

**RETURN BIDS TO:**  
**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**  
**Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions**  
**- TPSGC**  
**Room 910**  
**410 - 22nd Street East**  
**Bureau 910**  
**410 - 22e rue Est**  
**Saskatoon**  
**Saskatchewan**  
**S7K 5T6**  
**Bid Fax: (306) 975-5397**

## **SOLICITATION AMENDMENT**

## **MODIFICATION DE L'INVITATION**

The referenced document is hereby revised; unless otherwise indicated, all other terms and conditions of the Solicitation remain the same.

Ce document est par la présente révisé; sauf indication contraire, les modalités de l'invitation demeurent les mêmes.

### **Comments - Commentaires**

**Vendor/Firm Name and Address**  
**Raison sociale et adresse du**  
**fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur**

**Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution**  
Public Works and Government Services  
Canada/Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux  
Canada  
Suite 1650  
635 - 8th Ave. S.W.  
Bureau 1650  
635 - 8e avenue, SO  
Calgary  
Calgary  
Alberta  
T2P 3M3

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Interim Underground Stab Activities	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EW702-131876/F	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 006
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> EW702-131876	<b>Date</b> 2014-06-06
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$GMP-004-6229	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> GMP-2-35105 (004)	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2014-06-30</b>	<b>Time Zone</b> <b>Fuseau horaire</b> Central Standard Time CST
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Okemaysim, Tammy	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> gmp004
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (306) 975-6583 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (306) 975-5397
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b> PUBLIC WORKS AND GOVERNMENT SERVICES CANADA GIANT MINE YELLOWKNIFE, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES	

**Instructions: See Herein**

**Instructions: Voir aux présentes**

<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>	<b>Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée</b>
<b>Vendor/Firm Name and Address</b> <b>Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur</b>	
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> <b>Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur</b>	
<b>Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm</b> <b>(type or print)</b> <b>Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/</b> <b>de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

---

**NOTIFICATION OF REVISION**

Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Giant Mine Project

---

Project Name: Interim Underground Stabilization Activities, Giant Mine, Yellowknife, NT  
Project Number: R.014204.300

Date: Tuesday, May 27, 2014

---

To All Bidders:

The following changes, additions, and/or deletions are hereby made a part of the Solicitation Documents.  
The addendum will form part of the Contract Documents.

**1. Responses to RFI's:**

**Development:**

**Q: 1.** Are the stopes to be frozen after backfill?

**A: 1.** This has not been determined and does not impact the scope of work outlined in the Terms of Reference.

**Q: 2.** Reference is made to the requirement of wetting the dust in arsenic stopes with a lance via a borehole before placement of paste fill in order to fully saturate the dust to enable a quicker freezing process.

**A: 2.** Arsenic stopes are not part of this Terms of Reference.

**Additional questions:**

**Q: 3.** Does probe hole drilling ahead of the face in any new development have to be completed to check for unidentified voids?

**A: 3.** No. The proponent is not required to advance any new underground development as part of this particular solicitation.

**Q: 4.** Is there any new development as part of the interim underground stability activities?

**A: 4.** No.

**Q: 5.** Does ground support in refurbished headings and new development need to be designed for a particular excavation lifespan?

**A: 5.** The care and maintenance contractor will be responsible for maintenance of safe underground access where it is required by the proponent contractor and therefore no ground support design by the proponent is required.

- 
- Q: 6.** Are there any geotechnical documents available pertaining to structure, rock mass and excavation condition?
- A: 6.** Reports available focus on pillar stability on not ground control in the development openings.
- Q: 7.** Is a 3-D mine model available to bidders?
- A: 7.** Yes, a copy of the 3D mine model, in Surpac format was provided.
- Q: 8.** There is no discussion in the RFP about capturing any water leaching from the backfill, it not expected or is there an understanding on how this will/could be managed?
- A: 8.** The proponent is not responsible for ensuring that bleed water or leachate adheres to any guidelines.
- Q: 9.** Is the proponent required to develop and provide a plan for the backfilling over and the work done by Golder?
- A: 9.** The proponent is required to provide a backfilling plan that will meet the performance requirements of this solicitation package. The conceptual mitigation plans (completed by Golder) were developed to assist the bidders in understanding the scope of the project, backfill containment locations used to develop the backfill volumes in the Basis of Payment, key locations of backfill containment to prevent material from entering critical underground infrastructure (eg. Ventilation path) and containment required to prevent backfill from entering large voids that are not accessible in which backfill volume containment would be problematic. The proponent can either use the conceptual mitigation plans in the solicitation package to develop their backfilling plan or develop their own approach to meet the performance of the solicitation package.
- Q: 10.** Does the proponent need to undertake underground backfilled stope stability assessment and design during the backfilling of the stopes?
- A: 10.** No
- Q: 11.** Is the tailings on surface considered hazardous or is all the hazardous material stored underground already?
- A: 11.** Yes.
- Q: 12.** What alternatives to foam resin fences have been considered for remote barricade placement, if any?
- A: 12.** Expanding resin foam, and foaming concrete were considered but are not currently approved for use underground at Giant Mine (see Water Licence). Inflatable grout bags were considered but rejected for technical reasons including the delivery borehole required was relatively large diameter.

