the Nalcor Treasury and Risk Management Group.

The Group reviewed the ability of each individual entity to absorb the impact of potential adverse financial events as documented in LCP-PT-MD-0000-FI-PR-0003-01 – *Guidelines for Creditworthiness*. They also considered the size of the contract relative to each entity's annual sales and whether the entities in question experienced adverse events in the past as well as willingness to provide performance security.

As of to-day, The Treasury and Risk Management Group consider that all of the companies meet Nalcor creditworthiness criteria. Appendix E presents the details of this confirmation.


 SNC-LAVALIN			Revision 00		
	PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION REPORT and RECOMMENDED BIDDERS LIST			Date	Page
	SLI Doc. No. 505573-CH0007-51BA-0001			27 August 2012	10

APPENDICES

- A Call for Applications
 - A.1 Announcement:
 - A.2 List of Companies Invited to Apply
 - A.3 Companies submitting Applications for Prequalification
- B Approved Prequalification Evaluation Plan
- C Findings
 - Table C.1 Engineering News Record Rankings of Applicants
 - Table C.2 Summary of the Prequalification Evaluation

 - C.3 Scoring Tables
 - Table C.3.1 Scoring for the Technical Capability, Evaluation
 - Table C.3.2 Scoring for the Commercial Evaluation
 - Table C.3.3 Scoring for the Health and Safety Evaluation
 - Table C.3.4 Scoring for the Environmental Evaluation
 - Table C.3.5 Scoring for the Quality Evaluation

 - C.4 Findings with Respect to the Individual Applications
 - Table C.4.1 IKC-ONE
 - Table C.4.2 – Impregilo S.p.A
 - Table C.4.3 – Astaldi S.p.A
 - Table C.4.4 – Salini S.p.A
 - Table c.4.5 – Aecon – Flatiron Construction Demathieu & Bard Joint Venture
 - Table C.4.6 – Barnard – Dragados Joint Venture
 - Table C.4.7 – Strabag Inc.
 - Table C.4.8 – OHL Construction Canada Inc.
 - Table C.4.9 – Acciona Infrastructure Canada Inc.
- D. Recommended Bidders List
- E. Nalcor Creditworthiness Review of Recommended Companies

 SNC • LAVALIN		Revision 00		
	PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION REPORT and RECOMMENDED BIDDERS LIST		Date	Page
	SLI Doc. No. 505573-CH0007-51BA-0001		27 August 2012	11

APPENDIX A – CALL FOR APPLICATIONS



News

Invitation to prequalify for Muskrat Falls construction works package

30 April 2012

SNC-Lavalin Inc, as the engineering, procurement and construction management contractor for Nalcor Energy, invites interested companies to submit applications for prequalification with respect to Package CH0007: construction of intake, powerhouse, spillway and transition dams for the 824MW Muskrat Falls hydroelectric facility. The development of Muskrat Falls is phase one of the Lower Churchill Project, located in Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada.

The prequalification document will be available for downloading from SNC Lavalin's project website, starting 30 April 2012:

<https://gps.snclavalin.com/content/LowerChurchill/projects/project.html>

Completed applications for prequalification must be submitted no later than 30 May 2012.

The scope of work includes:

- Construction of the powerhouse and the intake which includes concreting, steel structure, embedment parts and miscellaneous metals as well as the architectural works related to the envelope of the powerhouse building.
- Construction of the gated spillway including the upstream and downstream permanent bridges and downstream temporary bridge over the gated spillway.
- Construction of the centre and north transition dams.
- Construction of the Powerhouse/Intake cofferdam (separation wall), inclusive of temporary road and temporary upstream bridge.
- Civil works related to permanent access roads to the powerhouse and to the spillway.
- The fabrication of the conventional vibrated concrete (CVC) This includes the mobilization, installation, operation and dismantlement of the batch plant(s), the fabrication of the aggregates for concrete from blasted rock stockpile and from sand gravel borrows areas, the supply and storage of Portland cement for the fabrication of concrete including Fly Ash and additives, the production of concrete at the batching plant and the quality control at the batch plant and at the pour location.
- Supply and installation of the spillway electrical building (structure only).
- Estimated major quantities: 450,000m³ CVC; 3,700 Tons structural steel.

All questions with respect to this invitation to prequalify should be forwarded to :

Ron Adamcyk
Senior Contract Administrator
SNC-Lavalin Inc.

International Water Power and Dam Construction

Page 2 of 2

Email: Ronald.Adamcyk@snc-lavalin.com

With a copy to:

Ed Over
Procurement Manager
SNC-Lavalin Inc.
Email: Ed.Over@snc-lavalin.com

International Water Power and Dam Construction ©2012
Published by Global Trade Media, a trading division of Progressive Media Group Ltd.

Appendix A.2 Companies Invited to Prequalify for Bidding on Package CH0007

Company
Acciona S.A.
Advanced Flexible Systems, Inc.
Aecon Group Inc.
Alberici Constructors
Astaldi SpA
Balfour Beatty plc (UK)
Barnard Construction Company, Inc. in Joint Venture with Pennecon
Bechtel
Big Land Construction Ltd.
Bilfinger Berger (Canada), Inc.
Bouygues Batiment International
Construtora Andrade Gutierrez S.A
Construtora Norberto Odebrecht S.A.
Demathieu & Bard (CDB) inc.
Dragados S.A
Ed. Zublin AG
EllisDon Corporation
Ferrovial-Agroman S.A.
Fluor Constructors Canada Ltd.
Hochtief A.G. (Flatiron Canada/USA):JV with Aecon
Iberdrola Ingenieria y Construcccion
Impregilo Group
Impresa Pizzarotti SpA
Kumagai Gumi Co., Ltd.
OHL Spain
PCL Construction Enterprises
Peter Kiewit (Joint Venture led by Kiewit, with O'Connell ,EBC and Nielsen)
Pomerleau Inc.
Salini SPA in JV with Strabag
Schiavone Construction Co. LLC
Skanska Construction
Strabag S.E.in JV with Salini
Taisei Construction Corporation (TCC)
TutorPerini
URS Corporation
VINCI Group

APPENDIX A.3 PREQUALIFICATION APPLICATIONS RECEIVED


PACKAGE CH0007 INTAKE, POWERHOUSE, SPILLWAY AND TRANSITION DAMS

	Name	PC	JV	Address	Authorized Signing Officer
1	Acciona Infrastructure Canada Inc.	X		Three Bentall Centre, 595 Burrard Street Suite 2000, PO Box 49125 Vancouver, BC, V7XJ1	Vincent Blesa, 1 (604) 622-6550 vblesa@acciona.ca
2	Aecon-Flatiron-Construction Demathieu & Bard – Joint Venture		X	20 Carlson Court, Suite 800, Toronto, Ontario Canada, M9W 7K6	Don Brophy, Senior Vice President, Aecon 1 (416) 293-7004 DBrophy@aecon.com
	• Lead: Aecon Constructors,		40%		
	• Flatiron Constructors Canada Limited		40%		
	• Construction Demathieu & Bard (CDB) Inc.		20%		
3	Astaldi S.P.A.	X		Via Giulio Vincenzo Bona N.65 Rome/Italy - 00144	Mario Lanciani, +39 6 417661 mlanciani@astaldi.com
4	Barnard-Dragados J.V.		X	701 Gold Avenue Bozeman, MT, US,59715	Kevin Ellerton, 1 (406) 586-1995 Kevin.Ellerton@barnard-inc.com
	• Managing Partner: Barnard of Canada, Inc.		50%		
	• Dragados Canada, Inc.		50%		
	• Pennecon as exclusive subcontractor				


APPENDIX A.3 PREQUALIFICATION APPLICATIONS RECEIVED

PACKAGE CH0007 INTAKE, POWERHOUSE, SPILLWAY AND TRANSITION DAMS

	Name	PC	JV	Address	Authorized Signing Officer
5	Impregilo S.p.A.	X		Via dei Missaglia, 97 Milan/Italy - 20142	Ing. Mario Lampiano, +39 02 44422111 impregilo@impregilo.it
6	IKC-ONE Civil Constructors, a Partnership		X	215 Water Street Atlantic Place, Suite 505 St. John's, NL, Canada, A1C 6C9	Stephen Paul Carter Jr. 1 (709) 738-6160
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sponsor: Innu-Kiewit Constructors; a partnership (IKC) 		40%		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> H.J. O'Connell Construction Ltd. 		20%		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neilson Inc. 		20%		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EBC Inc. 		20%		
7	Salini S.p.A.		X	Via della Dataria, 22 Rome/Italy - 00187	Claudio Lautizi, +39 06 6776903 d.onori@salini.it
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lead: Salini S.p.A 		50%		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FCC Construcción, S.A. 		50%		
8	OHL Construction Canada Inc.	X		1440 Ste. Catherine Street West, suite 410 Montreal, Quebec, Canada, H3G 1R8	Miguel Fraile 1 (514) 394-0865 mfraile@ohlcanada.com
9	Strabag Inc.	X		2520 Stanley Avenue Niagra Falls, Ontario, Canada, L2E 6S4	Ernst Gschnitzer 1 (905) 650-7906 Ernst.Gschnitzer@strabag.ca

 SNC • LAVALIN		Revision 00		
	PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION REPORT and RECOMMENDED BIDDERS LIST		Date	Page
	SLI Doc. No. 505573-CH0007-51BA-0001		27 August 2012	12

APPENDIX B – APPROVED PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION PLAN

 SNC-LAVALIN			Revision 00		
	PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION PLAN		Date		Page
	SLI Doc. No. 505 573-CH0007-518Q-0008		29-June-2012		1

Lower Churchill Project

Prequalification Evaluation Plan - Package CH0007

Date: 29-June-2012

Prepared by: SNC	Name	Signature
Contract Administrator	Ron Alamo	Ron Alamo
Lead Technical Evaluator	LAIRD PATON	LAIRD PATON
Health and Safety Coordinator	RANDY WALKER	Randy Walker
Environmental Coordinator	Michel Wawrzak	Michel Wawrzak
Quality Coordinator	WKM MORRISON	WKM MORRISON
Checked by SNC:		
Area Manager	LUC FROSTIE	LUC FROSTIE
Approved by SNC:		
Procurement Manager	Ellen	Ellen
Engineering Manager		
Health and Safety Manager	Sen Lee	Sen Lee
Environmental Manager	Michel Wawrzak	Michel Wawrzak
Quality Manager	WKM MORRISON	WKM MORRISON
Component 1 Manager		
Approved by Nalcor;		
Supply Chain Manager	(K) Scott O'Brien	Scott O'Brien
Nalcor Project Manager		

REVISION LIST

Revision						Remarks
N°	By	Check	Apr.	Apr.	Date	



 SNC • LAVALIN		Revision 00		
	PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION PLAN		Date	Page
	SLI Doc. No. 505573-CH0007-51BQ-0008		29-June-2012	ii

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND.....	1
2. OVERVIEW.....	1
3. PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION TEAM.....	2
4. COMMUNICATION WITH THE APPLICANTS	2
5. EVALUATION OF CATEGORIES – ELEMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED AND WEIGHTING.....	2
6. WEIGHTINGS FOR THE OVERALL SCORE.....	3
7. MINIMUM CRITERIA FOR ACCEPTANCE - PASS/FAIL SCORES	3
8. JOINT VENTURES	4
TABLES.....	5

 SNC-LAVALIN		Revision 00		
	PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION PLAN		Date	Page
	SLI Doc. No. 505573-CH0007-51BQ-0008		29-June-2012	1

1. PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

This report presents the method and criteria to be used in the evaluation of Applicants for Prequalification to bid on Package No. CH0007 – Construction of Intake, Powerhouse, Spillway and Transition Dams.

