COR/2019/06496

November 27, 2019

Dear Applicant:

Re: Your request for access to information under Part II of the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act [Our File #: TW/143/2019]

On October 29, 2019, the Department of Transportation and Works received your request for access to the following records:

All documents, briefings, reports and communications with regards to the decision to accept the Woodward Group of Companies bid for the North and South coast ferry contract.

I am pleased to inform you that a decision has been made by the Deputy Minister for Transportation and Works to provide access to some of the requested information. Access to the remaining records, and/or information contained within the records, has been refused in accordance with the following exceptions to disclosure, as specified in the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act (the Act):

Pages 76-135, severed under subsection 27(2)(a) The head of a public body shall refuse to disclose to an applicant a cabinet record; subsection 27(1)(c) In this section, "cabinet record" means a memorandum, the purpose of which is to present proposals or recommendations to the Cabinet.

Pages 136-137 severed under subsection 27(2)(a) The head of a public body shall refuse to disclose to an applicant a cabinet record; subsection 27(1)(e) In this section, "cabinet record" means an agenda, minute or other record of Cabinet recording deliberations or decisions of the Cabinet.

Please note you can find the Orders in Council for both on the Orders in Council Database:


As required by 8(2) of the Act, we have severed information that is unable to be disclosed and have provided you with as much information as possible. In accordance with your request for a copy of the records, the appropriate copies have been enclosed.
Please be advised that you may appeal this decision and ask the Information and Privacy Commissioner to review the decision to provide partial access to the requested information, as set out in section 42 of the Act (a copy of this section of the Act has been enclosed for your reference). A request to the Commissioner must be made in writing within 15 business days of the date of this letter or within a longer period that may be allowed by the Commissioner. Your appeal should identify your concerns with the request and why you are submitting the appeal.

The appeal may be addressed to the Information and Privacy Commissioner is as follows:

Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner
2 Canada Drive
P. O. Box 13004, Stn. A
St. John's, NL A1B 3V8

Telephone: (709) 729-6309
Toll-Free: 1-877-729-6309
Facsimile: (709) 729-6500

You may also appeal directly to the Supreme Court Trial Division within 15 business days after you receive the decision of the public body, pursuant to section 52 of the Act (a copy of this section of the Act has been enclosed for your reference).

Please be advised that responsive records will be published following a 72-hour period after the response is sent electronically to you or five business days in the case where records are mailed to you. It is the goal to have the responsive records posted to the Completed Access to Information Requests website within one business day following the applicable period of time. Please note that requests for personal information will not be posted online.

If you have any further questions, please contact me by telephone at 709-729-5351 or by email at ATTW@gov.nl.ca.

Sincerely,

Angela McIntyre
ATIPP Coordinator
Cabinet confidences

27. (1) In this section, "cabinet record" means

(a) advice, recommendations or policy considerations submitted or prepared for submission to the Cabinet;

(b) draft legislation or regulations submitted or prepared for submission to the Cabinet;

(c) a memorandum, the purpose of which is to present proposals or recommendations to the Cabinet;

(d) a discussion paper, policy analysis, proposal, advice or briefing material prepared for Cabinet, excluding the sections of these records that are factual or background material;

(e) an agenda, minute or other record of Cabinet recording deliberations or decisions of the Cabinet;

(f) a record used for or which reflects communications or discussions among ministers on matters relating to the making of government decisions or the formulation of government policy;

(g) a record created for or by a minister for the purpose of briefing that minister on a matter for the Cabinet;

(h) a record created during the process of developing or preparing a submission for the Cabinet; and

(i) that portion of a record which contains information about the contents of a record within a class of information referred to in paragraphs (a) to (h).

(2) The head of a public body shall refuse to disclose to an applicant

(a) a cabinet record; or

(b) information in a record other than a cabinet record that would reveal the substance of deliberations of Cabinet.

(3) Notwithstanding subsection (2), the Clerk of the Executive Council may disclose a cabinet record or information that would reveal the substance of deliberations of Cabinet where the Clerk is satisfied that the public interest in the disclosure of the information outweighs the reason for the exception.

(4) Subsections (1) and (2) do not apply to
(a) information in a record that has been in existence for 20 years or more; or

(b) information in a record of a decision made by the Cabinet on an appeal under an Act.
Policy advice or recommendations

29. (1) The head of a public body may refuse to disclose to an applicant information that would reveal

(a) advice, proposals, recommendations, analyses or policy options developed by or for a public body or minister;

(b) the contents of a formal research report or audit report that in the opinion of the head of the public body is incomplete and in respect of which a request or order for completion has been made by the head within 65 business days of delivery of the report; or

(c) draft legislation or regulations.

(2) The head of a public body shall not refuse to disclose under subsection (1)

(a) factual material;

(b) a public opinion poll;

(c) a statistical survey;

(d) an appraisal;

(e) an environmental impact statement or similar information;

(f) a final report or final audit on the performance or efficiency of a public body or on any of its programs or policies;

(g) a consumer test report or a report of a test carried out on a product to test equipment of the public body;

(h) a feasibility or technical study, including a cost estimate, relating to a policy or project of the public body;

(i) a report on the results of field research undertaken before a policy proposal is formulated;

(j) a report of an external task force, committee, council or similar body that has been established to consider a matter and make a report or recommendations to a public body;

(k) a plan or proposal to establish a new program or to change a program, if the plan or proposal has been approved or rejected by the head of the public body;
(l) information that the head of the public body has cited publicly as the basis for making a decision or formulating a policy; or

(m) a decision, including reasons, that is made in the exercise of a discretionary power or an adjudicative function and that affects the rights of the applicant.

(3) Subsection (1) does not apply to information in a record that has been in existence for 15 years or more.
Disclosure harmful to personal privacy

40. (1) The head of a public body shall refuse to disclose personal information to an applicant where the disclosure would be an unreasonable invasion of a third party's personal privacy.

