

Competition Dialogue Procedure for a Public Contract RAILWAY BRIDGES UNDER VYŠEHRAD

MINUTES OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEETING

(“Minutes”)

1. On 12 October 2021 and 13 October 2021, a meeting of the evaluation committee was held to assess the Concepts of the participants, who submitted their Concept via the Contracting Authority’s Profile within the deadline specified in the Tender Documentation of the Public Contract.
 2. The evaluation committee meeting was held in a combined form, i.e. some members/alternates of the evaluation committee participated in a physical meeting of the evaluation committee in the administrative premises of the Contracting Authority, to which other members/alternates of the evaluation committee had the possibility to connect online.
-

DAY ONE – 12 October 2021

3. **TIME: 10:00 a.m.** **Meeting initiation**

The meeting of the evaluation committee was opened on 12 October 2021 at 10:00 a.m. by the secretary of the competition dialogue, Mgr. Kamila Kulhánková, who welcomed the present members/alternates of the evaluation committee and invited experts. The secretary of the competition dialogue checked the presence of individual members/alternates of the evaluation committee, the confirmation of the presence of the persons concerned at the meeting of the evaluation committee being recorded in the attendance list which forms Annex No. 1 to the Minutes, and in the case of the members/alternates of the evaluation committee, who were present online, being confirmed by their signature of the affidavit which forms Annex No. 2 to the Minutes.

Based on the recorded presence of the members/alternates of the evaluation committee, the following persons were stated by the secretary of the competition dialogue as voting at the evaluation committee meeting:

Regular members – dependent part of the evaluation committee

1. Ing. Pavel Paidar
2. Ing. Petr Hofhanzl
3. doc. Ing. arch. Petr Hlaváček (during his absence represented by the alternate, Ing. arch. Tomáš Veselý)
5. Ing. arch. Adam Scheinherr (online participation)
4. Ing. arch. Zuzana Hamanová

Regular members – independent part of the evaluation committee

1. doc. Ing. Pavel Ryjáček, Ph.D.
2. Ing. Václav Jandáček
3. Ing. Michal Drahorád, Ph.D.
4. doc. Ing. arch. Radek Kolařík

5. Ing. arch. Jan Sedlák
6. Ing. Martin Krupauer

4. **TIME: 10:10 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.**

Summary of the competition dialogue so far, Summary of the participants' Concepts

The secretary of the competition dialogue further summarised the course of the competition dialogue to date and stated that within the deadline for the submission of Concepts, which had been set to 30 September 2021 by 6:00 p.m., 12 Concepts were accepted, i.e. all 12 participants, who had been invited to submit Concepts within the deadline, submitted their Concepts to the Contracting Authority via the Contracting Authority's Profile.

On 4 October 2021, after a check of the submitted Concepts by the representatives of the organiser of the competition dialogue, the Concepts were shared in electronic form with the evaluation committee, so that the members/alternates of the evaluation committee could study the received Concepts before the meeting of the evaluation committee.

The purpose of the meeting of the evaluation committee on 12-13 October 2021 is to evaluate the Concepts and, in accordance with paragraph 5.8. of the Tender Documentation, to reduce the number of designs.

The secretary of the competition dialogue further reminded that designs shortlisting criteria shall be the selected quality criteria set out by the Contracting Authority for the follow-up evaluation of proposals in the Tender Procedure, specifically the following quality sub-criteria under the evaluation criterion "**Quality of the Draft Design**":

	Evaluation sub-criteria	Evaluated aspects under the evaluation sub-criterion (in no order of significance)
1.	Transport Solution	<p>Transfer Links</p> <p>Within this aspect, better rating shall be awarded to that Concept, which offers a better transport solution in terms of the length of transfer links and actual transfers between different modes of transport. Shorter transfer links and better interconnectedness of transfers are deemed preferable in the evaluation.</p> <p>Road passenger transport and public transport</p> <p>In the evaluation of this aspect, the overall transport solution within the context of roads shall be assessed in terms of concept, capacity and functionality. For road public transport, also in terms of transfer links to other (relevant) modes of transport.</p> <p>Pedestrian and bicycle transport</p> <p>The aspect addressed under this specific criterion shall</p>

