

DOCKSIDE LANDS RFP #04-031

The description in the evaluation matrix is an attempt to distill the text of the RFP. To the extent that any of these vary from the RFP text, the RFP text prevails. Any references to section(s), page number(s), etc. is for reference only and does not limit the Evaluation Committee and/or the City from referring to section(s) or page number(s) not referenced, or other sections of the Proposal

Points Scored	Possible Points	Criteria/Questions	Source of Info. from proposal	Point Allocation	Source of Info. External *
---------------	-----------------	--------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------

1. Proposed Site Remediation

Consistency with Development Concept with regard to remediation and risk management

Environmental		In the City's opinion, will the proposed remediation plan meet the current requirements set out by the BC Environmental Management Act and Contaminated Sites Regulation? (RFP section 5.2.1, DC page 7)	Questionnaire	pass-yes fail-no	DC BC
		pass/fail			

Economic		Will the costs associated with the proposed remediation plan meet the City's goal of break-even? (RFP section 5.2.1, section 4 of these criteria, DC page 7, 13)		pass-yes fail-no	
		pass/fail			

Economic	15	What risks for remediation are assumed by the Proponent? (RFP section 5.2.1, DC page 7)	Design concept Dockside Business Case (city Dockside web page)	15-proponent assumes all risk Shared risk - varies with extent 0-city assumes all risk	DC BC
----------	----	---	---	--	----------

2. Proposed Land Use

.1 Consistency with Development Concept with regard to mix of uses

Social		Does the development provide a mix of use consistent with that proposed in the development concept (residential/commercial/light industrial/etc.) and to what extent? (RFP section 5.2.2, DC page 15)	Questionnaire	10-consistent with the DC 2 to 7-somewhat consistent with DC (varies with extent) 0-single use or not consistent at all	DC
		10			

DOCKSIDE LANDS RFP #04-031

	Points Scored	Possible Points	Criteria/Questions	Source of Info. from proposal	Point Allocation	Source of Info. External*
Social		5	Does the residential portion of the development provide a mix that satisfies the needs of a broad range of ages and stages of life, as well as income brackets and rental/ownership units? (RFP section 5.2.2, DC page 16/17)	Questionnaire Design concept	5-provides a mix of residential units 3 or 4-provides some mix of residential units 1 to 2-provides poor mix of residential units 0-provides no mix of residential units	HAS
Economic		5	How much employment (post construction) will be generated in the industrial, commercial and retail uses on Dockside once all four lots are developed? (calculated based on proposed area of each use multiplied by average number of employees per square foot for this type of use). (RFP section 5.2.2, Appendix E, DC page 15)	Questionnaire	5-proposal creating the most employment, sliding scale to 0.	UD
Environmental		5	Is the mix of uses provided such that environmental concerns such as noise and air pollution are considered through design (both on and off site)? (RFP section 5.2.3, DC page 22)	Design concept	5-proposal indicates mitigation measures for both 1 to 4-proposal indicates partial mitigation 0-proposal indicates no mitigation	SME DC

Points Scored	Possible Points	Criteria/Questions	Source of Info. from proposal	Point Allocation	Source of Info. External*	
.2 Consistency with Development Concept with regard to density/FSR						
Social		10	Does the proposed overall density of development for all four sites vary from the recommended density in the DC (average 2:1)? How does the proposed density/FSR balance between revenue space and amenity/support space? (RFP section 5.2.2, DC page 13, 31)	Design concept Questionnaire	10-density as per DC Density varies from DC (higher or lower) - reduce marks according to variance	SME
Social		5	Does the proposed range of density vary from the recommended density in the DC on a site by site basis? (RFP section 5.2.2, DC page 31)		5-density as per DC Density varies from DC (higher or lower) - reduce marks according to variance	SME
Economic		2	Does the proposed density/FSR require increase of civic infrastructure over and above what is outlined in section 5.2.4 (sewer, water, fibreoptic cable, or roads, not including hard landscaping)? (RFP section 5.2.4, DC page 22)	Questionnaire	2-zero impact 0-infrastructure upgrade required	ENG

DOCKSIDE LANDS RFP #04-031

Points Possible	Scored Points	Criteria/Questions	Source of Info. from proposal	Point Allocation	Source of Info. External*
3. Urban Design					
.1 Contextual response					
Social		10	How well does the proposal meet the considerations outlined in 5.2.3 Contextual Response of the RFP? (DC page 12, 18)	Design concept	10-excellent 7-very good 5-good 2-poor 0-none
Economic		5	What are the economic 'spin-offs' of the proposed development? (RFP section 5.1.4, 5.2.2, 7.3.6, DC page 12)	questionnaire proposal text	5-positive 2- neutral 0-negative VR
Environmental		20	What additional environmental techniques and environmental plans will be done outside of LEED considerations? (What site-wide approaches as opposed to building by building) (RFP section 5.2.3, DC page 12, 22)	proposal text design concept	20-excellent 15-very good 10-good 2-poor 0-none
.2 Building massing, form and character					
Social		10	Does the building massing, form and character coincide with that set out in the Development Concept? Does the proposed building massing respond to the neighbourhood "texture" of development? Does it support and act as a transition/natural progression from the harbour up to the existing building skyline? (RFP section 5.2.3, DC page 18, 19)	Design concept	10-excellent 7-very good 5-good 2-poor 0-not at all
Economic		2	Is the quality of construction proposed consistent with the Development Concept in terms of massing, form and character (with respect to articulation of massing)? (RFP section 5.2.3, DC pages 33-37)	Proposal text	2-yes 0-no