(2) A disclosure of personal information is not an unreasonable invasion of a third party's personal privacy where

(a) the applicant is the individual to whom the information relates;

(b) the third party to whom the information relates has, in writing, consented to or requested the disclosure;

(c) there are compelling circumstances affecting a person's health or safety and notice of disclosure is given in the form appropriate in the circumstances to the third party to whom the information relates;

(d) an Act or regulation of the province or of Canada authorizes the disclosure;

(e) the disclosure is for a research or statistical purpose and is in accordance with section 70;

(f) the information is about a third party's position, functions or remuneration as an officer, employee or member of a public body or as a member of a minister's staff;

(g) the disclosure reveals financial and other details of a contract to supply goods or services to a public body;

(h) the disclosure reveals the opinions or views of a third party given in the course of performing services for a public body, except where they are given in respect of another individual;

(i) public access to the information is provided under the Financial Administration Act;

(j) the information is about expenses incurred by a third party while travelling at the expense of a public body;

(k) the disclosure reveals details of a licence, permit or a similar discretionary benefit granted to a third party by a public body, not including personal information supplied in support of the application for the benefit;

(l) the disclosure reveals details of a discretionary benefit of a financial nature granted to a third party by a public body, not including...
(i) personal information that is supplied in support of the application for the benefit, or

(ii) personal information that relates to eligibility for income and employment support under the Income and Employment Support Act or to the determination of income or employment support levels; or

(m) the disclosure is not contrary to the public interest as described in subsection (3) and reveals only the following personal information about a third party:

(i) attendance at or participation in a public event or activity related to a public body, including a graduation ceremony, sporting event, cultural program or club, or field trip, or

(ii) receipt of an honour or award granted by or through a public body.

(3) The disclosure of personal information under paragraph (2)(m) is an unreasonable invasion of personal privacy where the third party whom the information is about has requested that the information not be disclosed.

(4) A disclosure of personal information is presumed to be an unreasonable invasion of a third party's personal privacy where

(a) the personal information relates to a medical, psychiatric or psychological history, diagnosis, condition, treatment or evaluation;

(b) the personal information is an identifiable part of a law enforcement record, except to the extent that the disclosure is necessary to dispose of the law enforcement matter or to continue an investigation;

(c) the personal information relates to employment or educational history;

(d) the personal information was collected on a tax return or gathered for the purpose of collecting a tax;

(e) the personal information consists of an individual's bank account information or credit card information;

(f) the personal information consists of personal recommendations or evaluations, character references or personnel evaluations;

(g) the personal information consists of the third party's name where

(i) it appears with other personal information about the third party, or
(ii) the disclosure of the name itself would reveal personal information about the third party; or

(h) the personal information indicates the third party's racial or ethnic origin or religious or political beliefs or associations.

(5) In determining under subsections (1) and (4) whether a disclosure of personal information constitutes an unreasonable invasion of a third party's personal privacy, the head of a public body shall consider all the relevant circumstances, including whether

(a) the disclosure is desirable for the purpose of subjecting the activities of the province or a public body to public scrutiny;

(b) the disclosure is likely to promote public health and safety or the protection of the environment;

(c) the personal information is relevant to a fair determination of the applicant's rights;

(d) the disclosure will assist in researching or validating the claims, disputes or grievances of aboriginal people;

(e) the third party will be exposed unfairly to financial or other harm;

(f) the personal information has been supplied in confidence;

(g) the personal information is likely to be inaccurate or unreliable;

(h) the disclosure may unfairly damage the reputation of a person referred to in the record requested by the applicant;

(i) the personal information was originally provided to the applicant; and

(j) the information is about a deceased person and, if so, whether the length of time the person has been deceased indicates the disclosure is not an unreasonable invasion of the deceased person's personal privacy.
Access or correction complaint

42. (1) A person who makes a request under this Act for access to a record or for correction of personal information may file a complaint with the commissioner respecting a decision, act or failure to act of the head of the public body that relates to the request.

(2) A complaint under subsection (1) shall be filed in writing not later than 15 business days

(a) after the applicant is notified of the decision of the head of the public body, or the date of the act or failure to act; or

(b) after the date the head of the public body is considered to have refused the request under subsection 16 (2).

(3) A third party informed under section 19 of a decision of the head of a public body to grant access to a record or part of a record in response to a request may file a complaint with the commissioner respecting that decision.

(4) A complaint under subsection (3) shall be filed in writing not later than 15 business days after the third party is informed of the decision of the head of the public body.

(5) The commissioner may allow a longer time period for the filing of a complaint under this section.

(6) A person or third party who has appealed directly to the Trial Division under subsection 52 (1) or 53 (1) shall not file a complaint with the commissioner.

(7) The commissioner shall refuse to investigate a complaint where an appeal has been commenced in the Trial Division.

(8) A complaint shall not be filed under this section with respect to

(a) a request that is disregarded under section 21 ;

(b) a decision respecting an extension of time under section 23 ;

(c) a variation of a procedure under section 24 ; or

(d) an estimate of costs or a decision not to waive a cost under section 26 .

(9) The commissioner shall provide a copy of the complaint to the head of the public body concerned.
**Direct appeal to Trial Division by an applicant**

52. (1) Where an applicant has made a request to a public body for access to a record or correction of personal information and has not filed a complaint with the commissioner under section 42, the applicant may appeal the decision, act or failure to act of the head of the public body that relates to the request directly to the Trial Division.

(2) An appeal shall be commenced under subsection (1) not later than 15 business days

(a) after the applicant is notified of the decision of the head of the public body, or the date of the act or failure to act; or

(b) after the date the head of the public body is considered to have refused the request under subsection 16 (2).

(3) Where an applicant has filed a complaint with the commissioner under section 42 and the commissioner has refused to investigate the complaint, the applicant may commence an appeal in the Trial Division of the decision, act or failure to act of the head of the public body that relates to the request for access to a record or for correction of personal information.

(4) An appeal shall be commenced under subsection (3) not later than 15 business days after the applicant
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Evaluation Report

Strait of Belle Isle Ferry Service

August 21, 2018
Evaluation Committee Sign Off

The Evaluation Committee completed the evaluation of the RFP for the Strait of Belle Isle Ferry Service and reached consensus scoring.