**Q: 13.** Can you please confirm that Golder is predrilling all design holes and if so, that we are to utilize this plan.

**A: 13.** The drilling is ongoing. All designed boreholes shown in the solicitation documents are anticipated to be drilled but some slight changes to position and diameter may occur once it is completed. The successful proponent will be provided with a report on the final borehole completion document after contract award. The proponent is expected to include costs for drilling additional boreholes that may be required to complete the backfilling work as specified in Section 02 02 00- Drilling of the solicitation package. Such drilling could include: additional drilling proposed by the successful proponent as an alternative mitigation approach as detailed in the Contractor's submitted Backfill Method Plan.

**Q: 14.** When are these holes anticipated to be completed?

**A: 14.** August 2014.

**Q: 15.** When will we be able to get a lay out of this plan so that we know where the design holes will be located?

**A: 15.** The solicitation package includes maps with the planned delivery boreholes and the 3D Mine Geometry Model contains these design holes.

**Q: 16.** Is there a 3 dimensional model of the underground stopes available that we can obtain?

**A: 16.** Yes, it was provided in Surpac format at the mandatory bidders conference.

**Q.17:** Could you please advise the estimated start date of the project in 2014?

**A.17:** Refer to Section 3.5 - Q.7.

**Q.18:** Can we receive a minimum two week extension of the solicitation close date (Jun 19, 2014) to fully address the requirements of the scope and provide the best value proposal?

**A.18:** Refer to Amendment #005, Section 1.1.

**Q.19:** Is it the contractor's responsibility to design the paste backfill material or is Golder Associates the design engineer responsible to design all paste backfill material?

**A.19:** The Contractor is to design backfill paste material.

**Q.20:** Could you please advise the volume of material to be excavated per year? When will be the estimated year to complete the tailing excavation?

**A.20:** The solicitation states that 20,000m3 to be processed during the 2014 work season with the balance required in 2015.

**Q.21:** Please clarify which licenses will be required by municipal and local authorities to execute the work and identify which licenses are contractor responsibilities.

**A.21:** It has been confirmed that a building permit from the City of Yellowknife will not be required. Please refer to Section 3.5 - Q.17.

**Q.22:** Could you please clarify if the Miscellaneous Project costs (Payment Items BOPC-1 through BOPC-5, Balance of Project Costs in the Basis of Payment Schedule) will be compensated under the Lump Sum portion of the Annex A bid price table?

**A.22:** Yes.

**Q.23:** Please provide best available estimates for:

- The total amount and/or percentage of clay/rock rejects from the original excavated material from the tailings pond.
- The amount of steel/metal found in source material during the backfill trial.

**A.23:** The quantities of clay/rock and other rejects and debris was not documented during the B1-18 backfill program in 2013. The type of materials found has been provided in Amendment #005 - Q.7.

**Q.24:** Please advise the distance of the existing stockpile location at the Giant mine for Non-Hazardous debris or identify in the drawings the potential proximity location to the stope complex backfilling operations where the stockpile Non-Hazardous material will be allowed for future stockpile.

**A.24:** The location for the stockpile of non-hazardous debris sorted or separated from tailings material by the contractor will be stockpiled as detailed in Section 02 41 23 - Debris Removal, Item 3.3.

**Q.25:** Are completed Consent to a Criminal Record Verification forms required to be submitted with the tender response at the time of closing, or are these simply required to be submitted upon request by PWGSC.