The Prequalification Document for Package CH0007 was issued on April 30th 2012. Six clarifications were also issued during the preparation period.

Applications were received on 29th June 2012. The evaluation to be executed in accordance with this report is structured around the questionnaires, and clarifications, that were part of the Prequalification Document.

2. OVERVIEW


The objective of the evaluation is to identify the five most qualified Applicants, who meet the standards set for prequalification.

In the first instance, the qualifications of each Applicant will be evaluated under five Categories: Technical Capability, Commercial Fitness, Health and Safety Record and Systems, Environmental Record and Systems and Quality Systems. The evaluation will be on a numerical basis; each Applicant will receive a score for each Category and the five Categories will be combined into one Overall Score by adding the weighted Category scores.

After the Overall Scores have been established, each Applicant will then be reviewed for compliance with the pass/fail criteria, which define the minimum standards needed to be considered for inclusion on the Bidder List. The five Applicants with the highest Overall Score, who meet all of the pass/fail criteria will be selected for the Bidders List.

Sections 5 and 6 of this report address the evaluation of Categories and Overall Score.

Sections 7 and 8 of this report address the pass/fail criteria.

 SNC-LAVALIN			Revision 00	
	PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION PLAN		Date	Page
	SLI Doc. No. 505573-CH0007-51BQ-0008		29-June-2012	2

3. PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION TEAM

The members of the Prequalification Evaluation Team, including area of focus and role, will be as follows:


Name	Area of Focus and Role
L. Paton	Technical Capability, Lead
G. Savard	Technical Capability, support, as required.
H. Bouzaiene	Technical Capability, support, as required.
Francois Raut	Technical Capability, support, as required.
T. Smith	Technical Capability, support, as required.
Randy Walker	Health and Safety
M. Wawrzkow	Environmental
Ken Morrison	Quality
J.D. Tremblay	Risk, included in Commercial
Ron Adamcyk	Commercial and Coordination of the Evaluation Report

4. COMMUNICATION WITH THE APPLICANTS

In performing the evaluations, the team may contact the Applicants to request additional information, as required. This will occur if Applicants have omitted to submit essential information; it is most likely to occur in situations where the Applicant has failed a criterion by a small margin; and consequently a prudent re-verification would be in order. All communication with the Applicants will be through the Contract Administrator.

5. EVALUATION OF CATEGORIES – ELEMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED AND WEIGHTING

In the first stage of the evaluation, the experience, capacity, organization, resources, systems, and record of performance will be evaluated in each of the following Categories: technical capability; commercial fitness; health and safety record and systems; environmental record and

 SNC-LAVALIN		Revision 00		
	PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION PLAN		Date	Page
	SLI Doc. No. 505573-CH0007-51BQ-0008		29-June-2012	3

systems and quality systems. Each of these Categories will be evaluated under the detailed set of elements which are identified in the Tables 1 to 5 (attached). The weightings to be allocated to each Element are also shown. Maximum score for each Category will be 100.

6. WEIGHTINGS FOR THE OVERALL SCORE

After evaluation of the scores for each of five Categories, an Overall Score will be calculated based on the following weightings:


Technical (T)	Commercial (C)	Health and Safety (H)	Environmental (E)	Quality (Q)
.45	.20	.10	.10	.15

Overall Score = .45 X T Score + .20 X C Score + .10 X H Score + .10 X E Score + .15 X Q Score

7. MINIMUM CRITERIA FOR ACCEPTANCE - PASS/FAIL SCORES

To be considered as a Bidder for Package CH0007, minimum pass/fail scores have been established for each Category of evaluation. Applicants must achieve the minimum score for each Category of evaluation as listed below. In addition, minimum scores have been established within the Commercial Category. This is necessary since certain commercial elements – such as the ability to provide bonding and financial viability - are absolutely essential if bids are to be received from healthy, robust companies. Applicants must meet all of the pass/fail criteria to be considered for inclusion on the Bidder list.


Category	Minimum Category Score	Minimum Score for Elements within the Category		Ref. Table
		Element	Minimum Score	
1. Technical Capability	60	N/A		1
2. Commercial	60			2
		Applicant not involved in Bankruptcy	5	2
		Financial Instruments to Perform	20/20	2
		Lower Churchill Construction Project Benefits	13/25	2
3. Health and Safety	70	N/A		3
4. Environmental	60	N/A		4
5. Quality	60	N/A		5

 SNC-LAVALIN		Revision 00		
	PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION PLAN		Date	Page
	SLI Doc. No. 505573-CH0007-51BQ-0008		29-June-2012	4

8. JOINT VENTURES

In the case of Applications from Joint Ventures or Partnerships, the following pass/fail criteria will also apply:

- a. Joint Venture shall collectively meet all of the listed criteria above.
- b. The Lead Partner shall be responsible for at least 30 to 40 percent of the work, including project management.
- c. Each partner shall meet the minimum category score for each of Health and Safety, Environment, Quality and Commercial
- d. Each partner shall meet the elements of the Technical Capability Category, for the work under its responsibility;
- e. The partners agree to be jointly and severally responsible for the execution of the work.

 SNC-LAVALIN		Revision 00		
	PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION PLAN		Date	Page
	SLI Doc. No. 505573-CH0007-51BQ-0008		29-June-2012	5

TABLES

- Table 1 Technical Capability, Elements for Evaluation and Weighting for Each Element
- Table 2 Commercial Fitness, Elements for Evaluation and Weighting for Each Element
- Table 3 Health and Safety, Elements for Evaluation and Weighting for Each Element
- Table 4 Environmental, Elements for Evaluation and Weighting for Each Element
- Table 5 Quality Systems, Elements for Evaluation and Weighting for Each Element

END

Table 1 - Technical Capability, Elements for Evaluation and Weighting for Each Element

Element	Weight for Element	Minimum Score
1.0 EXPERIENCE		
<p>1.2 Number of contracts undertaken in the last 10 years which are of a similar nature and complexity as Package CH0007 for Prequalification.</p> <p>Requirement for minimum score of 10, = at least one contract executed of similar nature and complexity and with at least 150,000 m3 of concrete placed</p>	20	
2.0 TECHNICAL SPECIFIC		
<p>2.1 Experience in production of concrete and/or operation of concrete batching plants. Projects where the Applicant was responsible for concrete production including the aggregate fabrication, mix design and quality control:</p>	3	
<p>2.2 Experience in placing concrete in an environment with climatic conditions similar to Labrador? Applicant to describe the protection measures taken for concreting during the cold months and indicate the average and peak concreting production achieved during the cold period and summer period?</p>	10	
<p>2.3 Experience in fabricating and installing steel superstructure.</p>	3	
<p>2.4 Applicant has a satisfactory organization with respect to Design work.</p>	3	
<p>2.5 Applicant would be able to mobilize its equipment and team in a timely manner.</p>	3	
<p>2.6 Experience in construction of large Hydro Electric Powerhouses.</p>	10	
<p>2.7 Experience in construction of large Gated Spillways.</p>	6	
<p>2.8 Experience in construction of concrete gravity dams.</p>	2	
<p>2.9 Applicant has satisfactory organization/arrangements in place for the execution of specialized formwork, such as the formwork for draft tube and spiral case.</p>	2	
<p>2.10 Experience in rock plug excavation (submerged rock).</p>	2	
<p>2.11 Experience in bridge construction</p>	2	
<p>2.12 Applicant appears to have proper organization for planning concrete pours.</p>	2	
3.0 ORGANIZATION AND RESOURCES		
<p>3.1 Project and Site Organization</p>		
<p>3.1.1 Project and Site Organization that would execute the scope of work of package CH0007. As a minimum the chart should show the positions for Project Manager, Quality Assurance Manager, Chief Design Engineer, Planning and Scheduling Manager, Material Manager (including procurement, inspection, expediting and logistics), Site Manager, and the key area superintendents. Include CVs for the key roles including the number of years of experience that the individual has in the position to be filled, and in hydro power work.</p> <p>Requirement for minimum score of 5, for item 3.1.1 = Applicant shall have proposed qualified personnel to fill the positions defined in the organization chart. In general, Managers shall have a minimum of 15 years experience overall, with minimum of 5 years experience in the position identified on the organization chart. In addition, the Project Manager, the Construction Manager and a significant number of the key area superintendants shall have previous hydro experience.</p>	15	

Table 1 - Technical Capability, Elements for Evaluation and Weighting for Each Element

Element	Weight for Element	Minimum Score
1.0 EXPERIENCE		
3.2 Subcontracting		
3.2.1 Applicant has policies, processes and procedures to select and qualify its subcontractors, suppliers and sub-suppliers.	1	
3.2.2 Applicant has policies, processes and procedures to monitor its subcontractors, suppliers and sub-suppliers.	1	
3.2.3 Applicant has free access to its suppliers, sub-suppliers and subcontractors plants, productions, manufacturing, service or other facilities for quality auditing, monitoring, inspecting or surveillance.	1	
3.3 Off Site Resources		
3.3.1 Applicant has described types of work that it would typically sub-contract.	1	
3.3.2 Applicant appears to have satisfactory facilities that would be used for the Package for Contract CH0007, including the square measure of fabrication facilities, offices, repair facilities, lay-down area, warehouse space, wharfage or other facilities relevant to the Scope of Work.	1	
3.3.3 Applicant appears to have satisfactory number of management, engineering, supervision, trades, employees and any other relevant categories for the personnel working at the locations covered in this Section 3.3.2.	1	
3.3.4 Applicant appears to have satisfactory equipment relevant to the execution of the Package for Prequalification.	2	
3.3.5 Given the Work loading, for the facilities and equipment covered in this Section 3.3, during the timeframe in which the work described for the Package for Prequalification it appears that the Applicant would be able to perform in the time frame indicated.	1	
3.4 Site Resources		
3.4.1 The portions of the Work that the Applicant would subcontract are identified and appear appropriate and effective.	4	
3.4.2 Applicant's list of equipment to perform the Work (construction plant) appears reasonable. In addition, Applicant has an appropriate and effective plan for mobilizing the construction plant to Site.	2	
3.4.4 Applicant appears to have the necessary internal administrative systems and software for the Work. In the case of a Joint Venture, Applicant has an appropriate plan to achieve integration of operations with respect to internal systems and software to be used.	2	
	100	60

Score Evaluation Guide (As a % of the Weight)
 0% - Question not answered or no relevant information provided in response.
 20% - Response does not meet key criteria.
 40% - Response only meets a few of the key criteria.
 60% - Response meets a majority of the key criteria.
 80% - Response meets all of key criteria.
 100%- Response meets and exceeds key criteria.