The Evaluation Committee attests that the pre-established process as prescribed in the RFP has been followed and the evaluation criteria has been applied diligently, consistently and without bias.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greg Cuff, Director of Marine Services, Department of Transportation and Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Ellis, Marine Manager, Department of Transportation and Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Samson, Buyer, Department of Transportation and Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Marshall, Manager of Policy and Program Planning, Department of Transportation and Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADVISORS:**

**Fairness Advisor**
Marc Brazeau, EY

**Relationship Review Committee:**
Marc Brazeau, EY
Denise Woodrow, Solicitor, Department of Justice

**Recommendation:**

The Strait of Belle Isle Ferry Service RFP Evaluation Committee recommends to the Steering Committee that the Strait of Belle Isle Ferry Service be awarded to Labrador Marine Inc.
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1 Introduction

The Strait of Belle Isle Ferry Service RFP sought vessel and shore based services for the Strait of Belle Isle crossing, including:

- Year-round transportation of passengers, vehicles and commercial traffic travelling between St. Barbe, Newfoundland and Labrador and Blanc Sablon, Quebec;
- Management and administration of the vessel and shore-based passenger and vehicle services including reservations and ticketing, vehicle marshalling, provision of wharfingers, provision and maintenance of terminal buildings and washroom facilities, and customer service;
- A roll-on roll-off (at bow and stern) vessel to accommodate a minimum of 300 passengers, 120 passenger vehicles and 8 tractor trailers; and,
- A vessel no older than 20 years at the commencement of the Service Agreement.

The RFP resulted in one submission.

Procurement Timelines:

- The RFP was issued on May 10, 2018
- The RFP closed on July 31, 2018 (original close was July 6, 2018)
- The completeness review was finalized on August 8, 2018
- The individual evaluations commenced on August 8, 2018
- Consensus meetings were held on August 16 & 17, 2018
- The evaluation was completed on August 17, 2018

The purpose of this document is to summarize the RFP evaluation process and results.

2 Proposals Received

The one submission received was from Labrador Marine Incorporated (LMI).
3 RFP Evaluation

3.1 Evaluation Committee

Below is an overview of the structure of the committees involved in the RFP Evaluation.

Steering Committee
Tracy King
Cory Grandy

Relationship Review Committee
Denise Woodrow
Marc Brazeau

Evaluators
Greg Cuff, Janet Samson
Fiona Ellis
Andrea Marshall

3.2 Evaluation Process

The evaluation process was divided into two parts, the Technical Evaluation and the Financial Evaluation. The Technical Evaluation was worth 60 per cent of the total points with the following breakdown: Past Experience and Qualifications (15 per cent), Proposed Vessel (15 per cent), Operational and Management Plans (18 per cent) and Customer Experience (12 per cent). The Financial Evaluation was worth 40 per cent of the total points.
### 3.3 Scoring Criteria

Each evaluation criteria was scored on a scale of 0 (lowest possible score) to 5 (highest possible score) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0 point</th>
<th>1 point</th>
<th>2 points</th>
<th>3 points</th>
<th>4 points</th>
<th>5 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absent – the response omitted to document the requirements of the applicable RFP references and associated scoring criteria.</td>
<td>Deficient – the Response fails to meet the requirements of the applicable RFP references and associated scoring criteria in a suitable and documented manner. The response has little merit and fails to demonstrate that the work will be performed in an acceptable manner.</td>
<td>Poor – the Response fails to meet the requirements of the applicable RFP references and associated scoring criteria in a suitable and documented manner. The response has some merit, but there are significant weaknesses that could result in unacceptable shortcomings in performance of the work.</td>
<td>Fair – the Response barely meets the requirements of the applicable RFP references and associated scoring criteria in a suitable and documented manner. The response has substance but there are weaknesses that could result in tolerable or reasonably correctable shortcomings in performance of the work.</td>
<td>Good – the Response reasonably demonstrates that the requirements of the applicable RFP references and associated scoring criteria are met in a documented and suitable manner. The response is comprehensive but there are minor weaknesses that should not significantly impact performance of the work.</td>
<td>Excellent – the Response fully demonstrates that the requirements of the applicable RFP references and associated scoring criteria are met in a documented and suitable manner. There are no apparent weaknesses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Evaluation Scoring

Total Evaluation Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labrador Marine Inc.</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past Experience and Qualifications (15)</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Vessel (15)</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational and Management Plans (18)</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Experience (12)</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial (40)</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Weighted Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>86.27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: for scoring of financial results, full marks are normally afforded to the proposal with the lowest overall price. Given that LMI submitted the only proposal, it was given full marks in the financial evaluation.

3.3 Scoring Rational

The following are the key points identifying the rational for the scoring of Labrador Marine Inc. Further details are provided in the evaluation worksheet.

- The Respondent Team has demonstrated a **Good** as it relates to past experience and qualifications.
- The Respondent Team has demonstrated a **Good to Excellent** proposal as it relates to the proposed vessel.
- The Respondent Team has demonstrated a **Good** proposal as it relates to the operational and management plans.
- The Respondent Team has demonstrated a **Fair** proposal as it relates to customer experience.

3.4 Monitoring of Evaluation

A Fairness Advisor, EY, was engaged as an independent monitor of the process to ensure that all proponents were evaluated fairly, consistently and on the merits of their submission.

4 Conclusion

The Committee recommended Labrador Marine Inc. as the preferred proponent.
Annex A: Summary of Evaluations of the Responses Received

