



File No.: 04-1000-20-2018-611

December 17, 2018

s.22(1)

Dear \$.22(1)

Re: Request for Access to Records under the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (the "Act")

I am responding to your request of November 23, 2018 for:

All bid committee evaluation records related to RFP PSVAHA2017-06 titled "Modular Housing Supplier for Housing Fit Strategy" issued July 14, 2017.

All responsive records are attached. Some information in the records has been severed, (blacked out), under s.17(1) of the Act. You can read or download this section here: <a href="http://www.bclaws.ca/EPLibraries/bclaws">http://www.bclaws.ca/EPLibraries/bclaws</a> new/document/ID/freeside/96165 00

Please Note: Bid Committee Report is available online on the September 20, 2017 Public Hearing Agenda: https://council.vancouver.ca/20170920/documents/cfscurgent1.pdf

Under section 52 of the Act, and within 30 business days of receipt of this letter, you may ask the Information & Privacy Commissioner to review any matter related to the City's response to your FOI request by writing to: Office of the Information & Privacy Commissioner, <a href="mailto:info@oipc.bc.ca">info@oipc.bc.ca</a> or by phoning 250-387-5629.

If you request a review, please provide the Commissioner's office with: 1) the request number (#04-1000-20-2018-611); 2) a copy of this letter; 3) a copy of your original request; and 4) detailed reasons why you are seeking the review.

Yours truly,

Cobi Falconer, FOI Case Manager, for

Barbara J. Van Fraassen, BA

**Director, Access to Information & Privacy** 

<u>Barbara.vanfraassen@vancouver.ca</u> 453 W. 12th Avenue Vancouver BC V5Y 1V4

\*If you have any questions, please email us at <a href="mailto:foi@vancouver.ca">foi@vancouver.ca</a> and we will respond to you as soon as possible. Or you can call the FOI Case Manager at 604.871.6584.

Encl.

:ma

## PSVAHA2017-06 - Request for Proposal - Modular Housing Strategy for Housing First Strategy

Evaluation Committee:	Term	Score
	Excellent (More than satisfies requirements)	5
	Very Good	4
	Good	3
Luke Harrison	Average	2
Roanna Chui	Poor	1
David Williams		

Substantiations (Remarks) must be provided for any scores 1 and under and 4 and greater

		Britco			Horizon North			Ladacor			
EVAL		211100			10.1201.101.61			Eddacoi			
UATI ON CRITE RIA			Weight	Weighted Score		Weight	Weighted Score		Weight	Weighted Score	
PRICI NG (Purc hasin g to initial ly revie w - All Costs for Propo sal)	Lowest Proposal \$/This Proposal x Weight =Weighted Score										
Lowe st Price	\$0.00										
Price	\$0.00		0%			0%			0%		
Sectio n in RFP	Evaluation Criteria	Remarks	Yes/No		Remarks	Yes/No		Remarks	Yes/No		
	Part 1 - Requested Information										
	Signed Proposal Form		Yes/No			Yes/No			Yes/No		
dix 5	Completed Certificate of Insurance		Yes/No			Yes/No			Yes/No		
Appen dix 6	Signed Declaration of Supplier Code of Conduct Compliance		Yes/No			Yes/No			Yes/No		
Part C - Appen dix 7	Completed Corporate Sustainability Leadership Questionnaire		Yes/No			Yes/No			Yes/No		
Part C - Appen dix 10	Proposed Amendments to the Form of Agreement		Yes/No			Yes/No			Yes/No		
Appen dix 12	Submitted Proof of WorksafeBC Registration (Local Firms)		Yes/No			Yes/No			Yes/No		
Part C - Appen dix 13	Conflicts/Collusion/Lobbying		Yes/No			Yes/No			Yes/No		