Table 2 - Commercial Fitness, Elements for Evaluation and Weighting for Each Element

Element	Weight for Element	Minimum Score
Supplier / Commercial Information		
1.0 Details of Applicant Complete	2	
2.0 Details of Organization Complete	2	
3.0 Current Contract Commitments Plus contract for prequalification, compared to the Annual revenue last 3 years, indicate Applicant not overextended.	5	
4.2 Annual revenue over the last 3 years, is at least twice the annual cash flow of the Package for Prequalification.	5	
4.4 Upper limit of Applicant's confirmed bidding range is consistent with the budget for Package CH0007.	5	
Financial Health of the Applicant		
4.2 Annual Revenue, Profit and Debt/Asset Ratio, last 3 years, indicate healthy company; and confirmed by submitted financial statements.	16	
4.10 Applicant not presently involved in any bankruptcy or reorganization proceedings.	5	5
Financial instruments to Perform		20
4.5 Lines of Credit sufficient for Peak Monthly Cash Flow	10	
4.6 Can you supply Performance/Payment bonds? Or 4.7 Letter of Credit?	10	
Contract Administration Performance		
4.9 No Arbitration or Litigation, against Applicant in Last 5 years	2	
4.10 No judgements, claims or suits pending or outstanding against Applicant Business	2	
4.10 Applicant has never cancelled a contract before completion of the work.	2	
4.10 Applicant has never had a draw down on a letter of credit issued for a contract.	2	
There are no issues identified under the headings above that would indicate a trend to negative contract administration.	2	
Lower Churchill Construction Project Benefits Strategy		13
5.1 Read Benefits Strategy & will Comply	10	
5.2 Previous relevant Experience working on projects with a local benefits strategy similar to Lower Churchill.	6	
5.3 Applicant has a named Individual responsible for Newfoundland and Labrador Benefits	3	
5.5 Previous relevant Experience Working with Aboriginal Groups?	2	
5.7 Has Applicant registered with any of the listed aboriginal groups?	2	
5.8 Applicant has Applicant/Aboriginal JVs	2	
Risk Management		
Applicant appears to have a culture supporting proactive risk identification, consistent with Lower Churchill Project.	5	
Score	100	60

Score Evaluation Guide (As a % of the Weight)
 0% - Question not answered or no relevant information provided in response.
 20% - Response does not meet key criteria.
 40% - Response only meets a few of the key criteria.
 60% - Response meets a majority of the key criteria.
 80% - Response meets all of key criteria.
 100% - Response meets and exceeds key criteria.

Table 3 Health and Safety - Elements for Evaluation and Weighting for Each Element

Scoring Guide:
0 - Question not answered or no relevant information provided in response
1 - Response does not meet key Criteria
2 - Response only meets a few of the key criteria
3 - Response meets a majority of the key criteria
4 - Response meets all key criteria
5 - Response meets and exceeds key criteria

Element	Element Weight	Minimum Score
Health and Safety		
2.0 HEALTH AND SAFETY MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE - Please provide the following safety statistics, referencing the attached incident definitions and frequency calculation.	10	
3.0 WORKER'S COMPENSATION - Indicate the jurisdiction where you are registered. List your overall Worker's Compensation industry rating for the current year and past three (3) years. Attach a WCB clearance letter and experience rating statements for the past three years.	3	
4.1 HEALTH AND SAFETY SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS - Do you have a certificate of recognition or is your health and safety management system certified by an outside agency? (OHSAS 18001, CSA Z-1000 etc.) If yes, provide a copy of the certificate.	2	
4.2 HEALTH AND SAFETY SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS - Does your health and safety program have a policy statement that clearly outlines the Company's commitment to health and safety?	3	
4.3 HEALTH AND SAFETY SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS - Has your company received an occupational health and safety stop work order, charges or equivalent from any regulator in the last three (3) years? If yes, provide details.	3	
4.4 HEALTH AND SAFETY SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS - Please list the highest ranking safety professional in your organization: (attach résumé). Do you plan to have a safety representative(s) for this Work full time or part time (Y or N)? If "Yes", provide a résumé(s).	3	
4.5 HEALTH AND SAFETY SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS - Does your health and safety management system address the following key elements? Management leadership and commitment; hazard/risk identification, evaluation and control; risk assessments on all critical and non-routine jobs/job functions; a permit to work system; ongoing inspection. If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).	8	
4.6 HEALTH AND SAFETY SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS - Does your health and safety management system include work practices and procedures, such as: Lockout and tagout; traffic control; excavation and trenching; confined space entry; hoisting and rigging; working near power lines; handling and transporting hazardous substances; unloading large/long materials (such as piles); vehicle recovery. If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).	8	
4.7 HEALTH AND SAFETY SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS - Do you have written programs for the following? Duty to refuse work; fall protection; noise management; workplace violence; working alone; personal protective equipment (PPE); WHMIS (Workplace Hazardous Materials Information System); respiratory protection. If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s). In regards to respiratory protection, have your employees been: trained? fit tested? medically approved?	8	
4.8 HEALTH AND SAFETY SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS - Do you conduct medical exams for the following? Pre-employment; replacement job capacity; pulmonary; respiratory. If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).	2	
4.9 HEALTH AND SAFETY SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS - Do you have a drug and alcohol program? If "Yes", does it include the following? Pre-employment testing; testing for cause; post incident testing; formalized arrangements with a collection and testing agency (if "Yes", provide testing agency information); does your drug and alcohol policy follow the guidelines as laid out in The Canadian Model for Providing A Safe Workplace - Alcohol and Drug Guidelines and Work Rule Version 2 - Effective October 1, 2010? If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).	3	
4.10 HEALTH AND SAFETY SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS - Equipment (Tools, Supplies, Machinery and Sanitary Facilities): Do you have a written list of equipment requiring pre-use inspections? Do you have a documented list of equipment requiring scheduled servicing in accordance with manufacturer's recommendations, legislated requirements, and industry standards? Is frequency of equipment inspections and maintenance identified? Are corrections of deficiencies documented? Do you have follow-up mechanism for corrective actions? If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).	4	

Table 3 Health and Safety - Elements for Evaluation and Weighting for Each Element

Element	Element Weight	Minimum Score
4.11 HEALTH AND SAFETY SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS - Orientation Program: Do you have a health and safety orientation program? Does the program include new, transferred and temporary workers? Does the program provide instruction on the following: employer health and safety responsibilities; employee health and safety responsibilities; obligation to refuse imminent danger work; progressive discipline policies and procedures; safe work practices and/or procedures; emergency response procedures; first-aid procedures; incident/near miss reporting; does your orientation program include a quiz? If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).	5	
4.12 HEALTH AND SAFETY SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS - Incident Investigation: Do you have a written procedure for incident reporting and investigation? Do you utilize a root cause determination process such as "Tap-Root"? If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).	5	
4.13 HEALTH AND SAFETY SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS - Do you have an emergency response plan related to activities and specific locations? If yes reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).	4	
4.14 HEALTH AND SAFETY SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS - Do you have a policy pertaining to prohibited items on (e.g. knives, firearms)? Are all employees made aware of the prohibited items policy and is it enforced? If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).	1	
4.15 HEALTH AND SAFETY SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS - Do you make reference to following legislative requirements where work is being performed?; violence policies and procedures; harassment policies and procedures. If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).	1	
4.16 HEALTH AND SAFETY SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS - Do you have a policy or specific rules with respect to the use of personnel protective equipment (PPE)? Do you have a formal process in place for determining PPE requirements? If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).	3	
4.17 HEALTH AND SAFETY SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS - Contractor Management: Do you pre-qualify subcontractors? Do you include subcontractors in: orientations, health and safety meetings, inspections, audits. If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).	5	
4.18 HEALTH AND SAFETY SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS - Communications: Do you inform employees and subcontractors on Health and Safety alerts, programs, practices, procedures, rules, revisions and related information? Do you have a joint Health and Safety committee? Do you hold scheduled safety meetings, such as weekly general safety meetings for all crew and weekly departmental meetings for each department at all worksites? Are Health and Safety meeting minutes and attendance recorded? If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).	5	
4.19 HEALTH AND SAFETY SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS - Does your Health and Safety program outline the requirements for supervisors and employees to conduct regular Health and Safety inspections of equipment and work conditions at all worksite(s)? If yes reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).	3	
4.20 HEALTH AND SAFETY SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS - Does your Health and Safety program require the prompt reporting of hazardous conditions at all worksite(s)? If yes reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).	5	
4.21 HEALTH AND SAFETY SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS - Health and Safety Training: Have your employees received the required Health and Safety training and retraining? Do you have a specific Health and Safety training program for supervisors? If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).	3	
4.22 HEALTH AND SAFETY SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS - Training Records: Do you have Health and Safety training records for your employees? How do you verify competency of the training (job monitoring? written test? competency check? oral test? other?). Are all training records available upon request? If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).	3	
Score	100	70
Percentag		

