

# REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

---

## Golden Municipal Airport (CYGE) Economic Viability Study

The Town of Golden is seeking proposals from qualified consulting firms with expertise in airport infrastructure, economic development and private investment dealings, to undertake a comprehensive analysis of historical, current, and future predictive factors to determine whether the Golden Municipal Airport has a sufficient or necessary business case to exist not only for the municipality but other agencies and entities, and if so, develop a comprehensive and realistic strategy and tactical plan for development, investment, higher level government assistance, and corporate sponsorship that can achieve it.



Proposals clearly marked “**Request for Proposals – Golden Municipal Airport Viability Study**” will be accepted until **12:00 PM (Noon) Mountain Time on Thursday, March 12<sup>th</sup>, 2020** at the office of the Town of Golden, 810 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, Golden, BC V0A 1H0

Proposal documents and further information are available online at the Town of Golden website at [www.golden.ca](http://www.golden.ca), the Civic Info website at [www.civicinfo.bc.ca](http://www.civicinfo.bc.ca) and at the office of the Town of Golden at the above address during regular office hours.

The Town of Golden reserves the right to accept or reject any or all proposals and to waive any informality in the proposals received, in each case without giving any notice. The Town of Golden reserves the right to accept the proposal which is deemed most advantageous.

Fax submissions will **not** be accepted. The lowest or any proposal will not necessarily be accepted.

For further information, please contact:  
Executive Administration  
E: [cao@golden.ca](mailto:cao@golden.ca)

## Overview

The Town of Golden is seeking proposals from qualified consulting firms with expertise in airport infrastructure, economic development and private investment dealings, to undertake a comprehensive analysis of historical, current, and future predictive factors to determine whether the Golden Municipal Airport has a sufficient or necessary business case to exist not only for the municipality but other agencies and entities, and if so, develop a comprehensive and realistic strategy and tactical plan for development, investment, higher level government assistance, and corporate sponsorship that can achieve it.

The Services required are described in detail in the attached Schedule A, Terms of Reference.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. Form of Contract

The successful Proponent will enter into a form of contract for the delivery of the services based on the Proponent's proposal, the terms within this RFP and negotiations with the Preferred Proponent and the Municipality.

### 1.2. Definitions

In this RFP the following definitions shall apply:

**“Closing Time”** has the meaning set out in Section 2.1;

**“Contract”** means a formal written contract between the Municipality and a Preferred Proponent to undertake the services;

**“Office”** means the office of the Town of Golden located at 810 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, Box 350, Golden, BC V0A 1H0;

**“Preferred Proponent(s)”** means the Proponent(s) selected by the Municipality to enter into negotiations for a Contract;

**“Proponent”** means an entity that submits a Proposal;

**“Proposal”** means a proposal submitted in response to this RFP;

**“Municipality”** means the Town of Golden;

**“Municipal Representative”** means the individual or position identified in section 2.5 hereof;

**“RFP”** means this Request for Proposal.

## 2. INSTRUCTIONS TO PROPONENT

### 2.1. Closing Time and Address for Proposal Delivery

Proposals must be received:

- (a) at the office of:  
Town of Golden  
Attention: Jon Wilsgard, Chief Administrative Officer  
810 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue South  
PO Box 350  
Golden, BC V0A 1H0 (herein called the “Municipality”)
- (b) or electronic submission via email PDF format to:  
[cao@golden.ca](mailto:cao@golden.ca)
- (c) on or before the following date and time (the “Closing Time”):  
**Time: 12:00 PM (Mountain Time)**  
**Date: Thursday, March 12<sup>th</sup>, 2020**

It is the Proponent’s sole responsibility to ensure its Proposal is received at the address set out above by the Closing Time.

Proposals received by fax will not be accepted.

Proposals will be opened in private by the Municipality after the Closing Time.

### 2.2. Number of Copies

Proposals submitted by mail should include the original plus two hard copies (three in total).