T.	Pomitire manufa	Evaluator Remarks	Score	Weight	Weighte	Evaluator Remarks	Score	Mainh	Weighted	Evaluator Damaska	Score	Mainh	Weighted
-6	Requirements	Evaluator Remarks	(1-5)	Weight	d Score	Evaluator Remarks	(1-5)	Weight	Score	Evaluator Remarks	(1-5)	Weight	Score
	Part 2	A.	-1	*									
t B -	Proposed Methodology												
quir ent	Proposed Methodology												
-		s.17(1)			s.17(1)				s.17(1)				s.17(1)
	Is the approach and methodology clear and				J.11 (1)				331X17				3.113.1.17
	rational? Will it achieve the project's objectives?			10%				10%				10%	
	Scheduling								i. C				
- 1									8				
	Does the proposal meet the required schedule? Does it offer an alternative schedule, including			60%				60%				60%	
ı	early delivery and if so, will this fulfill VAHA's short term and strategic goals?			60%				60%				60%	
	1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -								s:				
	Relocation												
	Has the Proponent presented a proven method												
	for relocating the units? Are the units durable enough for any relocation?			20%				20%				20%	
	chough for any relocation?												
-													
-	Value-Add and Innovation												2
	What innovation is being brought to the table? Are there extra costs associated with these?												
	Are there demonstrated examples of where			2547.77517040								TOTAL SERVICE	
	these solutions have worked in the past? Has the Proponent offered additional services that			5.0%				5.0%				5.0%	
	could be considered a value-add that are not												
- 0	identified in the RFP?								6				
	Sustainability								86				
	Procurement to complete			5.0%				5.0%				5.0%	
	TOTAL WEIGHTED TECHNICAL SCORE			100.0%				100.0%				100.0%	
-	TOTAL WEIGHTED COMBINED SCORE			100.00%				100.00%				100.00%	
1	TOTAL WEIGHTED COMBINED SCORE			100.00%				100.00%	l.			100.00%	
	Evaluator General Remarks/Assessment												
- 1													

Note: This evalua ion form will be used for the initial evaluation to determine or select preferred proponents to shortlist for future Requests for Proposals. Clarifications, changes, discussions or missing information from Respondents may be required to further evaluate the Proposals in which case the initial evaluation will be revised and a final evaluation completed and agreed to by Evaluation Committee.

Evaluated by:	
Signature:	
Date:	

DCVALAGOAT OF	- Request for Proposa	Madular Hausing	Ctratagu for	Housing Eirst Ctrates

Evaluation Committee:

Term
Score
Excellent (More than satisfies requirements)
Very Good
4
Good
3
Luke Harrison
Average
2
Roanna Chui
Poor
1
David Williams

Substantiations (Remarks) must be provided for any scores 1 and under and 4 and greater

				<b>-</b> 53									
		Britco				Horizon North				Ladacor			
EVALUATION CRITERIA			Weight	Weighted Score			Weight	Weighted Score			Weight	Weighted Score	
PRICING (Purchasing to initially review - All Costs for Proposal)	Lowest Proposal \$/This Proposal x Weight =Weighted Score							33317					
Lowest Price	\$0.00				5:								To the state of th
Bidder Price	\$0.00				0:								
			0%	5			0%	6			0%		ali,
Section in RFP	Evaluation Criteria	Remarks	Yes/No			Remarks	Yes/No			Remarks	Yes/No		
	Part 1 - Requested Information												
Part C	Signed Proposal Form		Yes/No		): ):		Yes/No				Yes/No		56 Ec
Part C - Appendix 5	Completed Certificate of Insurance		Yes/No				Yes/No				Yes/No		Till the state of
Part C - Appendix 6	Signed Declara ion of Supplier Code of Conduct Compliance		Yes/No		6	4	Yes/No				Yes/No		
Part C - Appendix 7	Completed Corporate Sustainability Leadership Questionnaire		Yes/No		×		Yes/No				Yes/No		
Part C - Appendix 10	Proposed Amendments to the Form of Agreement		Yes/No				Yes/No				Yes/No		
Part C - Appendix 12	Submitted Proof of WorksafeBC Registration (Local Firms)		Yes/No		10	9	Yes/No				Yes/No		
Part C - Appendix 13	Conflicts/Collusion/Lobbying		Yes/No		S.		Yes/No				Yes/No	3	
			70			7	31		0			4	0
	Requirements	Evaluator Remarks	Score (1-5)	Weight	Weighted Score	Evaluator Remarks	Score (1-5)	Weight	Weighted Score	Evaluator Remarks	Score (1-5)	Weight	Weighted Score
	Part 2												
Part B - Requirements	Proposed Methodology				- 47(4)								~ 47(4)
	Is the approach and methodology clear and rational? Will it achieve the project's objectives?	s.17(1)		10%	s.17(1)			10%	s.17(1)			10%	s.17(1)
	Scheduling								e e				
	Does the proposal meet the required schedule? Does it offer an alterna ive schedule, including early delivery and if so, will this fulfill VAHA's short term and strategic goals?			60%				60%				60%	
	Relocation				. i								
	Has the Proponent presented a proven method for relocating the units? Are the units durable enough for any relocation?			20%				20%				20%	