Table 4 Environmental - Elements for Evaluation and Weighting for Each Element

Scoring Guide		
0 - Question not answered or no relevant information provided in response		
1 - Response does not meet key Criteria		
2 - Response only meets a few of the key criteria		
3 - Response meets a majority of the key criteria		
4 - Response meets all key criteria		
5 - Response meets and exceeds key criteria		
Element	Element Weight	Minimum Score
1. MANAGEMENT INVOLEMENT, LEADERSHIP AND ADMINISTRATION		
1.1 Environmental Management System (ISO or Not)?	4.0	
1.2 Adequacy of TOC (if provided)	3.0	
1.3 Adequacy of Environmental Policy (if provided)	3.0	
1.4 Are Environmental Performance Targets developed and reviewed on a regular basis?	3.0	
1.5 Adequacy of Environmental Performance Target development and review process	3.0	
1.6 Has a formal system, including the use of audits and inspections, been developed to define responsibilities for verifying that environmental performance objectives are met?	2.0	
1.7 Adequacy of audit and inspection information	2.0	
2. ENVIRONMENTAL HAZARD IDENTIFICATION AND RISK MANAGEMENT		
2.1 Does the Bidder conduct formal Risk Assessments when planning and implementing operations and activities?	2.0	
2.2 If "Yes", does that risk assessment include environmental risks?	1.5	
2.3 adequacy of Risk Management System in assessing probabilities and consequences associated with environmental risks	1.5	
2.4 Has a formal Hazard Observation Program been implemented at the Bidder's worksites?	1.0	
2.5 Adequacy of Hazard Observation Program in identifying environmental hazards and environmental non-compliances.	1.0	
3. ORGANIZATIONAL RULES AND WORK PROCEDURES		
3.1 Does the Bidder have documented environmental protection plans for all jobs/work activities?	1.5	
3.2 Does the Bidder have environmental contingency plans (i.e. spill response plans)?	1.5	
3.3 adequacy of contingency plans and organizational chart for relevant plans.	2.5	
3.4 Does the plan outline responsibilities, available resources and actions to be taken in the event of an environmental incident?	2.5	
4. EMPLOYEE KNOWLEDGE, TRAINING AND AWARENESS		
4.1 Does the Bidder have an environmental awareness program?	1.5	
4.2 Does the Bidder provide environmental awareness training to supervisory staff?	3.0	
4.3 What is frequency of environmental awareness training?	3.0	
5. PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS/ENVIRONMENT MEETINGS		
5.1 Are personal communications conducted to impart environmental awareness with other workers and thereby reducing the likelihood of non compliances or environmental incidents?	2.5	
5.2 Is there a system for sharing best practices and procedures, incidents and other information across the Bidder's organization?	2.5	
6. ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING AND REPORTING		
6.1 Has the Bidder developed specific procedures for environmental monitoring and reporting on incidents that occur at its worksites?	2.0	
6.2 Adequacy of monitoring and incident procedure	1.5	
6.3 Does the Bidder use an EMS system to establish standards, reporting and follow up and corrective action?	1.5	
6.4 Adequacy of this process	1.0	
6.5 Are supervisors formally trained in accident/investigations?	1.0	


Table 4 Environmental - Elements for Evaluation and Weighting for Each Element

Element	Element Weight	Minimum Score
6.6 Adequacy of training program and frequency	1.5	
6.7 Does the Bidder have dedicated environmental personnel?	2.0	
6.8 Adequacy of organization and roles	1.5	
7. ENVIRONMENTAL INCIDENT ANALYSIS		
7.1 Does the Bidder have in place a formal system for the collection, analysis, trending and evaluation of environmental incident data and statistical analysis?	1.5	
7.2 Does the Bidder develop monthly environmental incident analysis reports, which are reviewed during management review meetings?	1.5	
7.3 Does senior management review and comment on serious and significant environmental incidents?	1.5	
7.4 Are all incident reports followed through from recommendations to completion and closure?	1.5	
8. LEADERSHIP TRAINING		
8.1 Does Bidder's management receive formal environmental management training which provides a thorough understanding of the philosophies and principles behind environmental management?	2.0	
8.2 Adequacy of environmental management training	2.0	
8.3 Does the Bidder's management receive an orientation to the Bidder's Environmental Management System that includes an introduction to individual accountabilities and responsibilities?	2.0	
8.4 Adequacy of EMS orientation in communicating accountability and responsibility to management personnel.	2.0	
9. ENVIRONMENTAL AUDITS, INSPECTIONS AND PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE		
9.1 Is there a documented process for performing environmental audits?	2.5	
9.2 Has a formal process been developed to ensure routine environmental monitoring?	2.0	
9.3 Does the Bidder have planned preventative measures in place to prevent environmental incidents?	2.0	
10. ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE		
10.1 Has a systematic approach been developed to identify and inventory all tasks based on mandatory rules, regulations and applicable codes, guidelines and standards?	2.0	
10.2 Is there a formal process to assess the environmental requirements associated with the tasks to ensure compliance with the requirements?	2.0	
11. SYSTEMS REVIEW AND EVALUATION		
11.1 Does the Bidder's senior management conduct regular reviews of the Environmental Management System, at least annually or at more frequent intervals, as the organization may deem necessary?	2.0	
11.2 Do these reviews include environmental management policies and procedures and other inputs such as the results and recommendations from environmental audits, monitoring and surveys and analysis of incident investigations?	2.0	
12. STATISTICS		
12.1 Number and type of directives from clients or regulators	1.0	
12.2 Oil spill incidents;	1.5	
12.3 Waste management incidents;	1.5	
12.4 Hazardous materials incidents;	1.5	
12.5 Water degradation incidents;	1.5	
12.6 Air degradation incidents; and	1.5	
12.7 Soil degradation incidents.	1.5	
12.8 Total Environmental Incidents	2.0	
Score	100	60

Table 5 - Quality Systems - Elements for Evaluation and Maximum Score for Each Element

Scoring Guide:
0 - Question not answered or no relevant information provided in response
1 - Response does not meet key Criteria
2 - Response only meets a few of the key criteria
3 - Response meets a majority of the key criteria
4 - Response meets all key criteria
5 - Response meets and exceeds key criteria

	Element Weight	Minimum Score	
Quality Part A - To be Completed by all Proponents			
Q1. Does your company have a registered Quality Management System? If "yes" please provide a copy of the registration certificate. If "No" proceed to part B of the Questionnaire.	50		
Q2. If company has a registered Quality management system, please provide the Table of Contents of your Quality Manual.	50		
Score Part A	100	60.00	
Quality Part B - To be completed by proponents that "does not" have a registered ISO 9001:2008 QMS			
Q3. If you do not have a registered Quality Management System, please explain how your organization controls its processes to ensure that you meet the customer's requirements.	15		
Q4. Are there written procedures for your core processes? Please list.	15		
Q5. How do you ensure that your main subcontractors meet specified requirements (including requirements for Quality)?	15		
Q6. What are your processes for addressing problems and opportunities for improvement? Provide details.	10		
Q7. Do you have a documented audit schedule for both internal and external audits?	10		
Q8. What is your process for responding to customer complaints or corrective action requests?	10		
Q9. Describe your process for investigating the root cause of problems and implementing effective corrective action.	10		
Q10. Is there a procedure for management of hard copy and electronic records?	10		
Q11. Please provide contact information for two client references and details of products or services provided.	5		
Score Part B	100		60.00

 SNC • LAVALIN		Revision 00		
	PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION REPORT and RECOMMENDED BIDDERS LIST		Date	Page
	SLI Doc. No. 505573-CH0007-51BA-0001		27 August 2012	13

APPENDIX C FINDINGS

Table C.1 Ranking of Applicants in *Engineering News-Record Top 225 Global Contractors*

Applicant	Company or Ultimate Parent	ENR Top 225 Global Ranking (2011)	Revenue 2010 \$Million
Acciona Infrastructure Canada Inc	ACCIONA INFRAESTRUCTURAS , Madrid, Spain†	61	4,034
Aecon-Flatiron-Construction Demathieu & Bard – Joint Venture	AECON GROUP INC. , Toronto, Ontario, Canada	91	2,667
Astaldi S.P.A.	ASTALDI SPA , Rome, Italy	93	2,564
Barnard-Dragados J.V.	GRUPO ACS , Madrid, Spain†	9	20,631
Impregilo S.p.A.	IMPREGILO SPA , Milan, Italy†	96	2,472
IKC-ONE Civil Constructors, a Partnership	KIEWIT CORP. , Omaha, Neb., U.S.A.†	32	8,206
Salini S.p.A. /FCC Construcción, S.A JV	SALINI COSTRUTTORI SPA , Rome, Italy†	141	1,500
OHL Construction Canada Inc.	OHL , Madrid, Spain†	38	6,480
Strabag Inc.	STRABAG SE , Vienna, Austria†	22	12,777

Note: Top 225 Global means: The Top 225 Global Contractors list, published annually in August, ranks the 225 largest world construction contractors, both publicly and privately held, based on total construction contracting revenue regardless of where the projects were located

TABLE C.2 - SUMMARY OF THE PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION - PACKAGE CH0007

Category	Weight for Category	Minimum Score	Acciona	Aecon - Flatiron - Demathieu&B	Astaldi	Barnard	Impregilo	IKC-ONE	Salini	OHL	Strabag
			Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score
Technical			67.7	86	86.9	71.9	90.6	95.7	84.9	68.1	72.8
Technical	0.45	60									
Commercial			65.12	82.42	79.9	83.35	82	87.12	81.08	76.5	85.7
Commercial	0.20	60									
Health and Safety			72.2	73.2	71.2	72.6	70.6	77.8	70.4	70.2	70.2
Health and Safety	0.10	70									
Environmental			98.3	88.82	89.9	85.78	93.7	68.58	89.95	80.2	75.95
Environmental	0.10	60									
Quality			80	66	80	80	80	80	80	80	80
Quality	0.15	60									
Overall Score			72.54	81.29	83.20	76.86	85.60	87.13	82.46	72.99	76.52
RANK			9	5	3	6	2	1	4	8	7