Consent to a Criminal Record Verification (PWGSC-TPSGC 229 form)  
<http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/app-acq/forms/formulaires-forms-eng.html>

**A.25:** Consent to Criminal Record Verification forms will only be required when requested from PWGSC.

## 2. Mandatory Site Visit

### Minutes of Mandatory Site Visit Interim Underground Stabilization Activities Giant Mine, Yellowknife, NT May 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup>, 2014

#### Attendees

Attendee	Organization
Robert Turek	Public Works and Government Services Canada

Tammy Okemaysim	Public Works and Government Services Canada
Jennifer Singbeil	Public Works and Government Services Canada
Chris MacInnis	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada
Dave Colbourne	DXB Project Management Inc. – Consultant to Canada
Lorne Schmidt	PPI Consulting Inc. - Fairness Monitor
Darren Kennard	Golder Associates Ltd. - Consultant to PWGSC
Brent Wiltzen	Nuna Logistics Ltd.
Larry Hooper	LPR Concrete
Pat Leacy	LPR Concrete
Mike Borden	Det'on Cho / Nuna JV
Roland Tosney	JR'T GeoEngineering
Larry Fairbairn	RTL
Hedley Rideout	RTL
Paul Gourlay	Tli Cho Investment Corp.
Pat Tymchatyn	Tli Cho Investment Corp.
Wally Mills	Tli Cho Investment Corp.
Kenny Ruptash	Det'on Cho Nahanni
Gord Peckford	Det'on Cho Nahanni
Mark Miller	AMEC
Bart Taylor	Quantum Murray
Josh Ruud	Quantum Murray
Adam Martel	Tetra Tech
Peter van Alphen	DMC Mining
Peter Wold	Parsons
Bob Johnson	Delta Engineering
Ross Hill	SCR Mining & Tunnelling
Brandon Seguin	SCR Mining & Tunnelling
Jon Jolicoeur	Tervita
Frank Palkovits	Kovit Engineering
Garnet Klause	Procon
Charlie Toepfner	Cementation
Pat Bartley	Cementation
Dan Betteridge	Betteridge Enterprises Ltd.
Jared Buchko	Everclear Environmental Solutions

### Summary of Activities

The registered attendees were divided into groups, as follows:

#### Group 1

RTL  
LPR Concrete  
Tli Cho Investment  
Det'on Cho / Nuna JV

#### Group 2

Tetrattech  
DMC Mining  
Parsons  
AMEC

#### Group 3

Everclear Environmental Solutions  
Betteridge Enterprises Ltd.  
SCR Mining & Tunnelling  
Tervita Corp.

Nuna Logistics Ltd.  
JRT GeoEngineering  
Nahanni

Gannett Fleming  
Quantum Murray  
Delta Engineering

Procon  
Kovit Engineering  
Cementation

The site visit for Group 1 occurred on May 12<sup>th</sup> at 1:00pm. The group toured the underground followed by a surface tour.

The site visit for Group 2 occurred on May 13<sup>th</sup> at 8:30am. The group toured the underground followed by a surface tour.

The site visit for Group 3 occurred on May 13<sup>th</sup> at 1:00pm. The group toured the underground followed by a surface tour.

Each meeting commenced with introductions, followed by a safety orientation provided by the Care and Maintenance contractor, Det'on Cho / Nuna Joint Venture. The safety orientation included an explanation on Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) required and how to use the emergency CO2 ventilator in case of a fire underground.

All underground tours were administered by Darren Kennard and covered the following areas:

- B1-18 stope complex, Upper, Middle, and Lower accesses. Rockfill in the upper access, paste fill (flooded) in the middle access and an example of a dismantled fill fence that was used to plug an exit from the B1-18 EA stope void.
- B3-06 South / Upper, visited the B3-06 bypass and looked into the non-man entry B3-06 South / Upper – West limb void. Also went to the 2<sup>nd</sup> level above B3-06 South Upper and observed existing underground boreholes drilled into the east and west limbs as well as the paste delivery / service hole drilled from surface. Also visited the B3-02 stope void on 3<sup>rd</sup> level where paste could report to if it leaks from the B3-06 South / Upper voids.
- Visited B3-10 Mid stope complex voids access between 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> levels (multiple interconnected void) from the main ramp in the area. Also visited 3<sup>rd</sup> level below B3-10 Mid voids where paste could exit if some inaccessible sub-vertical raises prove leaky.