### 2.3. Late Proposals

Proposals received after the Closing Time will not be accepted or considered and will be returned upon the Proponent’s request and at the Proponent’s expense.

### 2.4. Amendments to Proposals

Proposals may be revised by written amendment, delivered to the location set out above, or submitted electronically via email in PDF format, at any time before the Closing Time but not after. Amendments received by fax will not be accepted.

### 2.5. Inquiries

**All inquiries related to this RFP will be directed in writing to the email address below (the “Municipality Representative”):**

Chief Administrative Officer  
Town of Golden  
PO Box 350, Golden, BC V0A 1H0  
E: [cao@golden.ca](mailto:cao@golden.ca)

Information obtained from any person or source other than the Municipality Representative may not be relied upon.

Inquiries will be made no later than three (3) days before the Closing Time. The Municipality reserves the right not to respond to inquiries made within three (3) days of the Closing Time. Inquiries and responses will be recorded and may be distributed to all Proponents at the discretion of the Municipality.

Proponents finding discrepancies or omissions in the RFP, or having doubts as to the meaning or intent of any provision, will immediately notify the Municipality Representative. If the Municipality determines that an amendment is required to this RFP, the Municipality will issue an addendum in accordance with Section 2.6. Amendments to this RFP or any of the requirements stipulated hereunder must be in writing issued in accordance with Section 2.6 hereof to be effective.

**No oral conversation will affect or modify the terms of this RFP or may be relied upon by any Proponent.**

### **2.6. Addenda**

If the Municipality determines that an amendment is required to this RFP, the Municipality will post a written addendum on the Municipality's website at <http://www.golden.ca/Town-Hall/Bids-and-Tenders.aspx> that will form part of this RFP. No amendment of any kind to this RFP is effective unless it is posted in a formal written addendum on the Municipality website.

Upon submission of a Proposal, Proponents will be deemed to have received notice of all addenda that have been issued by the Municipality.

### **2.7. Examination of Documents**

Proponents will be deemed to have carefully examined the RFP, including all attached Schedules and all relevant documents, prior to preparing and submitting a Proposal with respect to any and all facts which may influence a Proposal.

## **3. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORM AND CONTENTS**

### **3.1. Package**

Proposals should be submitted in the Proposal Format as outlined in Schedule B, Proposal Submission Format. Proposals should be submitted in a sealed package, marked on the outside with the Proponent's name and title of the project.

### **3.2. Form of Proposal**

The Municipality reserves the right to waive any informality in Proposals, or non-compliance with any formality required under this RFP (whether or not material), reject any or all Proposals or accept the Proposal deemed most favorable in the interests of the Municipality, in the Municipality's sole discretion. Furthermore, the Municipality reserves the right to negotiate with any proponent in its discretion.

### **3.3. Signature**

The Proposal should be signed by a person authorizing to sign on behalf of the Proponent and include the following:

- (a) If the Proponent is a corporation then the full name of the corporation should be included, together with the names of authorized signatories. The Proposal should be executed by all of the authorized signatories or by one or more of them provided that a copy of the corporate resolution authorizing those persons to execute the Proposal on behalf of the corporation is submitted;
- (b) If the Proponent is a partnership or joint venture then the name of the partnership or joint venture and the name of each partner or joint venture should sign personally (or, if one or more person(s)

have signing authority for the partnership or joint venture, the partnership or joint venture should provide evidence to the satisfaction of the Municipality that the person(s) signing have signing authority for the partnership or joint venture). If a partner or joint venture is a corporation then such corporation should sign as indicated in subsection (a) above; or

- (c) If the Proponent is an individual, including a sole proprietorship, the name of the individual should be included.

## **4. EVALUATION AND SELECTION**

### **4.1. Evaluation**

The Municipality will evaluate the Proposals by applying the evaluation criteria as described in Section 4.2 to identify the Proponent(s) that the Municipality determines is the most advantageous to the Municipality.