		<p>be the quality, smoothness and accessibility of pedestrian and bicycle transport in the area. For pedestrian transport, better rating shall be awarded to a design that will ensure safe and intuitive access of pedestrians to individual modes of transport without the need for complicated transfer routes. For bicycle transport, better rating shall be awarded to a design that will allow a smoother connection in the Vršovice – Smíchov and Podolí – city centre directions (and their mutual interconnections), while at the same time without the need for cyclists to dismount their bicycles when traversing these routes and their interconnections.</p>
2.	<p>Architectural and urban (zoning) design</p>	<p>Overall quality of the architectural and urban (zoning) design</p> <p>Within this aspect, better rating shall be awarded to a design which, in architectural and urban terms, will better reflect the larger area under consideration and its contexts (in particular the right bank of the Vltava embankment), and will preserve or improve the quality of this area. Better rating shall be awarded to a design, which can be assumed to raise the level of appeal of the area under consideration to both local citizens and tourists. The evaluation committee shall take into account the fact that the area under consideration is subject to area monument protection (see paragraph 2.2.3. of the Task Specification) and better rating shall be awarded to a design, which will introduce a sensitive solution in terms of the area monument protection requirements and will respect major long-distance viewing axes in the area under consideration, so that the bridging design complements the urban characteristics of the area that is subject to monument protection. The evaluation committee in this context will refer in particular to the overall architectural and urban impact of the participant's design when drawn into photographs of the places concerned. At the same time, better rating will be awarded to a design, which will allow a view from the bridge in both directions – towards the Prague Castle as well as towards Vyšehrad.</p>
3.	<p>Future operation (traffic)</p>	<p>Use of common materials and approved systems in the structural design</p> <p>Better rating shall be awarded to a design, which will use, within the context of the support frame and substructure, common materials and approved,</p>

		<p>standard systems in the bridge structure.</p> <p>Robustness of the structural design</p> <p>Better rating shall be awarded to a design, which will, in terms of its robustness, enable the structure to withstand adverse events and occurrences such as fire, explosion, impact, flood load and other impacts of emergencies or human error, without suffering damage that is disproportionate to the original cause. In the evaluation from the viewpoint of robustness of the structure, better rating shall thus be awarded to a design, which will clearly ensure integrity of the structural system under various extreme and extraordinary loads (hence in terms of robustness, for example tie rods etc. would be deemed a completely unsuitable solution).</p>
4.	Technical parameters	<p>Simplicity of the bridge structure</p> <p>The submitted design shall be evaluated from the viewpoint of simplicity of the bridge structure. With the intention of easier implementation in construction and easier subsequent maintenance, better rating shall be awarded to a design, which will offer a simpler solution of the bridge structure with repeatability of individual elements and structures.</p>
5.	Restrictions during construction	<p>Exclusion of railway transport during construction – zero-track and limited traffic, restrictions on other transport during construction</p> <p>Subject of evaluation shall be the extent and duration of railway transport restrictions during construction, in terms of both the extent and duration of the traffic restrictions. Better rating shall be awarded to a Concept, which, in terms of the railway transport restrictions during the construction, will include a shorter duration and smaller extent of such restrictions. At the same time, any need for restrictions on other forms of transport due to construction shall be also taken into account (including restrictions on passenger vehicle transport, public transport, water transport, and bicycle and pedestrian transport). The less restrictions on the different forms of transport due to construction under the proposed design, the better rating for the design concerned.</p>

		<p>Total length of the construction period and method of construction, temporary occupation of land for construction site equipment/assembly</p> <p>Subject to evaluation under the criterion of restrictions during construction shall be also the total length of the construction period due to deterioration of conditions in the vicinity of the construction for the adjacent part of the city and the impacts of the construction on its surroundings. The evaluation committee shall award better rating to a design, which will include a shorter construction period and a construction schedule with less impacts on the wider surroundings. At the same time, better rating shall be awarded to a design that will include a shorter duration of the necessary occupation of land for the construction site equipment and its smaller footprint, as corresponds to current construction practice.</p>
--	--	--

Concepts shall be evaluated subjectively according to the Tender Documentation, according to the expertise and knowledge of the evaluation committee.