Attendees were able to see examples of barricades and fill fences. It was noted that the fill fences are not engineered.

All surface tours were administered by Darren Kennard and Dave Coulbourne and covered the following areas.

1. South and central tailings ponds: to be used as the primary source of raw materials for the paste production. Sea cans in the tailings pond were noted as being utilized for paste tests performed during the previous underground contract. Foam was tested but is not approved for use at Giant Mine. The Terms of Reference requires 20,000 m3 of tailings to be processed in FY 14/15. These tailings can be stored anywhere within the tailings basin. It was noted that water was added to place the paste last fall as the tailings had dried considerably.
2. Temporary storage facility: is available for this contract. The building is not lined and does not need to be as it rests on the tailings basin. There is no heat source in the building; however, frost fighters were used last season to keep tailings thawed. It was noted that the facility is not sufficient to store all the 20,000 m3 required for preparation this field season hence the requirement for a dust management plan.
3. Polishing pond: primary source of water for paste production. It was noted that the Water License has a restriction of 300 m3 as a daily limit from this pond and there is a requirement to share water with the Roaster project hence the Terms of Reference indicates a 250 m3 limit. The

Roaster deconstruction project is currently targeted for completion in 2014. The arsenic level in the polishing pond is 5%. It was also noted that the Water License has been amended so there is no limit on the amount of water used from the Northwest Tailings Pond.

4. South end of B1 pit near B shaft: locations above B1-18 complex directly below and along west side of pit. Other areas currently being drilled were pointed out: arsenic stope B2-08/B3-06 on east side of pit, arsenic stope B2-12/13/14 off north end of pit. Several borehole collars were pointed out and the surrounding site area available for equipment set up. Delivery holes are 8" lined and observation holes are 4" unlined. Pointed out the limited space available over the B1-18 complex and the associated challenges. There were 4 voids to be backfilled at B1-18, to date all but one has been filled. The need to utilize environmental safeguards when working near Baker Creek were also pointed out.
5. B3-10 Mid Complex, surface collars of several boreholes meant to be used to backfill and monitor filling of the area were pointed out and the surrounding site area available for equipment set up.
6. North end of A1 pit: location of 3-70 stope: no underground access to this stope. Underground access was thought about but it is too difficult. Several borehole collars were pointed out and the surrounding site area available for equipment set up. It was noted that the actual location of some of the boreholes may vary from the conceptual plans in the RFP. When drilling is complete, this information will be made available to the potential bidders.

#### Questions:

Q.1: Will all the paste delivery holes needed for this project be completed prior to the requirement for paste backfilling under this contract.

A.1: Yes, the drilling program is scheduled to be complete in August 2014.

Q.2: Stope A3-70: Is there a requirement to build a berm to protect the creek? Is there water in this stope? If so, is the contractor responsible to dewater the stope?

A.2: Environmental protection would be required as per the Terms of Reference as needed and would be the contractor's responsibility. We do not believe there is significant water in the stope and there is no expectation that dewatering stopes would be required.

Q.3: Is it possible to pipe water in from the NW tailings pond or to directly hook into the existing piping? When does the WTP typically start operations?

A.3: The Water Treatment Plans (WTP) operations start mid-June with discharge starting in July and continue throughout the summer. During this time approximately 6000 m3 of water per day is pumped from the NW Tailings Pond to the WTP. It would be an option to connect directly to this line for access to water. This would have to be coordinated with the Care & Maintenance Contractor.

Q.4: How do contractors access the B1 pit paste delivery borehole?

A.4: The ramp into the pit was pointed out.

Q.5: Was the B1 sinkhole the result of a crown pillar failure?