The criteria will be applied without priority or weighting established in advance of the evaluation, and in particular, the Proponent whose Proposal has the lowest price will not necessarily be selected as the Preferred Proponent. The Municipality will apply the criteria evenly and fairly to all Proposals.

### **4.2. Evaluation Criteria**

In order to determine the Proposal(s) that is most advantageous to the Municipality, the Municipality will compare and evaluate all Proposals to determine the Proponent's strength and ability to provide the Services as described in Schedule A (attached). The Municipality will use the Request for Proposals Evaluation Procedure as outlined in Appendix 1 (attached).

### **4.3. Additional Information**

The Municipality may, at its discretion, request clarifications or additional information from a Proponent with respect to any Proposal, and the Municipality may make such requests to only selected Proponents without advising other Proponents or providing them with an opportunity to respond to such questions or to provide additional information. The Municipality may consider such clarifications or additional information in evaluating a Proposal.

### **4.4. Municipality's Discretion in Evaluation**

The Municipality may, in its sole discretion, take any one or more of the following steps, at any time and from time to time, in connection with the review and evaluation, including ranking of any aspect of a Proposal, including if the Municipality considers that any Proposal or any part of a Proposal requires clarification or more complete information, contains defects, ambiguities, alterations, qualifications, omissions, inaccuracies or misstatements, or does not for any reason whatsoever satisfy the Municipality that the Proposal meets any requirements of this RFP at any time, or for any other reason the Municipality in its discretion deems appropriate and in the interests of the Municipality and this RFP, or either of them:

- (a) waive any such defect, ambiguity, alteration, qualification, omission, inaccuracy, misstatement or failure to satisfy and any resulting ineligibility on the part of the Proponent;
- (b) independently consider, investigate, research, analyse, request or verify any information or documentation whether or not contained in any Proposal;
- (c) request interviews or presentations with any, all or none of the Proponents to clarify any questions or considerations based on the information included in Proposals during the evaluation process, with such interviews or presentations conducted in the discretion of the Municipality, including the time, location, length and agenda for such interviews or presentations;
- (d) conduct reference checks relevant to the Proponent to verify any and all information regarding a Proponent and to conduct any background investigations that it considers necessary in the

course of the RFP process, and rely on and consider any relevant information in the evaluation of Proposals;

- (e) conduct credit, criminal record, litigation, bankruptcy, taxpayer information and other checks;
- (f) seek Proposal clarification with Proponents to assist in making its evaluation;
- (g) not proceed to review and evaluate, or discontinue the evaluation of any Proposal, and disqualify the Proponent from this RFP; and
- (h) request clarifications or additional information from a Proponent with respect to any Proposal, and consider such clarifications or additional information in evaluating a Proposal.

#### **4.5. Selection of Proponent**

The Municipality will select the Proponent which it determines is the most advantageous to the Municipality based on the Evaluation Criteria set out in Section 4.2. The Municipality is not bound to accept the lowest priced Proposal. The Municipality reserves the right to accept or reject any Proposal in whole or in part. The Municipality's ratings of Proponents may be subjective and it is the Municipality's intent that the evaluation of each criteria will be relative to the strength of the other Proposals received. A Contract may or may not take place as a result of Proposals received.

#### **4.6. Good Faith Negotiations**

By submission of its Proposal, the Proponent agrees that if at any time in the 60 days from the Closing Time it is selected by the Municipality to enter into negotiations for a Contract, the Proponent will, in good faith, participate in negotiations with the Municipality and use reasonable commercial efforts to reach agreement and finalize a Contract with the Municipality based on the Proponent's Proposal.