Table C.3.1 - Scoring for Technical Capability Evaluation

Element	Weight for Element	Minimum Score	Acciona		Aecon		Astaldi		Barnard		Impregilo		IKC-ONE		Salini		Ohi		Strabag	
			Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score
1.0 EXPERIENCE																				
1.2 Number of contracts undertaken in the last 10 years which are of a similar nature and complexity as Package CH0007 for Prequalification.	20		50	10	65	13	85	17	75	15	100	20	100	20	100	20	75	15	90	18
Requirement for minimum score of 10, = at least one contract executed of similar nature and complexity and with at least 150,000 m3 of concrete placed																				
2.0 TECHNICAL SPECIFIC																				
2.1 Experience in production of concrete and/or operation of concrete batching plants. Projects where the Applicant was responsible for concrete production including the aggregate fabrication, mix design and quality control.	3		95	2.85	95	2.85	100	3	50	1.5	100	3	85	2.85	100	3	90	2.7	100	3
2.2 Experience in placing concrete in an environment with climatic conditions similar to Labrador? Applicant to describe the protection measures taken for concreting during the cold months and indicate the average and peak concreting production achieved during the cold period and summer period?	10		80	8	95	9.5	80	8	40	4	95	9.5	100	10	75	7.5	25	2.5	25	2.5
2.3 Experience in fabricating and installing steel superstructure.	3		95	2.85	95	2.85	95	2.85	95	2.85	95	2.85	95	2.85	95	2.85	95	2.85	95	2.85
2.4 Applicant has a satisfactory organization with respect to Design work.	3		95	2.85	95	2.85	95	2.85	40	1.2	95	2.85	95	2.85	75	2.25	100	3	100	3
2.5 Applicant would be able to mobilize its equipment and team in a timely manner.	3		80	2.4	80	2.4	90	2.7	100	3	100	3	80	2.4	90	2.7	80	2.4	80	2.4
2.6 Experience in construction of large Hydro Electric Powerhouses.	10		50	5	85	8.5	80	8	85	8.5	100	10	95	9.5	100	10	85	8.5	95	9.5
2.7 Experience in construction of large Gated Spillways.	6		80	4.8	80	4.8	90	5.4	95	5.7	100	6	95	5.7	100	6	80	4.8	95	5.7
2.8 Experience in construction of concrete gravity dams.	2		95	1.9	95	1.9	95	1.9	95	1.9	100	2	75	1.5	80	1.6	85	1.7	75	1.5
2.9 Applicant has satisfactory organization/arrangements in place for the execution of specialized formwork, such as the formwork for draft tube and spiral case.	2		95	1.9	95	1.9	95	1.9	95	1.9	100	2	100	2	95	1.9	95	1.9	90	1.8
2.10 Experience in rock plug excavation (submerged rock).	2		95	1.9	95	1.9	95	1.9	95	1.9	95	1.9	100	2	95	1.9	75	1.5	75	1.5
2.11 Experience in bridge construction	2		100	2	100	2	100	2	100	2	100	2	95	1.9	100	2	100	2	100	2
2.12 Applicant appears to have proper organization for planning concrete pours.	2		85	1.7	90	1.8	80	1.6	100	2	95	1.9	77	1.54	90	1.8	95	1.9	85	1.7
3.0 ORGANIZATION AND RESOURCES																				
3.1 Project and Site Organization																				
3.1.1 Project and Site Organization that would execute the scope of work of package CH0007. As a minimum the chart should show the positions for Project Manager, Quality Assurance Manager, Chief Design Engineer, Planning and Scheduling Manager, Material Manager (including procurement, inspection, expediting and logistics), Site Manager, and the key area superintendents. Include CVs for the key roles including the number of years of experience that the individual has in the position to be filled, and in hydro power work.	15		29	4.35	100	15	83	12.45	47	7.05	74	11.1	95	14.25	61	9.15	39	5.85	45	6.75
Requirement for minimum score of 5, for item 3.1.1 = Applicant shall have proposed qualified personnel to fill the positions defined in the organization chart. In general, Managers shall have a minimum of 15 years experience overall, with minimum of 5 years experience in the position identified on the organization chart. In addition, the Project Manager, the Construction Manager and a significant number of the key area superintendents shall have previous hydro experience.																				

Table C.3.1 - Scoring for Technical Capability Evaluation

Element	Weight for Element	Minimum Score	Acciona		Aecon		Astaldi		Barnard		Impregilo		IKC-ONE		Saiani		Ohi		Strabag		
			Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	
			3.2 Subcontracting																		
3.2.1 Applicant has policies, processes and procedures to select and qualify its subcontractors, suppliers and sub-suppliers.	1		95	0.95	100	1	95	0.95	60	0.6	60	0.6	95	0.95	30	0.3	95	0.95	20	0.2	
3.2.2 Applicant has policies, processes and procedures to monitor its subcontractors, suppliers and sub-suppliers.	1		95	0.95	60	0.6	60	0.6	95	0.95	95	0.95	95	0.95	30	0.3	100	1	60	0.6	
3.2.3 Applicant has free access to its suppliers, sub-suppliers and subcontractors plants, productions, manufacturing, service or other facilities for quality auditing, monitoring, inspecting or surveillance.	1		95	0.95	95	0.95	95	0.95	95	0.95	95	0.95	95	0.95	95	0.95	95	0.95	95	0.95	
3.3 Off Site Resources																					
3.3.1 Applicant has described types of work that it would typically sub-contract.	1		95	0.95	100	1	40	0.4	40	0.4	70	0.7	100	1	50	0.5	35	0.35	20	0.2	
3.3.2 Applicant appears to have satisfactory facilities that would be used for the Package for Contract CH0007, including the square measure of fabrication facilities, offices, repair facilities, lay-down area, warehouse space, wharfage or other facilities relevant to the Scope of Work.	1		60	0.6	95	0.95	95	0.95	95	0.95	50	0.5	95	0.95	100	1	60	0.6	95	0.95	
3.3.3 Applicant appears to have satisfactory number of management, engineering, supervision, trades, employees and any other relevant categories for the personnel working at the locations covered in this Section 3.3.2.	1		95	0.95	40	0.4	95	0.95	100	1	60	0.6	95	0.95	20	0.2	80	0.8	20	0.2	
3.3.4 Applicant appears to have satisfactory equipment relevant to the execution of the Package for Prequalification.	2		100	2	95	1.9	95	1.9	100	2	95	1.9	95	1.9	95	1.9	95	1.9	95	1.9	
3.3.5 Given the Work loading, for the facilities and equipment covered in this Section 3.3, during the timeframe in which the work described for the Package for Prequalification it appears that the Applicant would be able to perform in the time frame indicated.	1		100	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	
3.4 Site Resources																					
3.4.1 The portions of the Work that the Applicant would subcontract are identified and appear appropriate and effective.	4		95	3.8	100	4	95	3.8	50	2	40	1.6	100	4	80	3.2	20	0.8	20	0.8	
3.4.2 Applicant's list of equipment to perform the Work (construction plant) appears reasonable. In addition, Applicant has an appropriate and effective plan for mobilizing the construction plant to Site.	2		100	2	95	1.9	95	1.9	100	2	95	1.9	95	1.9	95	1.9	95	1.9	95	1.9	
3.4.4 Applicant appears to have the necessary internal administrative systems and software for the Work. In the case of a Joint Venture, Applicant has an appropriate plan to achieve integration of operations with respect to internal systems and software to be used.	2		50	1	50	1	95	1.9	75	1.5	90	1.8	90	1.8	50	1	60	1.2	95	1.9	
	100	60	67.7		68.0		66.8		71.9		60.6		95.7		84.8		68.1		72.8		
Score Evaluation Guide (As a % of the Weight)																					
0% - Question not answered or no relevant information provided in response.																					
20% - Response does not meet key criteria.																					
40% - Response only meets a few of the key criteria.																					
60% - Response meets a majority of the key criteria.																					
80% - Response meets all of key criteria.																					
100% - Response meets and exceeds key criteria.																					

Element	Weight for Element	Minimum Score	Acciona		Aecon - Flatiron - Demathieu&Bard JV		Astaldi		Barnard		Impregilo		IKC-ONE		Salini		OHL		Strabag		
			Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	
Supplier / Commercial Information																					
1.0 Details of Applicant Complete	2		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1.4	2	2						
2.0 Details of Organization Complete	2		2	2	2	2	2	2	1.2	2	2	1.2	2	2	1.2						
3.0 Current Contract Commitments Plus contract for prequalification, compared to the Annual revenue last 3 years, indicate Applicant not overextended.	5																				
4.2 Applicant Annual revenue over the last 3 years, is at least twice the annual cash flow of the Package for Prequalification (240 Million) for 60% of points, three times for 80%.	5		5	4.4	3	5	3	5	3	5	5	4.5	5	5	5						
4.4 Upper limit of Applicant's confirmed bidding range is consistent with the budget for Package CH0007.	5		5	5	5	4	5	5	4.6	5	5	5	5	5	5						
Financial Health of the Applicant																					
Financial Health of the Applicant: Financial Score based on 2 points for each year of profit in 2009 to 2011; 4 points for Debt to Asset Ratio – 4 points for 60%, to 0 for 100% - ; and 6 points for Current Assets to Current Liabilities Ratio – 2 Points for 1 Increasing to 6 points for 2.5	16																				
4.10 Applicant not presently involved in any bankruptcy or reorganization proceedings.	5	5	10.92	11.66	10.30	11.85	11.00	13.71	9.98	7.40	11.60										
Financial Instruments to Perform																					
4.5 Lines of Credit sufficient for Peak Monthly Cash Flow	10																				
4.6 Applicant able to supply Performance and Payment bonds based on Letter from Surety	10																				
Contract Administration Performance																					
4.9 No Arbitration or Litigation, against Applicant in Last 5 years	2		2	0.72	1	1.1	1.6	0.66	1.4	1.2	2										
4.10 No Judgements, claims or suits pending or outstanding against Applicant Business	2		2	2	2	1.6	2	1.12	2	0.8	2										
4.10 Applicant has never cancelled a contract before completion of the work.	2		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2										
4.10 Applicant has never had a draw down on a letter of credit issued for a contract.	2		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2										
There are no issues identified under the headings above that would indicate a trend to negative contract administration.	2		1.6	1.52	1	1.2	1.6	1.2	1.4	1.2	2										
Lower Churchill Construction Project Benefits Strategy																					
5.1 Read Benefits Strategy & will Comply	10		10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10										
5.2 Previous relevant Experience working on projects with a local benefits strategy similar to Lower Churchill.	6		0	2.16	3.6	4.2	3.6	4.2	4.2	3.6	3.6										
5.3 Applicant has a named individual responsible for Newfoundland and Labrador Benefits	3		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3										
5.5 Previous relevant Experience Working with Aboriginal Groups?	2		1.6	0.96	0	1.6	0	1.64	0	0	0										
5.7 Has Applicant registered with any of the listed aboriginal groups?	2		0	0	0	0	0	0.72	0	0	0										
5.8 Applicant has Applicant/Aboriginal JVs	2		0	0	0	0	0	0.72	0	0	0										
Risk Management																					
Score Evaluation Guide (As a % of the Weight)																					
0% - Question not answered or no relevant information provided in response.																					
20% - Response does not meet key criteria.																					
40% - Response only meets a few of the key criteria.																					
60% - Response meets a majority of the key criteria.																					
80% - Response meets all of key criteria.																					
100% - Response meets and exceeds key criteria.																					
			2	3	3	3	4	80	4	3	2.5	3.5									
			65.12	82.42	79.9	83.35	82	87.12	81.08	76.5	85.7										

RFP Health and Safety Evaluation

RFP #:

RFP Name:

Scoring Guide:

- 0 - Question not answered or no relevant information provided in response
- 1 - Response does not meet key Criteria
- 2 - Response only meets a few of the key criteria
- 3 - Response meets a majority of the key criteria
- 4 - Response meets all key criteria
- 5 - Response meets and exceeds key criteria