What innovation is being brought to the table? Are there extra costs		s.17(1)	s.17(	(1)	s.17(1)
associated with these? Are there demonstrated examples of where these solutions have worked in the past? Has he Proponent offered additional services that could be considered a value-add that are no iden ified in the RFP?		5.0%	5.0%		5.0%
Sustainability		_			_
Procurement to complete		5.0%	5.0%		5.0%
TOTAL WEIGHTED TECHNICAL SCORE	n:	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%
TOTAL WEIGHTED COMBINED SCORE		100.00%	100.00%		100.00%
Evaluator General Remarks/Assessment		7.			_

**Note:** This evaluation form will be used for the initial evaluation to determine or select preferred proponents to shortlist for future Requests for Proposals. Clarifications, changes, discussions or missing information from Respondents may be required to further evaluate the Proposals in which case the initial evaluation will be revised and a final evaluation completed and agreed to by Evaluation Committee.

Evaluated by:	
Signature:	
Date:	

PSVAHA2017-06 - Request for Proposal - Modular Housing Strategy for Housing First Strategy

 Evaluation Committee:
 Term Excellent (More than satisfies requirements)
 Score Excellent (More than satisfies requirements)

 Luke Harrison
 Good
 4

 Roanna Chui
 Average
 2

 David Williams
 Poor
 1

Substantiations (Remarks) must be provided for any scores 1 and under and 4 and greater

		lo .		- A.O.									
	1	Britco				Horizon North			j.	Ladacor			
EVALUATION CRITERIA			Weight	Weighted Score			Weight	Weighted Score			Weight	Weighted Score	
PRICING (Purchasing to nitially review - All Costs for Proposal)	Lowest Proposal \$/This Proposal x Weight =Weighted Score												
Lowest Price	\$0.00							5					
Bidder Price	\$0.00					1	- X4 EX		0)				
200.4002.000.000			0%				09	6			0%		X.
Section in RFP	Evaluation Criteria	Remarks	Yes/No			Remarks	Yes/No			Remarks	Yes/No		
	Part 1 - Requested Information												
Part C	Signed Proposal Form		Yes/No				Yes/No				Yes/No		
Part C - Appendix 5	Completed Certificate of Insurance		Yes/No	1			Yes/No				Yes/No		
Part C - Appendix 6	Signed Declaration of Supplier Code of Conduct Compliance		Yes/No		3		Yes/No	4		-	Yes/No		
Part C - Appendix 7	Completed Corporate Sustainability Leadership Questionnaire		Yes/No				Yes/No				Yes/No		
Part C - Appendix 10	Proposed Amendments to the Form of Agreement	5	Yes/No	2	5		Yes/No	4			Yes/No		5
Part C - Appendix 12	Submitted Proof of WorksafeBC Registration (Local Firms)	2	Yes/No				Yes/No				Yes/No		
Part C - Appendix 13	Conflicts/Collusion/Lobbying	\$ = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =	Yes/No	1			Yes/No				Yes/No		
TVA	Requirements	Evaluator Remarks	Score (1-5)	Weight	Weighted Score	Evaluator Remarks	Score (1-5)	Weight	Weighted Score	Evaluator Remarks	Score (1-5)	Weight	Weighted Score
	Part 2		Ű.					A					
Part B - Requirements	Proposed Methodology	17/43					51.6					22	47/45
	Is the approach and methodology clear and rational? Will it achieve the project's objectives?	s.17(1)		10%	s.17(1)			10%	s.17(1)			10%	s.17(1)
	Scheduling			ř.									
	Does the proposal meet the required schedule? Does it offer an alterna ive schedule, including early delivery and if so, will this fulfill VAHA's short term and strategic goals?			60%				60%				60%	
-	Relocation												
	Has the Proponent presented a proven method for relocating the units? Are the units durable enough for any relocation?			20%				20%				20%	
-	Value-Add and Innovation												
	What innovation is being brought to the table? Are there extra costs associated with these? Are there demonstrated examples of where			5.00				5 004	5			5.00	
	these solutions have worked in the past? Has the Proponent offered additional services that could be considered a value-add hat are not identified in the RFP?			5.0%				5.0%				5.0%	
	Sustainability Procurement to complete			5.0%				5.0%				5.0%	
7	TOTAL WEIGHTED TECHNICAL SCORE			100.0%				100.0%	- 0			100.0%	
	TOTAL WEIGHTED COMBINED SCORE			100.00%				100.00%				100.00%	
	Evaluator General Remarks/Assessment					4				Y			19