- 
- A.5: No it was not crown pillar failure and we are confident the B1 sinkhole risk has been mitigated.
- Q.6: Can the diamond drill holes planned for observation be used for paste delivery also?
- A.6: Yes, note the holes are only 96mm in diameter and will not be lined with steel for their entire length.
- Q.7: What is the diameter of paste deliver boreholes?
- A.7: 8" diameter.
- Q.8: Stope A3-70: Is the contractor required to keep the utility road open behind/downstream from A370 at all times?
- A.8: Access south of the A370 work area is required during the backfill program. However, the access required is minimal and more critical during freshet season. After freshet access could be reduced to light vehicles only. This light vehicle traffic is only periodic in nature to allow the Care & Maintenance Contractor to conduct visual inspections of key infrastructure.
- Q.9: What are the dimensions of the Temporary storage facility designated for tailings?
- A.9: 100ft x 230ft.
- Q.10: When is the contractor required to recontour the tailing ponds affected by the sourcing for paste production?
- A.10: As per the Terms of Reference there is an interim and final restoration required.
- Q.11: Is the delivery line for B3-06 at the bottom of the pit?
- A.11: Noted that may have been pointed out in error during one of the tours. Delivery borehole for B3-06 is not in the pit, it is on the east rim of B1 pit between the pit and the old Highway 4.
- Q.12: Are there any remaining tailings available from the previous program to backfill B1-18?
- A.12: No, all the tailings prepared where utilized.
- Q.13: Is there any aggregate available on-site and can it be used?
- A.13: There is no aggregate material available on-site for paste production. Aggregate can be used but it would be the responsibility of the contractor to source it off site.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation  
EW702-131876/F  
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client  
EW702-131876

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.  
006  
File No. - N° du dossier  
GMP-2-35105

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur  
gmp004  
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

### 3. Mandatory Bidders Conference

**Minutes of Bidders Conference  
Interim Underground Stabilization Activities  
Giant Mine, Yellowknife, NT  
Wednesday, May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2014 at 9:00 AM MT**

#### Attendees

Attendee	Organization
Robert Turek	Public Works and Government Services Canada
Tammy Okemaysim	Public Works and Government Services Canada
Brad Thompson	Public Works and Government Services Canada
Jennifer Singbeil	Public Works and Government Services Canada
Chris MacInnis	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada
Dave Colbourne	DXB Project Management Inc. – Consultant to Canada
Lorne Schmidt	PPI Consulting Inc. – Fairness Monitor
Darren Kennard	Golder Associates Ltd. - Consultant to PWGSC
Brandon Seguin	SCR Mining & Tunnelling
Ross Hill	SCR Mining & Tunnelling
Mark Miller	AMEC
Jalil Mustafa	Tetra Tech
Peter van Alphen	DMC Mining
Paul Gourlay	Tli Cho Investment Corp.
Adam Martel	DMC Mining
Peter Wold	Parsons
Roland Tosney	JRT GeoEngineering
Steve Taylor	Quantum Murray
Gord Peckford	Det'on Cho Nahanni
Bob Johnson	Delta Engineering
Colin Campbell	Parsons
Dwight Peart	Nahanni
Jon Jolicoeur	Tervita
Kenny Ruptash	Det'on Cho Nahanni
Brent Wiltzen	Nuna Logistics Ltd.
Mike Borden	Det'on Cho / Nuna JV
Larry Hooper	LPR Concrete
Pat Leacy	LPR Concrete
Garnet Klause	Procon
Dale Wheaton	Tli Cho Investment Corp.
Larry Fairbairn	RTL Robinson Enterprises Ltd.
Ken Szarkowicz	Clark Builders
Josh Ruud	Quantum Murray

Larry Wheaton	RTL Robinson Enterprises Ltd.
Charlie Toepfner	Cementation
Pat Bartley	Cementation
Jared Buchko	Everclear Environmental Solutions
Dan Betteridge	Betteridge Enterprises Ltd.

## Summary of Activities

### 1.0 Opening Remarks

Opening remarks were provided by Tammy Okemaysim.

The USB sticks of the 3D mine model were distributed. One USB stick was distributed to each company. The 3D model was provided in Surpac (Geovia by Dassault Systèmes Canada Software Inc.) format.

### 2.0 Introductions

A brief introduction of each participant was provided.

### 3.0 Project Overview

Dave Colbourne, DXB Consulting went over the Terms of Reference. The highlights of the overview are below:

- He noted that there is no expectation of backfilling this field season.
- Land and water use permit info is in the solicitation package.
- The contractor will need to be involved in the community meetings per the Terms of Reference.
- Pointed out the completion date for work is scheduled for March 1, 2016
- Highlighted key Submittals e.g. Backfill Method Plan, Equipment List, Anticipated Equipment Layout, Mix Designs.
- Highlighted requirements for an Environmental Protection Plan and Environmental Monitoring Plan per the Terms of Reference.
- Identified Medical Monitoring requirements and ongoing work to get clear direction from WSCC related to the tailings and U/G work.
- Identified requirement to have contractors Site Specific Health and Safety Plan align with the Mine Managers.
- Identified construction facilities e.g. turnarounds required will be part of the scope of this contract. All current infrastructure will be maintained by the C&M provider. There is NO Camp permitted on site. Some use of C-Dry is permissible but must be coordinated with the C&M provider.
- 2 bays available for equipment maintenance including a 5 and 20 tonne crane.
- Highlighted the survey requirements of the Terms of Reference.
- Highlighted the possibility that if additional drilling was required it will fall under this contract.
- Aggregate materials for paste production pads etc must be sourced off site.
- Pointed out tailing excavation and prep of 20,000 m3 is required this season with the balance next season. South and central tailing ponds are the source and you should anticipate ice lenses.
- Interim and final restoration of tailings pond is required per the Terms of Reference.

- Stressed the point that unaddressed leakage will not be paid for. Plans for addressing leakage are to be detailed in the bidder's backfill plan.
- Highlighted key pay items and encouraged bidders to review this carefully.

Rob Turek, PWGSC, noted that the Care and Maintenance provider may be changing during this contract as the current contract expires March 31, 2015.

Brad Thompson, PWGSC spoke about the medical monitoring requirements. He noted that the requirements are still being finalized but during the solicitation period we will be able to provide that information so that potential bidders can price it accordingly.

Darren Kennard, Golder Associates Ltd. then went through the conceptual mitigation plans. He explained that they show one possible method to mitigate leakage risks. The highlights of the overview are below:

- B1-18 - Rockfill completed by the Care and Maintenance contractor to prepare the underground. The criteria for completion of B1-18 will be amended. The B1-18 complex will be backfilled to an elevation equivalent to top of the pipeline (slickline) existing in the B1-18 Upper stope.
- B1-18 - noted that this was a proof of concept stope.
- Corrected the location of the paste supply borehole for the B3-06 stope complex work. Borehole for the B3-06 stope (borehole PD\_B306\_x) is located on the eastern pit crest of the B1 pit, not in the B1 pit as mistakenly pointed out by Darren on the first surface tour).
- Gave a brief description of the types of mining at Giant Mine and explained how the mechanized mining pushed fill into many areas previously mined empty using the shrink-stope mining method. This means that previous sub-vertical raises, manways, etc. that could be potential leakage points were backfilled during subsequent mechanized mining.
- Ran through the "conceptual mitigation plans" for each area in the solicitation which includes Golder's ideas to backfill the area and importantly the location of potential barricades required to constrain the fill to the volumes outlined in the Terms of Reference.
- Highlighted key performance measures from the spec e.g. 100kPA, 28 day strength (Uniaxial Compressive Strength), with a flat profile at an elevation equivalent to that outlined in the spec. for each stope void area.
- Any existing cavity scans have been included in the current 3D Mine model. Additional scans will be provided to the proponent upon award.
- Final package on bore holes will be provided to the proponent awarded the contract.

#### 4.0 Request for Proposal Overview

Tammy Okemaysim gave an overview of the Request for Proposal (RFP) document.

The solicitation closes June 19, 2014 at 2PM CST at the Public Works and Government Services Canada office in Saskatoon, SK. The bid receiving address is detailed on the top left hand corner of the front page of the RFP document. Ensure that bids are received by the closing date and time.

Bidders were advised that this was a mandatory site visit and therefore bids received from bidders not in attendance will not be accepted.

Noted SI06 – Tlicho Land Claims Agreement. This contract is within the Tlicho Land Claims and Self-Government Agreement and therefore Annex C – AOC Certifications has been included.

Noted SI07 – Mandatory Health and Safety. These documents are not required with bid submission; however the recommended Bidder will be asked to provide the documents prior to Contract award.

Noted IB02 – Integrity Provisions – Bid. Noted that this was previously called the Code of Conduct Certifications – Bid and potential bidders should read this section as it has changed from the previous solicitation.

Reviewed IB03 – Overview of Selection Procedure. This is a one phase, two-envelope RFP utilizing a design-build service delivery methodology. As such, both technical and price proposals must be submitted at the same time on or before the solicitation closing date. The technical envelope is to address the technical evaluation portion and the price envelope should include the price, bid security and AOC certifications. The total score will be calculated based on 50% Merit and 50% Price.