Respondent: Labrador Marine Inc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Max Score for section</th>
<th>Respondent Score</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2a | Past Experience and Qualifications | 15.00 | 11.7 | The Respondent has demonstrated a **Good** proposal as it relates to Past Experience and Qualifications.  
|   |                      |                  | **Strengths**  
|   |                      |                  | o Excellent overview of corporate structure and experience; demonstration of successful delivery of Strait of Belle Isle Ferry Service (since 2000).  
|   |                      |                  | o Demonstration of sound financial standing.  
|   |                      |                  | o Resumes provided team members illustrated the experience, qualifications, and certifications required for delivery of the service.  
|   |                      |                  | **Weaknesses**  
|   |                      |                  | o Requested up to three project profiles demonstrating past delivery of similar/related services. One of the profiles provided was not relevant to the RFP and all were overly brief. |
| 2b | Proposed Vessel | 15.00 | 13.1 | The Respondent has demonstrated a **Good to Excellent** proposal as it relates to the Proposed Vessel.  
|   |                      |                  | **Strengths**  
|   |                      |                  | o Proposal met or exceeded the minimum requirements set out in the RFP for passenger and vehicle capacity.  
|   |                      |                  | o Good description of vessel’s operational capabilities including propulsion, speed, maneuverability, docking, loading/unloading of vehicles, etc.  
|   |                      |                  | o Good description of vessel specifications beyond minimum requirements and the associated benefits (e.g., modern, seven year old vessel as opposed to 20 year minimum, extra vessel capacity which could enable fewer trips and achieve fuel savings for government, etc.)  
<p>|   |                      |                  | o |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.c</th>
<th>Operational and Management Plans</th>
<th>18.00</th>
<th>14.00</th>
<th>The Respondent has demonstrated a <strong>Good</strong> proposal as it relates to Operational and Management Plans.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Provided good description of plan/approach to risk and change management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Confirmation that the required (i.e., current) service schedule can be met with the proposed vessel; provision of schedule options that could reduce the number of trips per year and achieve fuel savings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Good description of company’s approach and capabilities in terms of ongoing vessel maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Confirmation that any long-term service disruptions would be addressed as required (e.g., passenger air service put in place).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Weaknesses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Presentation of the general management plan for the service lacked detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Proposal did not provide much detail about the procedure to be used or the time required for loading and unloading the vessel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o The plan for unscheduled downtime lacked detail as did the plan for reporting and recording.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.4</th>
<th>Customer Experience</th>
<th>12.00</th>
<th>8.1</th>
<th>The Respondent has demonstrated a <strong>Fair</strong> proposal as it relates to Customer Experience.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Sound description of ability and approach to shore-based services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Weaknesses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Proposal lacked detail on approach to reservations and ticketing, customer communications and overall passenger comfort (i.e., as a result of spaces and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Score for section</td>
<td>Respondent Score</td>
<td>Key points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Respondent provided a total yearly cost of service of **$13,350,670** including the Daily Vessel Rate of **$10,239,100**, the Shore Based Daily Rate of **$1,679,000** and the Daily Fuel Rate of **$1,432,570**.
Hi Tracy,

There was only one bid received on the North Coast of Labrador Ferry Service RFP. The bid was from Labrador Marine Inc. (LMI) who has partnered with Nunatsiavut Marine Inc. (NMI) for shore base services. The evaluators for the RFP were Greg Cuff, Janet Samson and I. Marc Brazeau was the fairness advisor. LMI’s bid met the completeness review so each member of the evaluation team reviewed and rated the proposal individually in strict consideration of the Evaluation Criteria established in the RFP, and provided their assessment to the team. The team then considered the assessment of each individual and reached consensus scoring on August 6, 2018. The following table summarizes the results of the evaluation scoring:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent: LMI</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past Experience and Qualifications (15)</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Vessel (15)</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational and Management Plans (18)</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Experience (12)</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial (40)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Weighted Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>84.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Evaluation Matrix and Evaluation Notes are attached which provide details and rational for the scoring.

The team is seeking your approval to seek Cabinet Approval to award this contract.

Regards,

Fiona
## Evaluation Matrix - Strait of Belle Isle Ferry Service

### Rated Criteria

**Past Experience and Qualifications**
- Corporate profile
- Financial sustainability
- Project profiles
- Biographies/CVs for key personnel

**Proposed vessel**
- Passenger and Vehicle Capacity
- Operational capabilities of vessel, including mooring and docking
- Vessel specifications beyond minimum requirements and associated benefits

### Operational and Management Plans

- General management plans including risks and changes
- Schedule and service requirements
- Service disruption management plans
- Plan to manage recording and reporting
- Down Time/Schedule Maintenance Plan

### Customer experience

- Shore based services at each port
- Approach to reservations and ticketing
- Comfort and passenger spaces and services
- Approach to customer communications

### Total Points for Technical Evaluation (minimum pass mark of 65 points)

### Prorated Rated Criteria (minimum pass mark of 39 points)

### Financial Evaluation

- Vessel Daily Rate
- Shore Based Daily Rate
- Daily Fuel Cost

### Total Points for Financial Evaluation

### Total Points Awarded
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Pass/Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Matrix - North Coast Ferry Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rated Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Experience and Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate profile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project profiles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biographies/CVs for key personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed vessel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger and Vehicle Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational capabilities of vessel, including mooring and docking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessel specifications beyond minimum requirements and associated benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational and Management Plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General management plans including risks and changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule and service requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service disruption management plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan to manage recording and reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down Time/Schedule Maintenance Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off season plan, including ice free port for relief availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service proposal for Black Tickle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shore based services at each port</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach to reservations and ticketing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach to freight handling and coordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort and passenger spaces and services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach to customer communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points for Technical Evaluation (minimum pass mark of 65 points)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prorated Rated Criteria (minimum pass mark of 39 points)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Coast Vessel Daily Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strait of Belle Isle Daily Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shored Based Daily Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Coast Daily Fuel Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strait of Belle Isle Daily Fuel Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points for Financial Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points Awarded</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Points</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>44.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$9,954,100
$1,331,400
$3,277,755
$1,249,248
$186,278

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>40</th>
<th>40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>84.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C COMPLETENESS REVIEW CHECKLIST

Bidder: **Labrador Marine Inc**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page ii</td>
<td>Submission time of July 23, 2018</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 59</td>
<td>Proposal Declaration Form executed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 14,61</td>
<td>Proponent outlined all key assumptions in proposal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 24</td>
<td>Provided proof of capacity to obtain performance security</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 26</td>
<td>Provided evidence of capacity to obtain insurance requirements</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 14</td>
<td>Provided proof of ability to secure proposed vessel(s)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 40</td>
<td>Service schedule at least meets minimum requirements</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 14</td>
<td>Proponent team provided evidence of 5 years of ferry operations and vessel O&amp;M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 14</td>
<td>Evidence that vessel meets mooring requirements</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 15</td>
<td>Roll on - roll off from stern</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 15</td>
<td>Vessel must not be older than 15 years at Service Commencement (except for transition period)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 15</td>
<td>Must meet 1A ice classification</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 15</td>
<td>Must have minimum speed to meet schedule requirement and at least 13 knots</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 15</td>
<td>Must have ramps to operate in all tidal ranges in all operating ports</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 15</td>
<td>Must have bow thruster</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 15</td>
<td>Must have a redundant propulsion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluators:  
Fiona Ellis  
Greg Cuff  
Janet Samson

Signature:  
Date:
North Coast Ferries – Evaluation Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Rated Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Corporate Profile</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

A corporate profile describing the corporate structure and experience of the Proponent and its subcontractors. Proponents should outline their knowledge of and/or experience in the provision of marine passenger/freight service, as well as vessel operations in conditions similar to those anticipated for the North Coast of Labrador or Strait of Belle Isle Ferry Services.