Question Weight (%)	Acciona		Aecon		Astaldi		Barnard		Impregilo		IKC-ONE		Salini		OHL		Strabag		
	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	
Health and Safety																			
1.0 HEALTH AND SAFETY MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE - Please provide the following safety statistics, referencing the attached incident definitions and frequency calculation.	10	4	8	3	6	4	8	4	8	2	4	4	8	4	8	4	8	2	4
2.0 WORKER'S COMPENSATION RATES - Indicate the jurisdiction where you are registered. List your overall Worker's Compensation Industry rating for the current year and past three (3) years. Attach a WCB clearance letter and experience rating statements for the past three years.	3	3	1.8	3	1.8	3	1.8	3	1.8	0	0	4	2.4	3	1.8	3	1.8	2	1.2
3. H&S MANAGEMENT SYSTEM CERTIFICATION - Do you have a certificate of recognition or is your health and safety management system certified by an outside agency? (OHSAS 18001, CSA Z-1000 etc.) If yes, provide a copy of the certificate.	2	3	1.2	4	1.6	3	1.2	4	1.6	4	1.6	4	1.6	3	1.2	4	1.6	3	1.2
4. H&S POLICY STATEMENT - Does your health and safety program have a policy statement that clearly outlines the Company's commitment to health and safety?	3	4	2.4	4	2.4	4	2.4	4	2.4	4	2.4	4	2.4	4	2.4	4	2.4	4	2.4
5. REGULATORY COMPLIANCE PERFORMANCE - Has your company received an occupational health and safety stop work order, charges or equivalent from any regulator in the last three (3) years? If yes, provide details.	3	4	2.4	4	2.4	4	2.4	4	2.4	4	2.4	4	2.4	4	2.4	4	2.4	4	2.4
6. SAFETY PROFESSIONALS - Please list the highest ranking safety professional in your organization: (attach résumé). Do you plan to have a safety representative(s) for this Work full time or part time (Y or N)? If "Yes", provide a résumé(s).	3	4	2.4	4	2.4	4	2.4	3	1.8	4	2.4	4	2.4	4	2.4	3	1.8	4	2.4

<p>7. KEY PROGRAM ELEMENTS - Does your health and safety management system address the following key elements? Management leadership and commitment; hazard/risk identification, evaluation and control; risk assessments on all critical and non-routine jobs/job functions; a permit to work system; ongoing inspection. If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).</p>	8	4	6.4	4	6.4	4	6.4	4	6.4	4	6.4	4	6.4	4	6.4	4	6.4	4	6.4
<p>8. KEY PROGRAM ELEMENTS - Does your health and safety management system include work practices and procedures, such as: Lockout and tagout; traffic control; excavation and trenching; confined space entry; hoisting and rigging; working near power lines; handling and transporting hazardous substances; unloading large/long materials (such as piles); vehicle recovery. If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).</p>	8	4	6.4	4	6.4	4	6.4	4	6.4	4	6.4	4	6.4	4	6.4	4	6.4	4	6.4
<p>9. WRITTEN PROGRAM ELEMENTS - Do you have written programs for the following? Duty to refuse work; fall protection; noise management; workplace violence; working alone; personal protective equipment (PPE); WHMIS (Workplace Hazardous Materials Information System); respiratory protection. If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s). In regards to respiratory protection, have your employees been: trained? fit tested? medically approved?</p>	8	3	4.8	4	6.4	4	6.4	4	6.4	4	6.4	4	6.4	4	6.4	4	6.4	4	6.4
<p>10. MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS - Do you conduct medical exams for the following? Pre-employment; replacement job capacity; pulmonary; respiratory. If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).</p>	2	0	0	4	1.6	4	1.6	3	1.2	4	1.6	4	1.6	3	1.2	3	1.2	4	1.6
<p>11. DRUG AND ALCOHOL PROGRAM - Do you have a drug and alcohol program? If "Yes", does it include the following? Pre-employment testing; testing for cause; post incident testing; formalized arrangements with a collection and testing agency (if "Yes", provide testing agency information); does your drug and alcohol policy follow the guidelines as laid out in The Canadian Model for Providing A Safe Workplace -- Alcohol and Drug Guidelines and Work Rule Version 2 -- Effective October 1, 2010? If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).</p>	3	2	1.2	4	2.4	0	0	4	2.4	2	1.2	3	1.8	0	0	0	0	0	0

<p>12. TOOL AND EQUIPMENT PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE, USAGE AND INSPECTIONS : Do you have a written list of equipment requiring pre-use inspections? Do you have a documented list of equipment requiring scheduled servicing in accordance with manufacturer's recommendations, legislated requirements, and industry standards? Is frequency of equipment inspections and maintenance identified? Are corrections of deficiencies documented? Do you have follow-up mechanism for corrective actions? If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).</p>	4	4	3.2	3	2.4	4	3.2	3	2.4	4	3.2	4	3.2	3	2.4	4	3.2	3	2.4
<p>13. ORIENTATION PROGRAM - Do you have a health and safety orientation program? Does the program include new, transferred and temporary workers? Does the program provide instruction on the following: employer health and safety responsibilities; employee health and safety responsibilities; obligation to refuse imminent danger work; progressive discipline policies and procedures; safe work practices and/or procedures; emergency response procedures; first-aid procedures; incident/near miss reporting; does your orientation program include a quiz? If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).</p>	5	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3
<p>14. INCIDENT REPORTING AND INVESTIGATION - Do you have a written procedure for incident reporting and investigation? Do you utilize a root cause determination process such as "Tap-Root"? If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).</p>	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
<p>15. EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM - Do you have an emergency response plan related to activities and specific locations? If yes reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).</p>	4	3	2.4	3	2.4	3	2.4	3	2.4	3	2.4	3	2.4	4	3.2	3	2.4	4	3.2
<p>16. FIREARM AND WEAPON POLICY - Do you have a policy pertaining to prohibited items on (e.g. knives, firearms)? Are all employees made aware of the prohibited items policy and is it enforced? If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).</p>	1	4	0.8	4	0.8	0	0	4	0.8	4	0.8	3	0.6	0	0	4	0.8	4	0.8
<p>17. LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY COMPLIANCE PROGRAM - Do you make reference to following legislative requirements where work is being performed? violence policies and procedures; harassment policies and procedures. If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).</p>	1	4	0.8	4	0.8	4	0.8	4	0.8	4	0.8	4	0.8	3	0.6	4	0.8	4	0.8

Table C.3.3 Scoring for Health and Safety Evaluation

18. PERSONAL PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT PROGRAM - Do you have a policy or specific rules with respect to the use of personnel protective equipment (PPE)? Do you have a formal process in place for determining PPE requirements? If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).	3	4	2.4	4	2.4	4	2.4	4	2.4	4	2.4	3	1.8	4	2.4	4	2.4	4	2.4
19. CONTRACTOR MANAGEMENT - Do you pre-qualify subcontractors?; Do you include subcontractors in: orientations, health and safety meetings, inspections, audits. If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4
20. COMMUNICATIONS - Do you inform employees and subcontractors on Health and Safety alerts, programs, practices, procedures, rules, revisions and related information? Do you have a joint Health and Safety committee? Do you hold scheduled safety meetings, such as weekly general safety meetings for all crew and weekly departmental meetings for each department at all worksites? Are Health and Safety meeting minutes and attendance recorded? If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
21. SUPERVISOR SAFETY INSPECTIONS - Does your Health and Safety program outline the requirements for supervisors and employees to conduct regular Health and Safety inspections of equipment and work conditions at all worksite(s)? If yes reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).	3	3	1.8	4	2.4	3	1.8	3	1.8	4	2.4	4	2.4	4	2.4	3	1.8	4	2.4
22. HAZARD REPORTING - Does your Health and Safety program require the prompt reporting of hazardous conditions at all worksite(s)? If yes reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).	5	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
23. HEALTH AND SAFETY TRAINING Have your employees received the required Health and Safety training and retraining? Do you have a specific Health and Safety training program for supervisors? If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).	3	4	2.4	4	2.4	3	1.8	3	1.8	4	2.4	4	2.4	3	1.8	3	1.8	4	2.4
24. TRAINING RECORDS - Do you have Health and Safety training records for your employees? How do you verify competency of the training (job monitoring? written test? competency check? oral test? other?). Are all training records available upon request? If yes to any of these, reference appropriate Health and Safety manual section(s).	3	4	2.4	3	1.8	3	1.8	4	2.4	4	2.4	4	2.4	3	1.8	4	2.4	4	2.4
Score	100	72.20		73.20		71.20		72.60		70.60		77.80		72.20		72.00		70.20	
Percentage		72.20%		73.20%		71.20%		72.60%		70.60%		77.80%		72.20%		72.00%		70.20%	
Pass/Fail		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass	

Company does not have Employee	All areas evaluated meets the H&S	All areas evaluated meets the H&S	H&S Management system is adequate	Overall H&S program and documentation	Strong overall H&S Program	H&S Management system is adequate	All areas evaluated meets the H&S	H&S Management system is adequate
--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

medical program as required. Remainder of H&S Management System meets the requirements	requirements of the evaluation program	requirements of the evaluation program	but lacks active employee Drug and Alcohol Program in alignment with the Canadian Model	meets the requirements. Company did not provide H&S Injury performance as requested.		but lacks active employee Drug and Alcohol Program in alignment with the Canadian Model	requirements of the evaluation program	but lacks active employee Drug and Alcohol Program in alignment with the Canadian Model
--	--	--	---	--	--	---	--	---

Minimum Pass Score is 70%

Evaluated By	Sean Lee
Reviewed By	Randy Walker
Review Date	2012-08-02

Table C.3.5 Scoring for Quality Evaluation

Scoring Guide: EQI Stage

0 - Question not answered or no relevant information provided in response
 1 - Response does not meet key Criteria
 2 - Response only meets a few of the key criteria
 3 - Response meets a majority of the key criteria
 4 - Response meets all key criteria
 5 - Response meets and exceeds key criteria

Package Name: INTAKE, POWERHOUSE, SPILLWAY AND TRANSITION DAMS
 Package No.: CH0007
 Project : Lower Churchill Project
 Scored By: K. Morrison
 Date: 2012-07-30