In each individual evaluation sub-criterion (criteria 1 to 5), the Concept shall be rated by the extent to which it meets the individual criteria (more preferable rating shall always be awarded to the Concept, which will meet the individual aspects of the sub-criteria to a greater extent).

The Concepts shall be evaluated in each individual sub-criterion on a point scale with 10, 5 or 3 points depending on how and to what extent the above preferences of the Contracting Authority for the individual aspects are met, specifically meaning that:

- (i) The Concept which, in the given evaluation sub-criterion, meets the individual aspects in the most preferable way shall be awarded 10 points;
- (ii) The Concept which, in the given evaluation sub-criterion, meets the individual aspects adequately, but not to the extent justifying 10-point score, shall be awarded 5 points, and finally
- (iii) The Concept which, in the given evaluation sub-criterion, does meet the individual aspects in any adequate way shall be given 3 points.

The maximum number of points a Concept can achieve is 50.

The Concepts of individual participants shall then be sorted in descending order according to the total number of points received in a procedure pursuant to Section 5.8.9 of the Tender Documentation, and **a maximum of 6 Concepts**, which have received the highest number of points, shall advance to the next round in the Competition Dialogue. Participants, who submitted the Concepts, that have not made it into further talks under the Competition Dialogue, shall be excluded from further participation in the Tender Procedure by the Contracting Authority.

All participants, who submitted the Concepts under the Competition Dialogue within the set deadline, shall be sent the decision by the Contracting Authority on shortlisting the designs along with a verbal evaluation of each participant's Concept. From the moment of delivery of the decision on the designs shortlisting, the deadline for the submission of the Modified Concept by the participants concerned starts.

After repeating the procedure for reducing the number of designs, the secretary of the competition dialogue subsequently presented the Concepts that are to be evaluated during the evaluation committee meeting, by projecting their content and, at the same time, identifying the participant who submitted the Concept to the Tender Procedure.

The list of participants, whose Concepts shall be evaluated, is as follows:

	Name of participant	Registered office of the participant/managing member of the company	Company ID No. of the participant/managing member of the company
1.	Společnost 3.0 (The Prague Institute of Planning and Development, contributory organisation, EXCON, a.s., koucky-arch.cz s.r.o., Ing. Ivan Šír, projektování dopravních staveb CZ s.r.o.)	Prague 9, Vysočany, Sokolovská 187/203, Postcode 190 00	The company does not have
2.	2T engineering, s.r.o.	Prague 6, V. P. Čkalova 502/14, Postcode 16000	28259068
3.	ov architekti s.r.o. and V-NOC s.r.o. Výtoň bridge (ov architekti s.r.o., V-NOC s.r.o.)	Prague 6, Lotyšská 646/10, Postcode 160 00	24758064
4.	Association "SEU+ADNS+ EX_ Vyšehrad Bridges" (SUDOP EU a.s., A.D.N.S. architekti s.r.o., EXprojekt s.r.o.)	Prague 3, Žižkov, Olšanská 2643/1a, Postcode 130 00	05165024
5.	SUDOP PRAHA a.s.	Prague 3, Žižkov, Olšanská 2643/1a, Postcode 130 80	25793349
6.	Dissing + Weitling, COWI, Petr Tej, WaltGalmarini	Prague 6, Havlovská 1276/19, Postcode 160 00	The company does not have
7.	Association of Bridges under Vyšehrad represented by the head of the companies association Valbek, spol. s r.o. (Valbek, spol. s r.o. and Ing. arch. akad. arch. Libor Kábrt)	Liberec, Vaňurova 505/17, Liberec III-Jeřáb	48266230
8.	monom works s.r.o.	Prague 7, U průhonu 467/26, Holešovice, Postcode 170 00	01483951
9.	"Railway bridges under Vyšehrad – arch. study – PGP, TUBES, BOELE" (PRAGOPROJEKT, a.s., TUBES spol. s r.o. a Boele s.r.o.)	Prague 4, K Ryšánce 1668/16, Postcode 147 54	45272387
10.	Association in the company under the name "PX/A6/METROPROJEKT – Vyšehrad Railway Bridges – 2021" (Pontex, spol. s r.o., ATELIER A6, s.r.o. and	Prague 4, Bezová 1658/1, Braník, Postcode 147 00	40763439