**Notes**

- LMI parent company operating in the Marine service business since the 1950’s and 1960’s (Page 10);
- Long standing company operating in Marine industry since 1997 (Govt. of NL). Coastal freight service for the period of 1997-2010 for Govt. of NL operating shore services and three ships. LMI able to reinstate service during 2011/2012-Present for the Province because of a competitor being unable to meet obligations of the contract. (Page 10, 20, 24);
- Passenger and Freight service provider for the Straits 2000-Present (Apollo) (Page 10);
- Corporate structure of LMI provided with long standing teams in place with varying areas of expertise: (Page 14, 15, 16);
- NMI is experienced in providing shore-based service for Govt. of NL (2011-Present). Services provided for passenger/freight, freight, and MV Sir Robert Bond (until Spring of 2013) (Page 12)
- NMI also crews and operates the MV Northern Ranger (passenger/freight) from 2011-Present (Page 12);
- NMI will continue as the reservation team and freight team (shore based services) (Page 17);
- Both companies are committed to the area and the service they provide. LMI parent company has operated in the North for decades and NMI parent company is owned by the Nunatsiavut Group of Companies (NGC) which is the business arm of the Nunatsiavut Government (Page 10, 11);
- Both companies are experienced working together as a team providing services. NMI providing shore based services for the freight vessel owned by LMI (Astron) (Page 12);

**Clarification Requested**

1. Corporate Coordination/Interaction - Proposal lacks a clear picture of how NMI will fit into the corporate fold of LMI. Reporting structure is not clear.

**Response:**

1. Labrador Marine Inc. will be the contracting entity with the Government of NL and the point of contact on behalf of LMI will be Dave Leyden / Dennis White. NMI will be in legal terms, a subcontractor of LMI, responsible for fulfilling the shore services. Ultimately LMI is responsible for the execution of the entire contract including shore services.
North Coast Ferries – Evaluation Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Rated Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Financial sustainability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**
A description of the Proponent’s and its subcontractor’s financial sustainability so as to provide evidence of its or their ability to operate the Service. This evidence could include, for example, annual financial statements.

**Notes**
- LMI division of WGC, which has 12 operating companies – all profitable. Responsible for all financial and performance aspects of this RFP (Page 22);
- NMI to work under contract for LMI. Owned by NGC – business arm of NG and accountable to a Board of Directors of Labrador Inuit Capital Strategy Trust (Page 22);
- Audited financial statements for 2016-2018 inclusive provided (App. D);
- LMI economically dependent on Govt. of NL, however, as a division of a larger group able to share resources for fleet maintenance, in-house resources, self-sufficient, etc.; (App D)
- Certificate of Compliance provided (App E);
- RBC letter of reference confirms financial sustainability of LMI. Ability to meet all financial obligations, performance security requirement, and acquisition of the vessel proposed (App C);
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Project profiles</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Rated Criteria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**
Up to three project profiles describing past relevant marine passenger and/or freight services operated by the Proponent and/or its subcontractors. Such profiles should describe in detail the Proponent’s team experience in service operations, customer experience as well as in vessel operations and maintenance.

**Notes**

**Govt of NL**
- Operation of the Strait of Belle Isle service since 2000 utilizing the MV Apollo (Page 23, App F);
- 1997-2010 operated the entire freight and passenger service to the Labrador Coast inclusive of shore based services and the Ranger and the Bond (Page 10, 20, 23, 24);
- 2011 reinstated freight services for the province due to contractor default and provides service to date (Astron) (Page 23);

**Poseidon**
- This company is a naval arch company that is relied upon by LMI for most aspects of work execution, acquisition of ships, and repairs and maintenance if outside assistance is required. Hired often as a consultant including this project (Page 23, App G);

**Govt of Nunavut**
- 2001-Present delivery of fuel to Nunavut via sister company (Coastal Shipping Ltd.) (Page 24, App H)
- 26 communities accessible by Marine
- Also supply the fuel via sister company (Woodwards Oil Ltd.)
- Letter of Reference indicates no issues with service
- Contract renewed for 5 years just recently and another 2 years available for renewal

**Please note:**
Project profile for Poseidon Marine lacks relevance to this proposal for providing marine passenger and/or freight services by the proponent.
## Past Experience and Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Rated Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Biographies/CVs for key personnel</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

Biographies and/or CVs for a maximum of five (5) key personnel including their relevant work experience, qualifications and certifications

**Notes**

- CV’s for entire LMI Account Team supplied. All CV’s illustrate necessary experience (10-15 years + for each member) administering respective duties (App B);
- Qualifications clearly demonstrated;
- Certifications relevant to profession;

**CV’s included for following personnel:**

- VP of Operations; Ops
- VP of Finance; Finance
- VP of Legal; Contracts, compliance, regulatory
- GM of Marine Division – Lewisporte
- SMS/Ops Mgr – Lewisporte – ISM Coordinator
  (Pages 14, 15, 16, 18)

**Please Note:**

Although CV’s for NMI, shore based personnel was included, these were not reviewed as a part of the proposal as the proposal requested MAX of 5. The committee agreed prior to consensus meeting if proponents submitted greater than five CVs only the first five would be accepted.
## Proposed Vessel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Rated Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Freight capacity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description

The vessel’s capacity and ability to handle containers and reefer units of various sizes, the space available on the vessel concerned for vehicles including cars, trucks, and tractor trailers, the space available for mobile and mini homes, and for other purposes. Also, Appendix A requirements.

### Notes

Vessel meets ability to accommodate the freight capacity as follows: (Pages 27-29, App K, L, M)
- 125 TEU
- 20 vehicles
- Reefer units and mini home/mobile home

- No Crane is required to load as the vessel will utilize shore based equipment to load and off load as necessary;
- Reefers and vehicles will be loaded on open deck eliminating the need for ventilation/exhaust system for running diesel reefers.

### Please Note:

The proposal did not provide all required information so additional information was requested.