Question Weight (%)	Acciona		Aecon		Astaldi		Barnard		Impreglio		IKC-ONE		Salini		OHL		Strabag	
	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score
Quality Part A - To be Completed by all Proponents																		
Q1. Does your company have a registered Quality Management System? If "yes" please provide a copy of the registration certificate. If "No" proceed to part B of the Questionnaire.	50	4	40	0	4	40	4	40	4	40	4	40	4	40	4	40	4	40
Q2. If company has a registered Quality management system, please provide the Table of Contents of your Quality Manual.	50	4	40	0	4	40	4	40	4	40	4	40	4	40	4	40	4	40
Score Part A	100	80.00		0.00		80.00		80.00		80.00		80.00		80.00		80.00		
Percentage		80.00%		0.00%		80.00%		80.00%		80.00%		80.00%		80.00%		80.00%		
Quality Part B - To be completed by proponent that "does not" have a registered ISO 9001:2008 QMS																		
Q3. If you do not have a registered Quality Management System, please explain how your organization controls its processes to ensure that you meet the customer's requirements.	15	0	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q4. Are there written procedures for your core processes? Please list.	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q5. How do you ensure that your main subcontractors meet specified requirements (including requirements for Quality)?	15	0	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q6. What are your processes for addressing problems and opportunities for improvement? Provide details.	10	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q7. Do you have a documented audit schedule for both internal and external audits?	10	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q8. What is your process for responding to customer complaints or corrective action requests?	10	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q9. Describe your process for investigating the root cause of problems and implementing effective corrective action.	10	0	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q10. Is there a procedure for management of hard copy and electronic records?	10	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q11. Please provide contact information for two client references and details of products or services provided.	5	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Score Part B	100	0.00		66.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		
Total Percentage		80.00%		66.00%		80.00%		80.00%		80.00%		80.00%		80.00%		80.00%		

Table C.4.1 Findings – IKC-ONE

APPLICANT	Overall Score
IKC-ONE	

Category		Score
Technical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongest score of the potential bidders • Perfect score on projects of a similar nature and complexity • Perfect score on concreting in extreme cold conditions • Near perfect score on Powerhouses and gated spillways • Two excellent subcontractors • Strong experienced team with Hydro and Powerhouse experience • Known to have top notch equipment and an extensive equipment fleet • Strong administrative systems • Sterling reputation 	
Commercial	<p>Average Revenue Last 3 years (Million): IKC: 2,200; O’Connell:133; Neilson: 128; EBC: 524.</p> <p>Bank & Surety References: Positive ++ Letters of Comfort.</p> <p>Current Commitments: Does not appear to be overextended with CH0007</p> <p>CH0007 Within Applicant Bidding Range: Acceptable</p> <p>Parent Company Guarantee Required NO</p>	
Health and Safety	Strong overall H & S program.	
Environment	The system of Neilson, one of the partners of IKC-ONE, did not meet requirements. However, Neilson would use the system of IKC, the lead partner of the Joint Venture; thus this finding should not be an impediment to the qualification of IKC-ONE.	
Quality	Qualify by virtue of their registered quality systems.	

Table C.4.2 Findings – Impregilo S.p.A

APPLICANT	Overall Score
IMPREGILO S.p.A	

Category		Score
Technical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Second strongest score of the potential bidders • Perfect score on projects of a similar nature and complexity • Perfect score on large batch plant operation • Perfect scores on experience in Powerhouses, Gravity dams, Gated spillways • Excellent experience in concreting in extreme cold conditions • Team presented has strong pertinent experience. Subs not yet presented which will only improve the score • Strong administrative systems • Strong plant • Work to be subcontracted yet to be defined 	
Commercial	<p>Average Revenue Last 3 years (Million): 2,300</p> <p>Bank & Surety References: Positive + Letters of comfort</p> <p>Current Commitments: With CH0007, seems full, but not overextended.</p> <p>CH0007 Within Applicant Bidding Range: YES</p> <p>Parent Company Guarantee Required? NO</p>	
Health and Safety	<p>Overall, H & S program and documentation meets the requirements.</p> <p>Comany did not provide H&S injury performance as requested.</p>	
Environment		
Quality	Qualify by virtue of their registered quality systems.	

Table C.4.3 Findings – Astaldi S.p.A

APPLICANT	Overall Score
ASTALDI S.p.A	

Category		Score
Technical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong score on projects of a similar nature and complexity • Perfect score on large batch plant operation • Adequate experience in concreting under winter conditions • Strong experience in Power Houses, Gated spillways and gravity dams • Excellent local subcontractors identified • Good overall site team presented. A few holes to be plugged • Good identification of work to be subcontracted • Appears to have excellent internal administrative systems 	
Commercial	<p>Average Revenue Last 3 years (Million): 2,400</p> <p>Bank & Surety References: Positive ++ Letters of comfort</p> <p>Current Commitments: With CH0007, seems full, but not overextended.</p> <p>CH0007 Within Applicant Bidding Range: YES</p> <p>Parent Company Guarantee Required? NO</p>	
Health and Safety	Meets the H & S requirements of the evaluation program.	
Environment		
Quality	Qualify by virtue of their registered quality systems.	

Table C.4.4.Findings – Salini S.p.A

APPLICANT	Overall Score
SALINI S.p.A	

Category		Score
Technical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perfect score on projects of a similar nature and complexity • Perfect score on large batch plant operation • Middle of the pack for cold weather concreting experience • Perfect scores on experience in Powerhouses and Gated spillways • Middle of the pack for team relevant experience however few CV's sent and none for subs. Score can only improve for this item • Clear answers on subcontracting portions of questionnaire • Low score on appearance of adequate administrative systems to manage subs 	
Commercial	<p>Average Revenue Last 3 years (Million): Salini: 1,459; FCC: 8,388</p> <p>Bank & Surety References: Positive + Letters of comfort</p> <p>Current Commitments: Joint Venture not overextended.</p> <p>CH0007 Within Applicant Bidding Range: YES</p> <p>Parent Company Guarantee Required? NO</p>	
Health and Safety	H & S management system is adequate but lacks active employee drug and alcohol program in alignment with the Canadian model.	
Environment		
Quality	Qualify by virtue of their registered quality systems.	

Table C.4.5 Findings – Aecon-Flatiron-Construction Demathieu & Bard – JV

APPLICANT	Overall Score
Aecon-Flatiron-Construction Demathieu & Bard – JV	

Category		Score
Technical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aecon has the second lowest score on projects of a similar nature and complexity yet stands fourth overall on technical scoring. The low score is due to size and not complexity. • Excellent score on batch plant operation • Excellent experience in concreting in extreme cold conditions • Good on large Hydro Electric powerhouse experience. Plenty of smaller P/H experience • Highest score on site organization, experienced individuals including subs • Clear logical answers on subcontracting portions of questionnaire • Low score on appearance of adequate administrative systems to manage subs 	
Commercial	<p>Average Revenue Last 3 years (Million): Aecon group: 2,600; Flatiron Constructors Inc.: 1,030; Demathieu & Bard: 44</p> <p>Bank & Surety References: Positive Letters of comfort</p> <p>Current Commitments: With CH0007 Joint Venture partners do not appear to be overextended.</p> <p>CH0007 Within Applicant Bidding Range: YES</p> <p>Parent Company Guarantee Required? YES, for all 3 partners</p>	
Health and Safety	Meets the H & S requirements of the evaluation program.	
Environment		
Quality	Aecon did not provide ISO 9001:2008 registration; they were evaluated on their responses to the individual questions.	

Table C.4.6 Findings – Barnard – Dragados JV

APPLICANT	Overall Score
Barnard – Dragados JV	

Category		Score
Technical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Middle of the pack on projects of a similar nature and complexity • Lowest score on batch plant experience • Low score on cold weather concreting experience • Respectable score for P/H and Gated spillway experience but this is the JV partner (Dragados),not Barnard • Relatively low score on team strength. Little hydro experience (about 2 years for those that have any) • Low score on subcontracting portions of questionnaire • Middle of the pack on appearance of adequate administrative systems to manage subs 	
Commercial	<p>Average Revenue Last 3 years (Million): Barnard: 206; Dragados: 2,807.</p> <p>Bank & Surety References: Barnard: Positive ++ Letters of comfort; Dragados: Positive Letters of Comfort.</p> <p>Current Commitments: With CH0007 does not appear overextended.</p> <p>CH0007 Within Bidding Range: YES</p> <p>Parent Company Guarantee Required? YES</p>	
Health and Safety	H & S management system is adequate but lacks active employee drug and alcohol program in alignment with the Canadian model.	
Environment		
Quality	Qualify by virtue of their registered quality systems.	

Table C.4.7 - Findings – Strabag Inc.

APPLICANT	Overall Score
Strabag Inc.	

Category		Score
Technical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall score 10 points below next better rank (stands 6/9) • Strong showing on projects of similar nature and complexity • Tied for lowest score on cold weather concreting • Strong experience in Power Houses and Gated spillways • Lowest score on gravity dam experience • Tied for lowest score on rock plug excavation • Low team score with virtually no Hydro experience • Low score on subcontracting portions of questionnaire • Appears to have excellent internal administrative systems 	
Commercial	<p>Average Revenue Last 3 years (Million): 15,990</p> <p>Bank & Surety References: Positive + Letters of comfort</p> <p>Current Commitments: With CH0007 does not appear overextended.</p> <p>CH0007 Within Bidding Range: YES</p> <p>Parent Company Guarantee Required? NO</p>	
Health and Safety	H & S management system is adequate but lacks active employee drug and alcohol program in alignment with the Canadian model.	
Environment		
Quality	Qualify by virtue of their registered quality systems.	

Table C.4.8 - Findings –OHL Construction Canada Inc.


APPLICANT	Overall Score
OHL Construction Canada Inc.	

Category		Score
Technical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate score on projects of similar nature and complexity • At the low end of batch plant experience...still respectable • Tied for lowest score on cold weather concreting • Indicated that concrete might be stopped during winter months. Has not grasped schedule constraints. Also mentions the use of antifreeze additives demonstrating lack of knowledge of concrete placement in (extreme) winter conditions • Middle of the pack relative to experience in Power Houses, Gated spillways and gravity dams • Tied for lowest score on rock plug excavation • Second lowest score on team strength with absolutely no CV's containing Hydro experience • Low score on subcontracting portions of questionnaire • Middle of the pack on appearance of adequate administrative systems to manage subs 	
Commercial	<p>Average Revenue Last 3 years (Million): 5,900 (parent company)</p> <p>Bank & Surety References: Positive + Letters of comfort;</p> <p>Current Commitments: With CH0007 does not appear overextended.</p> <p>CH0007 Within Bidding Range: YES</p> <p>Parent Company Guarantee Required? YES</p>	
Health and Safety	Meets H&S requirements of the evaluation program.	
Environment		
Quality	Qualify by virtue of their registered quality systems.	

Table C.4.9 - Findings – Acciona Infrastructure Canada Inc.

APPLICANT	Overall Score
Acciona Infrastructure Canada Inc.	


