

1 Q. In assessing the responses to the Requests for Proposals (“RFP”) associated with the civil
2 construction costs, how did Hydro value the proponents’ ability to complete the work on
3 schedule and return Penstock 1 to service in advance of the 2025-2026 winter season?

4

5

6 A. The proponents’ ability to complete the work on schedule and return Bay d’Espoir Penstock 1 to
7 service was assessed as part of the evaluation process. A mandatory component of the
8 submission package was a Project Execution Plan and Schedule, which was evaluated per the
9 published evaluation matrix. Over half of the available technical evaluation points (35/60) to be
10 scored were related to the Project Execution Plan and Schedule, demonstrating the criticality of
11 the execution plan and schedule. Each submission provided a detailed execution plan and
12 corresponding project schedule that was reviewed in detail by the technical evaluation team.
13 Schedules were fully assessed for completeness, logical linking of activities, availability of float,
14 and to ensure critical path activities identified were achievable. Newfoundland and Labrador
15 Hydro (“Hydro”) notes that the request for proposal also includes a performance security
16 instrument to provide a financial incentive to the proponent to maintain the project schedule;
17 please refer to Hydro’s response to PUB-NLH-005 of this proceeding for further discussion on
18 performance securities.