### Clarification Requested

1. Clarification required on inventory of equipment. List of equipment does not match requirements. Will additional equipment be provided?
2. Shunt Trucks – are they 4 x 4?
3. Forklifts at each port compatible with current infrastructure – can they fit in the sheds where available?
4. No weight rating provided for 3 container stacker units. Do your 3 container reach stackers meet the weight limits prescribed in the RFP?

### Responses:

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Yes. All three exceed 90,000 lbs each (Vs RFP requirement of 62,000 lbs).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Rated Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Passenger and vehicle capacity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

The vessel’s capacity to accommodate, at a minimum, the level of passengers described in Schedule A, including the various amenities that will be provided to enhance customer service while aboard. Also, Appendix A requirements.

**Notes**

- Vessel will be certified to carry 140 passengers (more if required in future) (Page 29, App L)
- 80 berths (2 accessible)
- Interior and exterior seating
- 20 passenger vehicles (minimum – more if less freight on board)
- Medevac
- AED
- CTA code accessible (Page 29, App M)
- Cafeteria and Lounge
- Lounge deck large window seating
- Satellite TV/Entertainment systems
- Mixture of seating arrangements (Page 29, App L)
- Vessel will be equipped with standard communication system (radio and telephone) to allow constant contact with shore based services (Page 32);

**Please Note:**

The proposal did not provide all required information so additional information was requested.

**Clarification Requested**

1. Please indicate # of kennel spaces that will be provided?
2. Will kennels be fixed units or will customers bring their own?
3. Will water and access to outside be available for pets?

**Response**

1. Ten (10)
2. Customers will bring their own.
3. Water will be available. Outside access for fresh air will be available by owners personally taking onto outside deck using a properly secured leash or other appropriate restraint that ensures the safety of passengers.

**Additional questions/issues to be negotiated**

1. Will there be Wi-Fi available?
2. What are the hours of operation for the cafeteria service (2 hours during each mealtime)?
3. How will cold carry-on packages be accommodated – is there a cold storage area?
4. How will carry-on storage be administered (tag system to claim)?
5. Will there be any shower facilities on board for customers?
North Coast Ferries – Evaluation Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Vessel</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2b Operational capabilities of vessel, including mooring and docking</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3 /5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

How passengers, vehicles and freight, including containerized freight would be loaded on to, stored (while in transit), and off-loaded from the vessel and the estimated time required to fully load and off-load the vessel. The vessel's ease and flexibility of docking at each Service operational port, under normal conditions and its ability to meet the needs of the Strait of Belle Isle Ferry Service. Also, Appendix A requirements.

**Notes**

- Loading plan provided with arrangement of freight containers, vehicles, and reefer containers (App M);
- Vessel can operate stern or bow forward (reducing docking time) (Page 31);
- Bow and stern ramps (App M);
- Can load two lanes simultaneously at ports capable (reducing loading time) (Page 31);
- Passenger vehicles and reefer units on main deck (upper deck/open deck) (Page 30);
- Container freight on sheltered deck (lower deck) c/w lashings (Page 30);
- Container freight will be loaded with shore based equipment (shunt trucks and wheeled trailers) (Page 29);
- Maximum design speed of 16 knots – service speed of 14 knots. This allows vessel to meet schedule provided in RFP (service speed of 13 knots) (Page 31);
- Vessel will be fitted with hydraulic ramps at both ends (Page 32);

**Please Note:**

The proposal did not provide all required information so additional information was requested.

**Clarification Requested**

1. There was no estimated time given to fully load and off load the vessel. Please provide an estimate of on and off loading at each port.
2. Please provide the anticipated arrival and departure times for each port of call during normal operations. We have the departure times on the service schedule provided, however, would like to see time of arrival at each port thus providing us with amount of time at each port of call under normal operations

**Responses:**

1. Maximum time to fully load / off load: Goose Bay, Nain and Natuashish - 4 hours; Hopedale, Rigolet, Makkovik and Postville – 2.5 hours; Black Tickle – 1 hour.
2. Revised schedule provided.
North Coast Ferries – Evaluation Notes

### Proposed Vessel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Rated Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Vessel specifications beyond minimum requirements and associated benefits</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

How its vessel specifications would go above the minimum requirements described in Schedule A and provide additional benefits to the Province for the provision of the Service or for its relief obligations on the Strait of Belle Isle Ferry Service. This could include, for example, modern design and amenities for passengers. Also, Appendix A requirements.

**Notes**

- The proposed vessel is eight (8) years old (constructed in 2010) (Page 34);
- Vessel has a service speed of 14 knots (Page 31);
- Diesel electric propulsion makes the vessel fuel efficient (Page 31);
- Azimuthing (360 degree) thrusters (Page 32);
- Can increase capacity beyond what is requested allowing it to grow with the service if required (Page 34);
- Modern design for passenger comfort (Page 54);
- Vessel recently refitted of all systems and equipment (Page 34);
- Ability of the vessel to operate from both ends is advantageous, provides upgrade on manoeuvrability (Page 31);
- Vessel has two passenger elevators/redundant elevator service (Page 36);
- Vessel is not due for a major refit/dry-docking until 2021 (Page 36);
- Can match Straits service requirement (Page 34);

**Additional questions/issues to be negotiated**

1. Additional benefits that may enhance customer comfort would be Wi-Fi throughout the vessel, sleeper units (common), and shower facilities.
**Operational and Management Plans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Rated Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>General management plans including risks and changes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

Provide an overall description of their general management plan for the Service, including how it will manage risks and change. Also, Appendix A requirements.

**Notes**

- LMI is experienced in providing services @ these ports (Page 37);
- LMI will be responsible for all financial and performance aspects of the contract including shore services to be provided (Page 22);
- NMI is a subcontractor for shore-based services. The process for services is provided on charts, including walk on passenger traffic, drive on traffic, luggage, and freight (Pages 39-41);
- Risk Management Plans are in place for both LMI and NMI (App P & Q);
- Risk Management Plan completed by key decision makers and management. It is included in the vessel daily work plan fleet wide (Page 42);
- LMI Risk Management Plan is class approved and adopted from sister company Coastal Shipping Ltd. (Page 42);
- SMS details the process for all crew and shore personnel to carry out (Page 42);
- Risk Assessments available to all staff via online portal (Page 43);
- Management of Change process has been adopted by LMI (Page 44);
- Change Management Plan inclusive of forms in place (App R);

**Please Note:**

The proposal failed to provide a management plan for the straits so additional information was requested.