Note: This evaluation form will be used for the initial evaluation to determine or select preferred proponents to shortlist for future Requests for Proposals. Clarifications, changes, discussions or missing information from Respondents may be required to further evaluate the Proposals in which case the initial evaluation will be revised and a final evaluation completed and agreed to by Evaluation Committee.

Evaluated b	by:
Signature:	181
Date:	

## PSVAHA2017-06 - Request for Proposal - Modular Housing Strategy for Housing First Strategy

Evaluation Committee:

Term
Score
Excellent (More than satisfies requirements)

Luke Harrison
Very Good
4

Roanna Chui
Good
3

David Williams
Average
2

Poor
1

Substantiations (Remarks) must be provided for any scores 1 and under and 4 and greater

		ni .		<u>F</u>									
		Britco				Horizon North				Ladacor			
EVALUATION CRITERIA			Weight	Weighted Score			Weight	Weighted Score			Weight	Weighted Score	
PRICING (Purchasing to initially review - All Costs for Proposal)	Lowest Proposal \$/This Proposal x Weight =Weighted Score												
Lowest Price	\$0.00												
Bidder Price	\$0.00												
			0%				0%				0%		
Section in RFP	Evaluation Criteria	Remarks	Yes/No			Remarks	Yes/No			Remarks	Yes/No		
	Part 1 - Requested Information									50 FA 70 FE			
Part C	Signed Proposal Form		s.17(1)			s.17(1)				s.17(1)			
Part C - Appendix 5	Completed Certificate of Insurance		_										
Part C - Appendix 6	Signed Declara ion of Supplier Code of Conduct Compliance		_										
Part C - Appendix 7	Completed Corporate Sustainability Leadership Questionnaire		_										
Part C - Appendix 10	Proposed Amendments to the Form of Agreement												
Part C - Appendix 12	Submitted Proof of WorksafeBC Registration (Local Firms)												
Part C - Appendix 13	Conflicts/Collusion/Lobbying												
	Requirements	Evaluator Remarks	Score (1-5)	Weight	Weighted Score	Evaluator Remarks	Score (1-5)	Weight	Weighted Score	Evaluator Remarks	Score (1-5)	Weight	Weighted Score
	Part 2												
Part B - Requirements	Proposed Methodology		~ 47/4)		- 47/4)								
	Is the approach and methodology clear and rational? Will it achieve the project's objectives?		s.17(1)	10%	s.17(1)		s.17(1)	10%	s.17(1)		s.17(1)	10%	s.17(1)
	Scheduling				i				·				
	Does the proposal meet the required schedule? Does it offer an alternative schedule, including early delivery and if so, will this fulfill VAHA's short term and strategic goals?		-	60%			-	60%				60%	
	Relocation						ĺ						
	Has the Proponent presented a proven method for relocating the units? Are the units durable enough for any relocation?			20%				20%				20%	
	Value-Add and Innovation												
	What innovation is being brought to the table? Are there extra costs associated with these? Are there demonstrated examples of where these solutions have worked in the past? Has the Proponent offered additional services that could be considered a value-add that are not identified in the RFP?			5.0%	į			5.0%				5.0%	
	Sustainability												
				5.0%			1	5.0%				5.0%	
	Procurement to complete			0.070									
	Procurement to complete  TOTAL WEIGHTED TECHNICAL SCORE			100.0%				100.0%				100.0%	
	A7.				-			100.0% 100.00%					

Evaluated by:	
Signature:	
Date:	

Note: This evaluation form will be used for the initial evaluation to determine or select preferred proponents to shortlist for future Requests for Proposals. Clarifications, changes, discussions or missing information from Respondents may

be required to further evaluate the Proposals in which case the initial evaluation will be revised and a final evaluation completed and agreed to by Evaluation Committee.