#### **4.7. Negotiation of Contract and Award**

If the Municipality selects a Preferred Proponent(s), then it may:

- (a) Invite the Preferred Proponent(s) to enter into discussions with the Municipality to reach agreement on a final Contract with the Preferred Proponent(s); or
- (b) Enter into discussions with the Preferred Proponent(s) to clarify any outstanding issues and attempt to finalize the terms of the Contract(s), including financial terms. If discussions are successful, the Municipality and the Preferred Proponent(s) will finalize the Contract(s);
- (c) If at any time the Municipality in its sole discretion, forms the opinion that an agreement acceptable to the Municipality is not likely to be reached within a reasonable time, give the Preferred Proponent(s) written notice to terminate discussions, in which event the Municipality may then either open discussions with another Proponent or terminate this RFP and retain or obtain the services in some other manner.

## 5. GENERAL CONDITIONS

### 5.1. No Municipality Obligation

This RFP is not a tender and does not commit the Municipality in any way to select a Preferred Proponent, or to proceed to negotiations for a Contract, or to award any Contract, and the Municipality reserves the right in its sole discretion to at any time reject all Proposals, and to terminate this RFP process.

### 5.2. Proponent's Expenses

Proponents are solely responsible for their own expenses in preparing, and submitting Proposals, and for any meetings, negotiations or discussions with the Municipality relating to or arising from this RFP. The Municipality and its representatives, agents, consultants and advisors will not be liable to any Proponent for any claims, whether for costs, expenses, losses or damages, or loss of anticipated profits, or for any matter whatsoever, incurred by the Proponent in the preparation and submission of a Proposal, or the participation in negotiations for a Contract, or any other activity related to or arising out of this RFP.

### 5.3. No Contract

By submitting a Proposal and participating in the process as outlined in this RFP, Proponents expressly agree that no contract of any kind is formed under or arises from this RFP prior to the signing of a formal written Contract.

### 5.4. Conflict of Interest

A Proponent shall disclose in its Proposal any actual or potential conflicts of interest and existing business relationships it may have with the Municipality, its elected or appointed officials or employees. The Municipality may rely on such disclosure.

### 5.5. Confidentiality

All submissions become the property of the Municipality and will not be returned to the Proponent. All submissions will be held in confidence by the Municipality unless otherwise required by law. Proponents should be aware the Municipality is a "public body" defined by and subject to the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act of British Columbia.

### 5.6. Insurance

The successful Proponent will, in the event of award, be required to provide to the Municipality, within ten (10) days of award:

- (a) proof of public liability insurance for injury, property damage or death arising from the Proponent's operations under the agreement in an amount not less than **THREE MILLION (\$3,000,000) DOLLARS** naming the Town of Golden as additional named insured;
- (b) proof of professional liability insurance in an amount of not less than **FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND (\$500,000) DOLLARS**; and
- (c) proof of registration with WorkSafe BC.

## Schedule A

### TERMS OF REFERENCE

#### Purpose and Intent



In the context of responsible asset management and accountability to the local taxpayers, the municipality has amassed the necessary data and commensurate inventories and analyses to determine a sizeable corporate infrastructure deficit, compelling the local government to begin re-evaluation of its service levels and developing long term financial strategies to ensure core infrastructure (water, sewer, roads, facilities) maintenance and renewal is prioritized and achieved. This can at times be at odds with the many and varied public services and their own commensurate costs vs. benefits, requiring meaningful contemplation over the scope and nature of the municipality's obligations and services it provides.

In this context, the Town of Golden Council is at a juncture wherein it is unsure of what to do with its municipal airport.

From one perspective, the Golden Municipal Airport represents a depreciating and low return facility in this spectrum, benefiting a niche population, requiring consistent annual operating funds, and posing a risk liability to the organization given our limited capacity for maintenance, runway clearing and no significant capital renewal ability. Specifically, the runway and associated tarmacs have received a very poor rating resulting from a technical assessment – the risk liability associated with the inability to fund even a portion of the \$3M+ in renewal needs are daunting. Foreseeable economic expansion seems unlikely to occur, and the economic impact of the facility as is remains unknown.