	METROPROJEKT Praha a.s.)		
11.	"The Büro & SHP" company (The Büro, s.r.o. and Stráský, Hustý a partneři s.r.o.)	Brno, Tučkova 917/24a, Postcode 602 00	07730209
12.	HUA+FAN+PS_Vyšehrad (HUA HUA ARCHITECTS s.r.o., Fundament Architects s.r.o., PROJEKTSTUDIO EUCZ s.r.o.)	Brno, Vinohrady 368/68b, Pisárky, Postcode 639 00	09546146

5. **10:30 a.m. – 12:15 p.m.**

Expert opinions of selected invited experts

The evaluation committee subsequently, between 10:30 a.m. and 11:30 a.m., heard expert opinions of the following invited experts:

1. SŽ DG 06 – Ing. Jiří Krouský (specialisation – bridge structures)
2. SŽ DG 06 – Ing. Miroslav Veliš (specialisation – railway superstructure)
3. SŽ DG 06 – Mgr. Martin Pacner (specialisation – environment)
4. SŽ DG 013 – Ing. Ivo Jauris (specialisation – to be added)

The aforementioned invited experts presented to the evaluation committee their expert assessment of the individual Concepts, especially with regard to the assessment of the Concepts in terms of the criteria of future operation, technical parameters, restrictions during construction and transport solution.

Ing. Veliš subsequently participated personally also in the afternoon part of the evaluation committee meeting, when he was giving answers to the evaluation committee's questions on the technical solutions presented by the participants within the framework of the individual Concepts to the present members/alternates of the evaluation committee during their discussion on the individual Concepts.

6. **12:00 noon – 12:45 p.m. Break**

7. **12:45 p.m. – 13:15 p.m. Expert opinion of the representative of the National Heritage Institute**

The afternoon part of the meeting of the evaluation committee was opened by Ing. arch. David Měska, a conservationist and a representative of the National Heritage Institute, specialist territorial office in Prague, who presented to the evaluation committee the opinion of the National Heritage Institute on the individual Concepts from the perspective of the heritage conservation.

8. **1:15 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. Evaluation committee discussion**

During the afternoon part of the first day of the evaluation committee meeting, the evaluation committee subsequently held a joint discussion on the individual Concepts in terms of the evaluation criteria transport solution, architectural and urban design, future operation, technical parameters and restrictions during construction. As for this discussion, the evaluation committee always asked the invited expert Ing. Veliš partial questions regarding the technical solution of the Concepts and the invited expert Ing. arch. David Měska partial questions regarding the assessment of the

Concepts from the perspective of heritage conservation.

9. **6:00 p.m. Closing of the evaluation committee meeting**

The meeting of the evaluation committee was ended on 12 October 2021 at 6:00 p.m. The evaluation committee shall continue its meeting to evaluate the Concepts on 13 October 2021 from 10:00 a.m. in the same format – hybrid form of the meeting (see clause 2 of the Minutes).

DAY TWO – 13 October 2021

10. **TIME: 10:00 a.m. Meeting initiation**

The meeting of the evaluation committee was opened on 13 October 2021 at 10:00 a.m. by the secretary of the competition dialogue, Mgr. Kamila Kulhánková, who welcomed the present members/alternates of the evaluation committee. The secretary of the competition dialogue checked the presence of individual members/alternates of the evaluation committee, the confirmation of the presence of the persons concerned at the meeting of the evaluation committee being recorded in the attendance list which forms Annex No. 3 to the Minutes, and in the case of the members/alternates of the evaluation committee, who were present online, being confirmed by their signature of the affidavit which forms Annex No. 2 to the Minutes.