Category		Score
Technical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lowest score overall • Lowest score on projects of similar nature and complexity • Excellent experience in large batch plant operations • Good cold weather concreting experience • Lowest score on construction of large Hydro Electric powerhouses • Tied for lowest score on large Gated spillway experience (score still respectable 80/100) • At the low end on rock plug excavation • Lowest team score. Only two persons with (limited hydro experience). Few CV's submitted but increase here would not counterbalance overall score enough to change rank 	
Commercial	<p>Average Revenue Last 3 years (Million): 2,377</p> <p>Bank & Surety References: None Submitted.</p> <p>Current Commitments: With CH0007 does not appear overextended.</p> <p>CH0007 Within Bidding Range: YES</p> <p>Parent Company Guarantee Required? YES</p>	
Health and Safety	<p>Company does not have Employee medical program as required.</p> <p>Remainder of H & S management System meets the Requirements.</p>	
Environment		
Quality	<p>Qualify by virtue of their registered quality systems.</p>	

 SNC • LAVALIN		Revision 00		
	PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION REPORT and RECOMMENDED BIDDERS LIST		Date	Page
	SLI Doc. No. 505573-CH0007-51BA-0001		27 August 2012	14

APPENDIX D– RECOMMENDED BIDDERS LIST

Table D – Recommended Bidders List- Package CH0007

BIDDERS	CONTACT	TELEPHONE/FAX/E-MAIL
IKC-ONE Civil Constructors, a Partnership 215 Water Street Atlantic Place, Suite 505 St. John's, NL, Canada, A1C 6C9	Stephen Paul Carter Jr.	Tel: 1 (709) 738-6160 Cell: TBD Fax: TBD Email:
Astaldi S.p.A. Via Giulio Vincenzo Bona N.65 Rome/Italy - 00144	Mario Lanciani	Tel: +39 6 417661 Cell: TBD Fax: TBD Email: mlanciani@astaldi.com
Salini S.p.A./FCC/Impregilo S.p.A. – Joint Venture. Via della Dataria, 22 Rome/Italy - 00187	Claudio Lautizi	Tel: +39 06 6776903 Cell: TBD Fax: TBD Email: d.onori@salini.it
Aecon-Flatiron-Construction Demathieu & Bard – Joint Venture 20 Carlson Court, Suite 800, Toronto, Ontario Canada, M9W 7K6	Don Brophy	Tel: 1 (416) 293-7004 Cell: TBD Fax: TBD Email: DBrophy@aecon.com

 SNC • LAVALIN		Revision 00		
	PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION REPORT and RECOMMENDED BIDDERS LIST		Date	Page
	SLI Doc. No. 505573-CH0007-51BA-0001		27 August 2012	15

APPENDIX E--NALCOR CREDITWORTHINESS CHECK OF RECOMMENDED COMPANIES

From: ScottPelley@nalcenergy.com
To: Adamcyk, Ronald
Cc: Over, Ed; pat.hussey@nalcenergy.com; JamesMeaney@nalcenergy.com
Subject: Re: FW: LOWER CHURCHILL PROJECT - PREQUALIFICATION FOR PACKAGE CH0007 - RFI-5
Date: August 15, 2012 9:59:02 AM
Attachments: [EOI-Prequal FINANCIAL Scoring Sheet_CH0007.xlsx](#)

Ron,

I just completed the review of Spalini SpA. Like the other bidding entities (and as outlined in my email dated August 14), the Spalini Joint Venture would currently meet Nalcor's creditworthiness criteria, assuming that they provided the required performance security which, in the case of CH0007, will be a reducing letter of credit, 50% performance bond and a 50% materials bond. Therefore, from a financial perspective, all the respondents to the EOI are qualified bidders.

I also updated the scoring sheet which determines the **relative** creditworthiness of each bidding entity using a notional scale of 20 points. The final results are as follows:

1. AECON JV - 20/20
2. IKC JV and the Spalini JV - 18/20
3. Imregilio SpA - 17/20
4. Astaldi SpA - 16/20

1.



Scott W. Pelley
Assistant Treasurer
Treasury and Risk Management
Nalcor Energy
t. (709) 737-1364 c. (709) 730-2927 f. (709) 737-1901
e. ScottPelley@nalcenergy.com
w. nalcenergy.com

This email communication is confidential and legally privileged. Any unauthorized reproduction, distribution or disclosure of this email or any attachments is strictly prohibited. Please destroy/delete this email communication and attachments and notify me if this email was misdirected to you.

From: "Adamcyk, Ronald" <Ronald.Adamcyk@snclavalin.com>
To: <ScottPelley@nalcenergy.com>
Cc: <pat.hussey@nalcenergy.com>, "Over, Ed" <Ed.Over@snclavalin.com>
Date: 08/14/2012 05:17 PM

From: ScottPelley@nalcorenergy.com
To: Adamcyk.Ronald
Cc: Grant.Joselyn; pathussey@nalcorenergy.com; JamesMeaney@nalcorenergy.com; MBradbury@nalcorenergy.com
Subject: Re: CH0007 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
Date: August 13, 2012 6:34:59 PM
Attachments: [EOI-Prequal FINANCIAL Scoring Sheet_CH0007.xlsx](#)

Ronald,

Further to your request below, we've evaluated the creditworthiness of each of the entities that responded to the EOI for CH007, with the exception of the JV between Spalini and FCC Construccin. As per my email earlier this afternoon, we need more up to date financial statements for Spalini. Therefore, any conclusions below are not relevant to the Spalini JV.

Our review was based on the most recent financial statements provided by each entity, which were used to determine financial ratio scores for each entity. The particular ratios used, which are meant to reflect the ability of each individual entity to absorb the impact of potential adverse financial events, are documented in LCP-PT-MD-0000-FI-PR-0003-01 (*Guidelines for Creditworthiness*). We also considered the size of the contract relative to each entities annual sales and whether the entities in question experienced adverse events in the past as well as willingness to provide performance security.

If we were assessing these entities as part of the RFP process as of today's date, our conclusion would be that each bidder would be considered a creditworthy counterparty, provided that the required credit support was provided. [While not relevant to the current exercise, it's worth noting that in the case of CH0007, the required credit support will be a letter of credit (declining balance with % to be determined) issued by a Schedule 1 Canadian Bank as well as a 50% performance bond and a 50% materials bond].

In case its of any use to you or your team, (i.e. in case its necessary to rank the bidders relative to one another), I calculated a relative financial score for each bidder on a notional 20 point scale. The scores for the JV's represent a weighted average for each participating entity and are thus an estimate of the financial strength of the JV (Note: We have individual scores for each entity if you need them). This is summarized in the attached spreadsheet.

Obviously, if any of the entities covered in this review eventually reply to our RFP, we'll need to repeat this process and undertake a full review based on circumstances at that time

If you have any questions, please feel free to give me a call



nalcor
energy

Scott W. Pelley
Assistant Treasurer
Treasury and Risk Management



EXPRESSION OF INTEREST / PREQUALIFICATION
FINANCIAL SCORING SHEET

Package Number CH0007
 Package Name Intake, Powerhouse, Spillway and Transition Dams
 Est Pkg Value _____
 Score assigned 20

Section	Scoring	Weight	Description	Inpave/ABEYS				A24421/SGA				AECOM - Flatiron - Deamthieu JV				HCC - 2011 Joint Venture				B24421/SGA			
Financial																							
3.2.1			Turnover Score	Score	Target	Score/Target	Final Score	Score	Target	Score/Target	Final Score	Score	Target	Score/Target	Final Score	Score	Target	Score/Target	Final Score	Score	Target	Score/Target	Final Score
	Note 1	8.00		3.92	2.00	196%	8.00	4.34	2.00	217%	8.00	4.71	2.00	235%	8.00	1.54	2.00	77%	6.16	6.51	2.00	326%	8.00
3.2.2			Financial Ratio Scores	Score	Target	Score/Target	Final Score	Score	Target	Score/Target	Final Score	Score	Target	Score/Target	Final Score	Score	Target	Score/Target	Final Score	Score	Target	Score/Target	Final Score
	Note 1	2.00	FFO to Debt	22%	45%	49%	0.99	12%	45%	28%	0.55	49%	45%	100%	2.00	1285%	45%	100%	2.00	37%	45%	82%	0.82
	Note 1	2.00	Debt to Capital*	47%	35%	75%	1.50	71%	35%	50%	0.99	35%	35%	100%	2.00	13%	35%	100%	2.00	60%	35%	58%	0.58
	Note 1	2.00	Debt to EBITDA*	3.7	2.0	54%	1.08	6.4	2.0	31%	0.63	2.4	2.0	84%	1.67	0.3	2.0	100%	2.00	2.9	2.0	145%	1.45
	Note 1	2.00	EBIT to Interest Coverage	3.3	1.5	100%	2.00	1.5	1.5	100%	2.00	8.0	1.5	100%	2.00	25.8	1.5	100%	2.00	4.3	1.5	287%	2.87
	Note 1	2.00	Quick Ratio	0.6	1.0	61%	1.23	0.7	1.0	75%	1.49	1.3	1.0	100%	2.00	1.6	1.0	100%	2.00	1.2	1.0	120%	1.20
Subtotal		10.00					6.79				5.66				9.67				10.00				6.92
3.2.3			Performance Security																				
		0.50	Is Company (or Parent Company) willing to provide a performance bond	Yes	Yes	100%	0.50	Yes	Yes	100%	0.50	Yes	Yes	100%	0.50	Yes	Yes	100%	0.50	Yes	Yes	100%	1.00
		0.50	Is Parent Company Guarantee Available from a parent with adequate financial strength	Yes	Yes	100%	0.50	Yes	Yes	100%	0.50	Yes	Yes	100%	0.50	Yes	Yes	100%	0.50	Yes	Yes	100%	1.00
Subtotal		1.00					1.00				1.00				1.00				1.00				2.00
3.2.4			General																				
		0.25	Outstanding Legal Claims?	No	No	100%	0.25	No	No	100%	0.25	No	No	100%	0.25	No	No	100%	0.25	No	No	100%	0.25
		0.25	Bankruptcy or reorganization proceedings?	No	No	100%	0.25	No	No	100%	0.25	No	No	100%	0.25	No	No	100%	0.25	No	No	100%	0.25
		0.25	Contract cancellation before work completion?	No	No	100%	0.25	No	No	100%	0.25	No	No	100%	0.25	No	No	100%	0.25	No	No	100%	0.25
		0.25	Litigation Last 10 Years	No	No	100%	0.25	No	No	100%	0.25	No	No	100%	0.25	No	No	100%	0.25	No	No	100%	0.25
Subtotal		1.00					1.00				1.00				1.00				1.00				1.00
TOTAL		20.00					16.79				15.66				19.67				18.16				17.92

* Targets represent maximum scores

Completed By: Scott Pelley
 Completed on: August 13, 2012