To Town Council and the general public, notionally having such a facility has many positive attributes. Practically it services a significant number of back country lodges, plays a strategic role in wild land fire staging, and there is other evidence to suggest the facility has great value – it has a runway of sufficient length to accommodate anything short of a 737 aircraft, its location adjacent to the town is convenient, approaches are registered in the R-CAP, it is a reliable refuelling station, it has a sizeable developable apron area, offers the only skydiving service in North America between two mountain ranges, and by air, puts the local ski resort as the closest to Calgary.

But Town Council is unsure if this is enough now and in the future to rationalize keeping it. If it is worth keeping, we need to know how valuable it is, to whom, what its economic value is and how the municipality can feasibly achieve a sustainable business case for it. While use statistics have been collected for the past five years, there is no context to the uneducated for its numbers and relevance. Capital funding requirements are daunting, but if there are substantial economic and geopolitical reasons for its continuance, what is the spectrum of funding sources for it – from local tax payers, to higher levels of government, to the private sector be it angel investors or foundations.

It is the purpose of this initiative to either or not convince Town Council that the facility is worth keeping and if so, its inherent and explicit geopolitical and economic value must be clear, including a reasonable way forward to achieve a better, sustainable, and ultimately increased status. This includes rationalization to the local taxpayer and a benefit proposition by existing and potential users and uses for the future.

Should there be an insufficient rationale for maintaining the facility as is, this plan will focus on either the facility's devolution into a reduced or more focused need for the community or its eventual divestiture as an asset in preparation for alternate land development as a better investment return for the community.

## Deliverables

To arrive at a decision point with respect to the above as well as build a road forward, the Town of Golden is seeking proposals from qualified consulting firms or consortiums with experience and expertise in airport infrastructure, economic development, and private investment, to undertake comprehensive analyses of as many factors deemed relevant which will include amongst others the:

- trends now influencing the aviation industry, associated technological progression, societal expectations, commercial opportunities, innovations, and private investment potential in a local, regional, provincial and national context;
- current state of service infrastructure and business occurring at CYGE;
- scope and nature of aircraft movements at CYGE;
- positions of representatives from relevant organizations, private interests, and institutions on CYGE;
- local, regional, provincial, national geopolitical importance of CYGE;
- appropriate comparisons of CYGE to other similar airports including best practices;
- financial and administrative requirements of the municipality relative to airport operations and capital development, including the full life cycle costs of municipally owned capital infrastructure;
- costs and practicalities associated with typical airport developments necessary for continuity;
- potential and forecasted use CYGE by key agencies, organizations and the private sector under current and expanded business models;
- consultancy's own experiences, observations, and expert opinions;
- value of alternative uses of the lands from an assessment and taxation perspective.

From these analyses determine and produce:

1. An economic impact report and assessment of the Golden Municipal Airport, from a dynamic geographical spectrum perspective and commentary on its viability and potential;

*If the consultancy recommends the continuation of CYGE as is, modified, or expanded in scope and nature:*

2. A comprehensive and structured palate of business case options aligned and costed with requisite levels of infrastructure, business development, and service provision appropriate for the community, and the projected results for the facility and the community over a 5-10 year timeline;
3. Clear and defensible rationales and commentaries to recommend a specific business case from the options listed in the above deliverable to keep the airport functional and cost effective(or not);
4. Assuming a recommended business case for facility continuity, a comprehensive, realistic, and costed strategy and tactical plan to:
  - 4.1 Continue or modify operations incorporating best practices for administrative tactics, regulatory bylaws, and maintenance regimes;
  - 4.2 Achieve specific facility needs for renewal, development, and investment;
  - 4.3 Provide avenues, examples, possibilities and clear rationales for acquiring:
    - 4.3.1 Administrative Federal and Provincial level government assistance
    - 4.3.2 Capital funding at a regional government level
    - 4.3.3 Direct political assistance from both government levels
    - 4.3.4 Private investment and corporate sponsorship.