Based on the recorded presence of the members/alternates of the evaluation committee, the following persons were stated by the secretary of the competition dialogue as voting at the evaluation committee meeting:

1. Ing. Pavel Paidar
2. Ing. Petr Hofhanzl (present until 5:00 p.m., during his absence represented by the alternate Ing. Jakub Bazgier)
3. doc. Ing. arch. Petr Hlaváček (online)
4. Ing. Adam Scheinherr, MSc., Ph.D. (present until 3:30 p.m., during his absence represented by the alternate Ing. arch. Tomáš Veselý)
5. Ing. arch. Zuzana Hamanová

Regular members – independent part of the evaluation committee

1. doc. Ing. Pavel Ryjáček, Ph.D.
2. Ing. Václav Jandáček
3. Ing. Michal Drahorád, Ph.D.
4. doc. Ing. arch. Radek Kolařík
5. Ing. arch. Jan Sedlák
6. Ing. Martin Krupauer

11. **TIME: 10:15 a.m. – 10:45 a.m. Summary of the 1st day of the evaluation committee meeting**

At the beginning of the second day of the evaluation committee meeting, the secretary of the competition dialogue summarised the course of the first day of the evaluation committee meeting and a written record of the comments made by the

evaluation committee during its discussion of the individual Concepts in the afternoon part of the first day of the evaluation committee meeting was projected to the evaluation committee.

12. **TIME: 10:45 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. Evaluation committee discussion**

The evaluation committee subsequently continued its discussion on the individual Concepts, in terms of the evaluation criteria transport solution, architectural and urban design, future operation, technical parameters and restrictions during construction, and at the same time the committee already formulated, for individual Concepts, the basis for their evaluation for the purposes of the Minutes.

13. **12:30 p.m. – 1:00 p.m. Break**

14. **1:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. Evaluation committee discussion**

The evaluation committee continued its discussion on the individual Concepts, in terms of the evaluation criteria transport solution, architectural and urban design, future operation, technical parameters and restrictions during construction, and at the same time the committee already formulated, for individual Concepts, the basis for their evaluation for the purposes of the Minutes.

15. **4:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. Scoring of individual Concepts**

At the end of the evaluation committee's discussion on the individual Concepts, the evaluation committee agreed to score the individual Concepts, pursuant to clause 5.8.9 of the Tender Documentation jointly, not by voting, with expressing the opinion of both the regular members and alternates of the evaluation committee.

Based on the evaluation committee's discussion of the individual Concepts in terms of the evaluation criteria of transport solution, architectural and urban design, future operation, technical parameters and restrictions during construction, the evaluation committee performed a **joint scoring** of the individual Concepts in the scoring scale of 10, 5 and 3 points, in relation to how and to what extent, in the expert opinion of the evaluation committee, the individual Concepts fulfil the individual evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 5.8 of the Tender Documentation.

The joint scoring of the individual Concepts by the evaluation committee was determined as follows:

	Transport Solution	Architectural and urban design	Future operation	Technical parameters	Restrictions during construction
Concept 1	3	10	5	5	5
Concept 2	5	3	10	10	10
Concept 3	10	5	3	3	5
Concept 4	3	3	3	3	3

Concept 5	10	10	10	10	10
Concept 6	5	3	5	5	5
Concept 7	5	10	5	3	5
Concept 8	5	3	3	3	3
Concept 9	3	3	5	5	5
Concept 10	3	3	5	5	5
Concept 11	5	5	5	10	10
Concept 12	10	3	10	10	10

	Total points
Concept 1	28
Concept 2	38
Concept 3	26
Concept 4	15
Concept 5	50
Concept 6	23
Concept 7	28
Concept 8	17
Concept 9	21
Concept 10	21
Concept 11	35
Concept 12	43