**Clarification Requested**

1. Provide a service schedule for the Straits relief requirement

**Response:**

1. Any 42 day period in the January to May timeframe.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational and Management Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

Describe how it plans to meet and/or exceed the minimum requirements related to the operational schedule identified in Schedule A and identify any areas of the Service which may require abilities/expertise external to their organization. Also, Appendix A requirements.

**Notes**

- Vessel service speed of 14 knots will allow for it to meet current schedule which is maintained at 13 knots (Page 31 & 45);
- Vessel’s ability to dock stem and bow will reduce the current time it takes to dock and depart at each port (Page 31);
- Vessel has ability to load two lanes at a time at ports capable of accommodating. This will reduce loading and off loading times at certain ports (Page 31);
- The monthly trip to Black Tickle will require an additional 12-14 hours to complete. An early departure from Goose Bay will assist with maintaining the schedule/ability to service all ports within the current rotation (7 day cycle) (Page 51);

**Please Note:**

The proposal was vague so additional information was requested.

**Clarification Requested**

1. Service schedule provided doesn’t give estimated transit times under normal operations, please provide anticipated arrival and departure time for each port of call during normal operations;
2. Estimated time to fully load and off load is not provided – request to have this information

**Response:**

1. Revised schedule provided.
2. Maximum time to fully load / off load: Goose Bay, Nain and Natuashish - 4 hours; Hopedale, Rigolet, Makkovik and Postville – 2.5 hours; Black Tickle – 1 hour.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Rated Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>Service disruption management plan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**
Demonstrate its ability to deal with prolonged service issues. Also, Appendix A requirements.

**Notes**
- Company anticipates that service disruptions will be minimal based on the age of the vessel and critical spares readily available for equipment on board (Page 46);
- Qualified maintenance personnel/vessel repair team on staff. Team qualified in hydraulics, marine electrical, and engineering service (Page 46);
- Company has ability to dispatch in-house expertise with company resources (aircraft and helicopter (Page 46);
- Company has a computerized maintenance program in place;
- Service disruption for passengers beyond 48 hours – passengers will be flown to their destination (Page 47);
- Freight will be held for 120 hour minimum at which time a marine solution will be implemented (Page 47);
- Company will fully comply with downtime section of RFP (Page 47);

**Please Note:**
The proposal did not identify a spare vessel, if one was required. Also, a marine solution was not identified for freight disruption beyond the 120 hours.
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### Operational and Management Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Rated Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>Plan to manage recording and reporting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**
Describe its plan to manage recording and reporting requirements. Also, Appendix A requirements.

**Notes**

- LMI verifies that access will be granted to Province for all records as per RFP (Page 48);
- Forms required for the service will be produced by the company (vehicle and passenger tickets, bills of lading, berthing and wharfage receipts, and delivery receipts) (Page 48);
- Vessel position reports to continue and/or will be completed and posted to the website (Page 48);
- Company has an SMS for reporting relevant items related to safety management;
- Statistics to be provided through NMI which has an on-line system that captures information and can be provided in a format suitable to the Department (Page 49);

**Please Note:**

Though the proponent confirmed they can meet the requirements of the RFP, the proposal failed to provide details on how they plan to manage recording and reporting.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Rated Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>Downtime/schedule maintenance plan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4 /5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description
Define how it plans to accommodate both scheduled maintenance and unscheduled vessel downtime to ensure continuity in its delivery of the Service as well as its relief obligations. Also, Appendix A requirements.

Notes
- Vessel is not due for dry-docking until 2021 (Page 21);
- Regulatory and mandatory inspections will be conducted during active operations or during scheduled winter lay up (Page 50);
- Equipment redundancy capacity in place (Page 50);
- Qualified in house maintenance personnel are able to be dispatched for unscheduled maintenance (Page 46);
- Company has spaces for refit prebooked for its fleet;
- Refit estimated to take approximately 2 weeks (Page 51);
- The company has a planned maintenance program in place (Page 47);
- Spares and replacement parts will be readily available;
- Vessel is able to be accommodated by a syncrolift as well as a graving facility;

Clarification Requested
1. Refit plan of 2 weeks during 2021 (5 year cycle) is ambitious. Please provide more detail on how this will be accomplished.

Response:
1. This is a normal refit period for this type of ship similar to tankers owned by a sister company. The refit is planned months ahead of time with all necessary parts and contractors arranged in advance to minimize downtime. Further with the ferry under service 211 days (169 + 42), there remains a 154 day period in which to schedule the refit. Also from a dry docking perspective, this vessel does not require a “graving dock”. The size of the ferry allows for use of a syncrolift giving more flexibility for the drydocking schedule.
## Operational and Management Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Rated Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>Off season plan, including ice free port for relief availability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description
Describe where and how it plans to maintain the vessel in an ice free port to ensure it is available to provide relief services for the Strait of Belle Isle Ferry Service, in the Service off season, for periods of refit and planned maintenance/repair. Also, Appendix A requirements.

### Notes
- Vessel will be maintained at ice free port (St. John’s) during the off season (Page 50);
- Vessel is capable of serving the Strait of Belle Isle as and when required during the Service off season;
- Vessel is free to operate during the off season as a dry-dock refit is not due until 2021;
- Mandatory and Regulatory inspections will be completed during the off season (if required) or during vessel operations;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Rated Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>Service proposal for Black Tickle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

Provide details on how it plans to accommodate a periodic, as needed (no more than once per month), freight service to Black Tickle including an outline of the impacts (if any) to the normal sailing schedule to the regular Service operational ports. Also, Appendix A requirements.

**Notes**

- LMI proposes an early departure out of Goose Bay and divert to Black Tickle en route (Page 51);
- 12-14 hours will be required for diversion to Black Tickle, inclusive of discharging and loading of vessel (Page 51);
- Tides will be closely monitored and if the vessel is prohibited from stopping en route – it will go to Black Tickle on the way back down the coast (Page 51);
- "Manageable" without significant delays;

**Please Note:**
Proponent did not present a scenario and/or a sample schedule with Black Tickle included and the impacts to call times at regular service operational ports.
## Customer Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Rated Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2d</td>
<td>Shore based services at each port</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 / 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description

Proponents should describe the passenger, freight and shore based services that will be provided at the various ports along the Service as well as off site. To this end, Proponents should describe their shore based services to be provided at each Service operational port. Also, Appendix A requirements.