The Town of Golden expects in any submitted proposals there to be a chart of activities in delivering this project, phasing as appropriate, reviews, engagement listings, prioritizing, comparisons with other airports, and value added propositions from the proponent.

In the interests of exploring s.4.3, meaningful opportunities including municipal staff to travel to and participate in interviews and engagements to achieve such goals are acceptable.

The end result shall be a final report presented in-person to Town Council that is highly presentable, readable, understandable, informative, and can be used as a stand-alone document.

### **Background Information**

The Golden Municipal Airport has its beginnings in the 1980's, a time when volunteer efforts were often rewarded with large provincial grants with little rationale other than commitment and idealism. To that end, with little funding from the municipal taxpayer, CYGE was developed.

At the time and over the next 30 years it became an acknowledged component of the community. It has remained owned and operated by the Town of Golden and has a single, asphalt surfaced Runway 14-32 measuring at 4,519 ft x 75 ft (1,377.4 m x 22.9 m). The runway is normally maintained and serviceable year round, but is not a priority for snow ploughing given other critical areas in the community, nor are there any de-icing operations. Other paved airside surfaces include connecting short taxiways and large apron areas (for aircraft movement and parking). There is no runway edge lighting so the airport is used only during daylight hours. IFR is available.

The Airport is home to a variety of aviation related businesses and users including helicopter charter and maintenance, aviation fuelling, a seasonal provincial wildfire staging base, the local Search and Rescue Society, private aircraft owners (T-hangars), recreational flying, eco-tourism (skydiving), and day-use picnic area. The Town maintains a building on the Airport providing visiting pilots with a washroom, telephone, and flight planning area. An Environment Canada weather station is also operated out of the terminal building, staffed by qualified weather observers and funded by Nav Canada. Weather observation reports (METARs) are disseminated on an hourly basis each day, from 14:00 to 24:00 GMT (07:00 to 17:00 local time).

In the spring of 2010, the first instrument approach procedure was published by Nav Canada for use at YGE. Approaches in the CAP and R-CAP have been subsequently renewed as required since then. Presently, this approach is restricted to use by aircraft with wingspans less than 118 ft. The narrow mountain valley and narrow runway surface both contribute to this required safety-related restriction.

In 2011 EBA produced for the Town a "Selective Airport Initiatives" report for CYGE. This cursory product was considered excellent and laid some good foundations at the time for directions the municipality could take in developing the facility to a better state in order to entice more traffic and activity.

In 2015 a technical condition assessment of the runway was undertaken by WSP Canada as well as an estimate for runway widening and navigation aids.

Nearly 10 years have passed since the EBA report with no material improvements to the facility. A brief period of negotiation with the regional district in an effort to secure a capital fund contribution regime was not successful. Use statistics noted as lacking in the 2011 EBA report however have been collected annually since 2016 and are attached.

CYGE ostensibly represents an attractive amenity for a niche population of visitors, an even smaller number of locals, a federal government contract for a weather station, a search and rescue base, a provincial wildfire crew assembly, a fuel depot, a sky diving company, a helicopter company and private storage. We seem to get the occasional Canadian Forces presence, occasional fixed wing medevac activity and some other curious aircraft landings. The annual operating costs as is are sustainable; the updates to the Canada Air Pilot are maintained.

But in order to keep the facility operating, at some point over \$3 million is needed in runway and taxiway repaving. As at 2011, a recommended \$3.6 million was necessary to augment the facility to accommodate larger planes and provide more up to date navigation aids and terminal amenities. The current water and

sewer servicing capacity is not able to accommodate further development, and represents an undetermined amount in upgrade costs to do so.

The capital investments needed are daunting if not virtually impossible to meet. The arguments to maintain focus on core service capital needs (water, sewer, roads) versus this facility are compelling if not required given their own status and criticality to the community. Moreover, replacing the airport lands with residential development could ostensibly present an attractive alternative opportunity for developers and ultimately result in a greater tax base for the community.