DOCKSIDE LANDS RFP #04-031

	Points Possible	Points Scored	Criteria/Questions	Source of Info. from proposal	Point Allocation	Sou of Ir Exter
Environmental		15	Does the design of massing, form and character take into consideration wind, light and shadow and sight lines in a positive way? (RFP section 5.2.3, DC page 19-22)	Design concept	15-excellent 10-very good 5-good 2-poor 0-not at all	
.3 Environmental (LEED) Considerations						
Environmental		10	Are buildings in risk-assessed portions of the site design to include soil vapour barriers or other approved engineered vapour controls? (RFP section 5.2.1)	Design concept	yes - 10 no - 0	SME
Environmental		20	What percentage of space constructed will be LEED certifiable and to what level? (RFP section 5.2.3, DC page 22)	Questionnaire	20-platinum 15-gold 10-silve Points may range based on the percentage of proposed buildings to target certain levels.	
.4 Circulation						
Social		10	How does the circulation encourage connectedness, a sense of place and community, both within the Dockside Lands and between the community of Victoria West and Victoria? (RFP section 5.2.3, DC page 22-25)	Design concept	10-excellent 7-very good 5-good 2-poor 0-not at all	
Economic		2	Are the modes of transportation sustainable to maintain/service, both now and in the long term? (RFP section 5.2.3, DC page 22-25)	questionnaire Proposal text	2-yes 0-no	

DOCKSIDE LANDS RFP #04-031

Environmental		10	To what extent does the proposal encourage alternate modes of transportation? (RFP section 5.2.3, DC page 22-25)		Measure by environmental impact: 10-excellent 0-poor	
Points Possible Scored Points			Criteria/Questions	Source of Info. from proposal	Point Allocation	Source of Information
.5 Public realm requirements						
Social		20	Is the streetscape pedestrian friendly and inviting and are building elements or spaces designed at a "human scale" (relative to the dimensions and proportions of the human body) and consistent with the Development Concept "Dockside View"? (RFP section 5.2.3, DC page 1, 26-28)	Design concept	Each of the 5 elements can score a potential of 4 points as follows: 4 - excellent 3 - very good 2 - good 1 - poor	
Social		10	Does it meet CPTED requirements? (RFP section 5.2.3, DC page 30)	Design Concept	10-yes 0-no	CDG
Economic		4	How are the operating and maintenance costs proposed to be addressed - now and in the long term? Are the operational/capital costs reasonable? Is the proposal for the developer to maintain the public realm elements in the long term at the developer's cost? (RFP section 5.2.3, DC page 26-28)	questionnaire proposal text	4-no costs 0-all costs	SME
Environmental		10	What protection and/or enhancement of natural resources (including shoreline) is proposed? (RFP section 5.2.3, DC page 21, 28)		10-excellent 7-very good 5-good 2-poor 0-none	
.6 Negotiable/Optional Provisions						
Social		10	What is the proponent offering, that in their opinion, meets the local needs? (RFP section 5.2.3, DC Appendix 1)	design concept	10-excellent 7-very good 5-good 2-poor 0-none	

	Points Possible	Points Scored	Criteria/Questions	Source of Info. from proposal	Point Allocation	Source of Information
Economic		5	How are the operating and maintenance costs proposed to be addressed - now and in the long term? Are the operational/capital costs reasonable? Is the proposal for the developer to maintain the public realm elements in the long term at the developer's cost? (RFP section 5.2.3, DC page 29)	questionnaire	5-no costs 3-some costs 0-all costs	SME
Environmental		10	What are the environmental benefits of the proposed provisions? (RFP section 5.2.3, DC page 29)	design concept	5-positive 3-neutral 0-negative	

4. Net Present Value

.1 Value of offer						
		pass/fail	Must meet breakeven of \$6.7 million dollars (net present value of purchase). This does not include cost of remediation or amenities.			
Economic		50	Formula for point calculation to be determined Calculated based on net present value, including NPV for remediation proposal.	questionnaire financial information	50-highest offer 20-break even Points, between 20 and 50 calculated using a formula provided by City*	SME

*Score higher = $30 - 2 \times 30 \left(\frac{\text{value of offer} - \text{breakeven}}{\text{breakeven}} \right)$

DOCKSIDE LANDS RFP #04-031

	Points Possible	Scored Points	Criteria/Questions	Source of Info. from proposal	Point Allocation	Source of Information
.2 Tax revenue projections for the City						
Economic		10	Calculated based on projected tax revenue to the City, based on build out proposal and average value/use assessment/estimated market value. This will be calculated with the assistance of a subject matter expert.	questionnaire financial information		SME
Proponent Score Subtotal	0	300				
	0	100	Social category			
	0	100	Environmental category			
	0	100	Economic category			

	Points Possible Scored Points	Criteria/Questions	Source of Info. from proposal	Point Allocation	Sou of In Exter
5. Presentation to Council and Public					
.1 Response to and from proponents at the public meeting					
			This will be based on the "strength of the team" and overall response to the proposal from the public and Council, as well as response from the Proponents to comments from the public and Council. Additional considerations will be the level of credibility/competence conveyed by the proponent teams. Feedback forms will be provided.	public presentation/feedback	
Proponent Score					

***Abbreviations for heading "Source of Info. – external":**

DC – Development Concept
 BC – Business Case
 HAS – Housing Affordability Study
 UD – City of Victoria Urban Design
 SME – Subject Matter Expert
 ENG – City of Victoria Engineering
 VR – Current Commercial Vacancy Rates
 CDG – CPTED Design Guidelines