16. **5:00 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.**

Shortlisting the designs

The secretary of the competition dialogue summarised that according to the scoring of the individual Concepts, which was formulated jointly by the evaluation committee

and which is the result of the two-day discussion of the evaluation committee on individual Concepts, the participants, who submitted the following Concepts, advance to the next stage of the competition dialogue:

	Total points
Concept 1	28
Concept 2	38
Concept 5	50
Concept 7	28
Concept 11	35
Concept 12	43

17. **5:30 p.m. – 5:45 p.m. Summary of the next steps**

The secretary of the competition dialogue recalled that during the two-day meeting, the evaluation committee had formulated a written summary of the most important aspects of the individual Concepts, which had been subsequently the reason for assigning the scores as set out in clause 15 of the Minutes. This written record of the evaluation shall be sent to the evaluation committee for per rollam approval after the conclusion of the evaluation committee meeting.

The secretary of the competition dialogue further stated that in relation to those participants who, based on the designs shortlisting, advanced to the next stage of the competition dialogue, recommendations for finalisation of the Concepts into the Modified Concept would be compiled on the basis of the evaluation committee's comments made by the committee during the two-day meeting. These recommendations shall be sent to the evaluation committee for per rollam approval after the conclusion of the evaluation committee meeting.

The following documents shall subsequently be sent to the individual participants in the Tender Procedure:

1. Decision of the Contracting Authority to reduce the number of solutions/designs
 - this decision shall identify the participants advancing to the next stage of the competition dialogue
 - the following Minutes shall be annexed to this decision
 - each of the advancing participants shall be sent a verbal evaluation of their Concepts separately to the above documents (in order to preserve the confidentiality of the proposed design, the verbal evaluation of all Concepts cannot be made available to all participants at the same time)
 - each of the advancing participants shall be sent a recommendation for the completion of the Concept into the form of the Modified Concept.
2. Decision of the Contracting Authority regarding the exclusion of a participant from participation in the Tender Procedure (in the context of the Decision of the

Contracting Authority to reduce the number of solutions/designs)

- this decision shall identify the participants who do not advance to the next stage of the competition dialogue
- the following Minutes shall be annexed to this decision
- each of the non-advancing participants shall be sent a verbal evaluation of their Concept separately to the above documents

18. 5:45 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. Final word of the evaluation committee chairman

At the end of the meeting, the chairman of the evaluation committee took the final word. He thanked all the members and alternates of the evaluation committee for the constructive debate on the participants' Concepts. At the same time, he said that the participants had faced a difficult task in dealing with such a difficult topic. He appreciated the work of all the participants without distinction, because the generally high quality of all the submitted Concepts had also reflected in the long discussions over the individual Concepts during the two-day meeting of the evaluation committee.

At the same time, the chairman of the evaluation committee requested that a note on behalf of the evaluation committee be included in the decision to exclude participants reading that the evaluation committee thanks all participants for their efforts in the preparation of the Concepts.

The chairman of the evaluation committee instructed the secretary of the evaluation committee to send the written record of the evaluation of the Concepts, the recommendations for finalisation of the Concepts into the form of the Modified Concept and the Minutes of the evaluation committee meeting, which is a record of the two-day meeting of the evaluation committee, to all the jurors present, in the above-mentioned order.

The chairman of the evaluation committee asked those present if any of the members or alternates of the evaluation committee requested to put any personal opinion or comment in the Minutes. No such proposal was raised.

The meeting of the evaluation committee was ended on 13 October 2021 at 6:00 p.m.

PROCEDURE OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE AFTER THE END OF THE MEETING

After the end of the evaluation committee meeting, in the meantime when the members of the evaluation committee were revising the written record of the evaluation meeting, the Contracting Authority and the chairman of the committee received a written request from the members of the evaluation committee, doc. Ing. arch. Petr Hlaváček and Ing. arch. Adam Scheinherr, for the possibility of convening a meeting of the evaluation committee, with the proviso that the aforementioned members of the evaluation committee would justify their request at this meeting.