### Notes

- Company states that there are shore based services at all sites (Page 52);
- Appendix A is a table outlining shore based services for ports, covering passenger services, freight services, and shore based services as outlined in the RFP;
- Appendix A outlines current service provider to continue but little detail provided other than continuation of current services;
- Flowchart provided outlines services offered at each port and the processes for reservations, ticketing, luggage, embarkation, disembarkation and luggage collection (Page 39);
- On-line services – webpage;
- Customer Service Reps in place;
- 1-800 #;
- Facebook;
- Offices at HVGB;
- Supervisor & Staff at warehouse;
- Managers have cellular/radio for communications;

### Please Note:

This section is somewhat vague on details. A lot of reliance is being placed on “continuation of current services” which assumes that the Team has detailed knowledge of current services being provided.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Rated Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2d</td>
<td>Approach to reservations and ticketing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

Proponents should describe the passenger, freight and shore based services that will be provided at the various ports along the Service as well as off site. To this end, Proponents should describe their approach to reservations and ticketing. Also, Appendix A requirements.

**Notes**

- Subcontract company (NMI) currently has toll-free and on line reservation system (Page 52);
- Trained, experienced, long-term staff in place to meet RFP requirements (Page 52);
- Will ensure each port and terminal have required telecommunications (Page 52);
- Ticket sellers will be available during required hours (Page 52);
- Shore based staff will be trained for safe operations (Page 52);
- Tickets can be purchased on board the vessel for the coastal communities (Page 38);
- Current data collection can be modified to provide additional information, etc.;

**Please Note:**

This section is vague on detail with the assumption for continuation of existing services and a statement to meet any new requirements in the RFP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Rated Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2d</td>
<td>Approach to freight handling and reservations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

Proponents should describe the passenger, freight and shore based services that will be provided at the various ports along the Service as well as off site. To this end, Proponents should describe their approach to freight handling and coordination. Also, Appendix A requirements.

**Notes**

- Flowchart illustrates process for freight handling and coordination at all ports (Page 38);
- Appendix A outlines RFP service requirements and process currently in place (App A);
- Online freight calculator after freight is received and customer shipment record is completed by staff;

**Please Note:**

This section is short on detail on how freight is handled at each port. For example, the custody of freight—who receives it at the ports. Customers will have 12 hours to pick up freight after docking. Will the freight be secured? Will there be someone available 12 hours after the vessel docks?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Rated Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2d</td>
<td>Comfort and passenger spaces and services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**
Proponents should describe the passenger, freight and shore-based services that will be provided at the various ports along the Service as well as off-site. To this end, Proponents should provide details on the comfort and condition of passenger spaces and services on the vessel. Also, Appendix A requirements.

**Notes**

- Vessel is modern (built in 2010) (Page 53-56);
- Food/Cafeteria services available;
- Entertainment areas available;
- Passenger lounge area has windows throughout providing a natural light area and unobstructed view for passengers;
- Vessel is tidy and clean;
- Janitorial services will be provided daily;
- NMI will implement a planned maintenance program for on-shore facilities to keep them in good condition;
- Any Government required maintenance, the proponent will advise Government in a timely fashion to have rectified;

**Please Note:**

Most of the detail provided in this section is through pictures of proposed areas. These images/descriptions may not be the same after the vessel is retrofitted.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer Experience</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2d</td>
<td>Approach to customer communications</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description

Proponents should describe the passenger, freight and shore-based services that will be provided at the various ports along the Service as well as off site. To this end, Proponents should describe their plan to provide effective and efficient means of communications and engagement with passengers, shippers, communities and other stakeholders for the duration of the Service. Also, Appendix A requirements.

Notes

- Communications will be provided through company website, Facebook, toll-free #’s, and local representatives for customer communication at ports (Page 56);
- LMI has a long history and have no problem answering all customer inquiries/concerns;
- Company has a track record of on-time service;
- Parent company WGC is a part of local communities, they hire local, and have permanent facilities in most of the coastal communities for decades (Page 57);
- The company expects to have scheduled meetings with communities to gauge issues;

Please Note:

This section is vague on detail with the assumption for continuation of their long history answering customer enquiries and concerns and their track record of providing on time service. The proposal did not provide information on how they would engage customers and their feedback. Instead it stated “they know where to find us.”
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APPENDIX F GUIDANCE FOR SCORING FOR EVALUATORS

Each criteria will be scored on a scale of 0 (lowest possible score) to 5 (highest possible score) prior to the application of the weighting above. Table 2 provides an example of numerical scoring criteria. Scoring is restricted to whole numbers (e.g. 2, 3, 4).

Table 2: Numerical Scoring Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
<th>0 point</th>
<th>1 point</th>
<th>2 points</th>
<th>3 points</th>
<th>4 points</th>
<th>5 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Absent</strong> – the response omitted to document the requirements of the applicable RFP references and associated scoring criteria.</td>
<td>Deficient – the Response fails to meet the requirements of the applicable RFP references and associated scoring criteria in a suitable and documented manner. The response has little merit and fails to demonstrate that the work will be performed in an acceptable manner.</td>
<td>Poor – the Response fails to meet the requirements of the applicable RFP references and associated scoring criteria in a suitable and documented manner. The response has some merit, but there are significant weaknesses that could result in unacceptable shortcomings in performance of the work.</td>
<td>Fair – the Response barely meets the requirements of the applicable RFP references and associated scoring criteria in a suitable and documented manner. The response has substance but there are weaknesses that could result in tolerable or reasonably correctable shortcomings in performance of the work.</td>
<td>Good – the Response reasonably demonstrates that the requirements of the applicable RFP references and associated scoring criteria are met in a documented and suitable manner. The response is comprehensive but there are minor weaknesses that should not significantly impact performance of the work.</td>
<td>Excellent – the Response fully demonstrates that the requirements of the applicable RFP references and associated scoring criteria are met in a documented and suitable manner. There are no apparent weaknesses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>