Town Council is now in a position wherein it is compelled to ask and know the current and potential holistic worth of this facility and if substantiated, what the road forward looks like.

### **Timeline**

The project is to be completed no later than December 31, 2020.

### **Budget**

The total maximum budget for this project is \$100,000.

**Schedule B**

**SUBMISSION FORMAT (MANDATORIES)**

Proposals should contain sufficient information to demonstrate to the Municipality that the Proponent is qualified to provide the specified services within the identified timeline at the most suitable cost. All Proposals will include at minimum, the following:

- An Executive Summary of the Proponent's company and the key personnel assigned to the project.
- A methodology that describes the key elements of the Proponents approach to providing the Deliverables.
- A proposed work plan and schedule in response to the Terms of Reference.
- A detailed budget of the fees including all expenses and taxes related to the delivery of the Scope of Work.
- References for which the Proponent has provided similar services with an emphasis on similar work over the past five (5) years. Reference contact information must be included.

**Appendix 1**

**PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORMAT**

1. All qualified Proposals will be reviewed by an Evaluation Team, which will consist of select Municipality staff members and other appropriate participants, if warranted. The Municipality Project Representative (Project Representative) will appoint a minimum of three (3) members to the Evaluation Team.
2. The Project Representative will verify all Proposals against the mandatory criteria. Proposals that do not meet all mandatory criteria will be rejected without further consideration. Proposals that do meet the mandatory criteria will be assessed and scored against using the Evaluation Criteria. Each member of the evaluation team will then independently complete the attached Proposal Evaluation Form.
3. Upon completion of the Proposal Evaluation Form by each individual Evaluation Team member, the scores given by each Evaluation Team member will be averaged for each Proposal. The Municipality will select the Proponent which it determines is the most advantageous to the Municipality based on the Evaluation Criteria.
4. Evaluation team members will use the following Proposal Evaluation Form to guide the completion of the RFP Evaluation.

**Proposal Evaluation Form**

| <b>STEP ONE:</b>           |  | <b>YES</b>            | <b>NO</b>     |
|----------------------------|--|-----------------------|---------------|
| <b>Mandatory Criteria:</b> | Proposal received prior to closing (includes acknowledgement of all addendums)                         |                       |               |
|                            | Executive summary and key personnel  |                       |               |
|                            | Methodology outline/key approach   |                       |               |
|                            | Work plan, schedule, and fees/expenses   |                       |               |
|                            | Reference list   |                       |               |
| <b>STEP TWO:</b>           |  | <b>Maximum Points</b> | <b>Points</b> |
|                            | Reputation and Resources   |                       |               |
|                            | - Resources and capacity   | 20                    |               |
|                            | - Past performance and references  | 20                    |               |
|                            | - Qualifications of personnel  | 30                    |               |
|                            | - Demonstrated relevant experience   | 30                    |               |
|                            | Specifications –Schedule A Services  |                       |               |
|                            | - Scope of research and application  | 35                    |               |
|                            | - Methodology and innovation   | 30                    |               |
|                            | - Scheduling   | 10                    |               |
|                            | - Clarity and organization of proposal   | 15                    |               |
|                            | - Value added propositions to proposal   | 20                    |               |
|                            | Financial – Ratio Method = (lowest cost proposal divided by proposal being evaluated multiplied by 40) | 30                    |               |
| <b>TOTAL SCORE</b>         |  | <b>240</b>            |               |

Appendix 2

ATTACHMENTS

NOTE: Attachments are found at: <http://www.golden.ca/Town-Hall/Bids-and-Tenders.aspx>

- Land Use Brief by EBA, 2009
- Selected Airport Initiatives Report by EBA, 2011
- Condition Assessment by WSP, 2015
- Airport Terminal Condition Assessment 2016
- Annual Aircraft Movement Statistics, 2016-2019
- CYGE Lease Areas Overview Map
- CYGE Revenues and Expenses