The Contracting Authority and the chairman of the evaluation committee complied with the request of the above-mentioned members of the evaluation committee and a meeting of the evaluation committee was convened on 21 January 2022 from 11:00 a.m. in accordance with their request and the time availability of the individual members and alternates of the evaluation committee.

The following persons attended this meeting of the evaluation committee:

DEPENDENT PART OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Regular members

1. **Ing. Pavel Paidar** (physical presence)
2. **Ing. Petr Hofhanzl** (physical presence)
3. **doc. Ing. arch. Petr Hlaváček** (physical presence)
4. **Ing. Adam Scheinherr, MSc., Ph.D.** (physical presence)
5. **Ing. arch. Zuzana Hamanová** (physical presence)

Alternates

1. **Ing. arch. Tomáš Veselý** (physical presence)
2. **Ing. Jakub Bazgier** (online participation)

INDEPENDENT PART OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Regular members

1. **doc. Ing. Pavel Ryjáček, Ph.D.** (physical presence)
2. **Ing. Václav Jandáček** (online participation)
3. **Ing. Michal Drahorád, Ph.D** (online participation)
4. **doc. Ing. arch. Radek Kolařík** (physical presence)
5. **Ing. arch. Jan Sedlák** (physical presence)
6. **Ing. Martin Krupauer** (online participation)

Alternates

1. **Doc. Ing. Tomáš Rotter, CSc.** (physical presence)
2. **Mgr. Michal Novotný, Ph.D.** (online participation)
3. **Ing. arch. Jaroslav Wertig** (physical presence)
4. **Ing. arch. MgA. David Mateáško** (physical presence)

Doc. Ing. arch. Petr Hlaváček and Ing. Adam Scheinherr, MSc., Ph.D. began by thanking the members and alternates of the evaluation committee for attending the meeting of the evaluation committee, adding that doc. Ing. arch. Petr Hlaváček, who had been present online at the meeting of the evaluation committee on 12 and 13 October 2021, and Ing. Adam Scheinherr, MSc., Ph.D., who had been represented by an alternate at the meeting of the evaluation committee on 13 October 2021 from 3:30 p.m., would be interested in repeating the meeting of the evaluation committee in order to go through all the participants' Concepts again before issuing the Minutes of the evaluation committee meeting held on 12 and 13 October 2021.

Regarding the abovementioned request of the evaluation committee, the secretary of the competition dialogue stated that in order to allow for the already concluded meeting of the evaluation committee held on 12 and 13 October 2021, it would be necessary to revoke the previous result of the evaluation committee meeting. A majority of the voting members of the evaluation committee would have to agree to the proposal for revocation.

The individual members of the evaluation committee commented on the proposal of doc. Ing. arch. Petr Hlaváček and Ing. Adam Scheinherr, MSc., Ph.D. in such a way that in their opinion the meeting held on 12 and 13 October 2021 had been absolutely correct, each member or alternate of the evaluation committee had had the space to comment on the submitted Concepts, individual statements had then been discussed, experts had been invited for the expert topics and the two-day meeting had given space for the expression of all opinions; the final score had reflected the subjective evaluation of not only all members but also alternates of the evaluation committee.

Notwithstanding the above, the members and alternates of the evaluation committee agreed to project the participants' Concepts together again and to review the record of the verbal evaluation of each Concept and recommendations for finalisation of the Concepts into the form of the Modified Concept. This process was carried out by the evaluation committee from between 11:30 a.m. and 1:40 p.m.

After completion of the aforementioned procedure, evaluation committee voting was announced regarding the proposal of doc. Ing. arch. Petr Hlaváček and Ing. Adam Scheinherr, MSc., Ph.D. for the revocation of the result of the evaluation committee meeting dated 13 October 2021.

Before the beginning of the voting, the secretary of the competition dialogue summarised the voting members of the evaluation committee as follows:

DEPENDENT PART OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Regular members

1. **Ing. Pavel Paidar** (physical presence)
2. **Ing. Petr Hofhanzl** (physical presence)
3. **doc. Ing. arch. Petr Hlaváček** (physical presence)
4. **Ing. Adam Scheinherr, MSc., Ph.D.** (physical presence)
5. **Ing. arch. Zuzana Hamanová** (physical presence)

INDEPENDENT PART OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Regular members

1. **doc. Ing. Pavel Ryjáček, Ph.D.** (physical presence)
2. **Ing. Václav Jandáček** (online participation)
3. **Ing. Michal Drahorád, Ph.D.** (online participation)
4. **doc. Ing. arch. Radek Kolařík** (physical presence)
5. **Ing. arch. Jan Sedlák** (physical presence)
6. **Ing. Martin Krupauer** (online participation)

1:45 p.m. Proposal for voting on the revocation of the result of the meeting dated 13 October 2021

Question from the secretary of the competition dialogue: *"Who is in favour of the result of the evaluation committee meeting dated 13 October 2021 being revoked and the evaluation committee holding a new meeting of the evaluation committee focused on the Concepts evaluation?"*

Positive vote of a majority of the voting members of the evaluation committee is required for the proposal to be accepted.

FOR: 5
AGAINST: 4
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 2

Voting result: The proposal for revocation of the result of the meeting dated 13 October 2021 was not adopted.

2:00 p.m. Closing of the evaluation committee meeting

The chairman of the evaluation committee instructed the secretary of the competition dialogue to record the information about this meeting of the evaluation committee in the Minutes of the evaluation committee meeting dated 12 and 13 October 2021 and to circulate them again, with a verbal record of the evaluation of the individual Concepts and a verbal record of the recommendations for finalisation of the Concepts into the form of the Modified Concept, to the evaluation committee. Once the Minutes and the above-mentioned annexes have been agreed, the steps pursuant to clause 17 of the original version of the Minutes can then be implemented.

All members and alternates of the evaluation committee present concluded by thanking the Contracting Authority for the opportunity to hold the meeting.

The meeting of the evaluation committee was ended on 21 January 2022 at 2:00 p.m.

As part of the per rollam approval of the Minutes, Ing. Adam Scheinherr, MSc., Ph.D. to record his personal opinion as follows:

Deputy Mayor Ing. Adam Scheinherr pointed out that the Concept No. 12 does not meet the requirements of conservation and does not comply with the valid opinion of the Department of Monument Conservation of the City of Prague and as such cannot be permitted in the future. Therefore, it is inappropriate to push this proposal to the next round when the concept cannot receive the approval of the Historic Preservation Board for permitting. It would be detrimental for this proposal to take the place of another proposal which, on the other hand, does not have this problem. Ing. Adam Scheinherr also supported concept no. 6 and 3, which preserve the listed bridge structure, giving it a new use and thus a new function, subject to the requirements of the conservation authority. While the authors of concept No. 3 admit in the material that the form of the concept is now inadequate in terms of loading, the concept of the design is of very high architectural quality and it is therefore appropriate to have its form examined in the next round, subject to any conditions. Concept No 6 is again a very good proposal in terms of technical and architectural quality. It has been designed by an international team of bridge engineers with extensive worldwide experience in the reconstruction and new construction of bridge structures. The original steel structure of the bridge is used to extend the leisure function of the Smíchov and New Town embankments. The design appropriately connects the embankments and thus expands the area of the embankments, which are already inadequate in terms of capacity for visitors. The listed structure thus acquires a new function and is preserved for future generations. For rail traffic, on the other hand, a new bridge of subtle design is proposed, which does not disturb the environment and can fully fulfil its transport function. Finally, Ing. Adam Scheinherr pointed out that proposals that do not include the preservation of the current listed structure should present a solution on how and where to use this structure.

All voting members/alternates of the evaluation committee agreed to the minutes of the evaluation committee meeting per rollam. The consents are available for inspection from the secretary of the competition dialogue.