Noted that as per IB04 enquiries should be received no later than 10 calendar days prior to solicitation closing. Enquiries received after that time may not result in an answer being provided. As well, bidders were advised that all questions relating to this Solicitation are to come through the PWGSC Contracting Authority, Tammy Okemaysim.

Noted IB06 – Completion of Bid. Ensure that bid documents are being accessed through the Government Electronic Tendering Service (GETS) which is Buyandsell.gc.ca

As per IB11 - Limitation of Submissions, a proponent can only provide one proposal. However, more than one proponent can propose the same sub-consultants.

Bid Bond / Bid Security must be submitted with your price proposal.

Reviewed IB21 – Debriefing. Anyone who submits a bid will be able to request a debriefing within 15 working days of the notification of the results.

Noted the bid validity period for this solicitation is 90 days.

Reviewed IB27 – Conflict of Interest, paragraph 4. This paragraph is specific to Giant Mine solicitations and basically states that as part of your design-build team, you cannot propose resources already dedicated to work at the GM site in other contracts.

Highlights of the submission requirements and evaluation section were then reviewed. This section consists of a technical portion, price portion and Aboriginal Opportunities Consideration (AOC) evaluation criteria. There is to be no reference in your technical proposal to pricing. The maximum number of pages for the technical portion is 60. Please review this section for definition of what constitutes a page and exclusions to page count.

To be considered responsive there are minimum pass marks for a few of the individual criterion as well as overall pass marks for each of the Technical Proposal and the Management and Organization Proposal section.

The contractor will be selected on the basis of the assessed best value with the highest overall score of merit – 50% and price – 50%. Please have a look at this section as there are mandatory requirements you should be aware of.

In section 1.3 of the Technical Proposal section, potential bidders were told to ensure they have a look at Terms of Reference section 01 33 00 – 1.6 Contractors Backfill Method Plan as the Terms of Reference is more detailed as to what information the evaluation team will be looking for.

In section 2.3 of the Management and Organization Proposal section we are requesting resumes for each key position and backup or cross-shift. We have also included a description of the type of relevant experience we are looking for.

The evaluation and rating grid outlines how points will be allocated.

The Aboriginal Opportunities Consideration (AOC) is an opportunity to gain additional technical points. However, a proponent must pass the technical section before the AOC is evaluated. There is no minimum pass mark in this section. If you are providing a guarantee for AOC, you need to complete the certifications and provide with the technical portion of your bid.

Noted SC01 – Payment for Design Changes and Revisions. Please ensure that hourly rates are provided in section 3.3 of the Price Bid Form for the Designer's principals and other personnel as these rates may be used when determining changes and revisions to design services.

Noted SC02 – Insurance Terms. The types and amounts of insurance required are stated in Annex F on the Certificate of Insurance forms.

The offer amount in Annex B – Bid Price Form is comprised of a total of the lump sum amount, the total estimated amount from the unit price table and the total estimated amount from the additional personnel and/or equipment.

The work is to be complete 01 March 2016.

Cost breakdown table – Annex B1 – will not be used for evaluation purposes; however, prior to contract award the proponent assessed as representing best value will be required to submit a completed Cost breakdown table as per Annex B1.

Annex C – Aboriginal Incentive and penalty evaluation applies if you have provided AOC guarantees. If no guarantees are provided as part of the proposal then the incentive/penalty conditions will not apply.

The full description of the Optional Services was noted to be a part of Solicitation Amendment #002 which would be on Buyandsell by the end of the week. Basically, the optional service is an irrevocable option to acquire additional construction services for the backfilling of arsenic stopes B2-08 and B2-12/13/14 with an estimated paste volume of 16, 500 m3. The Contracting Authority may at any time before the expiration of the Contract send a written notice to the Contractor requesting the completion of a Best and Final Offer (BAFO) offer form. This request will include additional information and will call for a proposal consistent with the level of detail required in the original RFP. We are not evaluating the option right now.

### **Tentative Schedule for BAFO Process**

PWGSC is targeting the fall of 2014 for completion of a detailed work description. Once complete this work description and a BAFO offer form specific to this additional work will be sent by the PWGSC contract authority to the successful DB contractor. This request may include additional evaluation criteria relevant to the new scope of work.

The successful DB contractor will be given a minimum of 2 weeks to submit a formal offer in response to the BAFO request.

PWGSC will evaluate the offer and clarify with the Contractor as required within 2 weeks of receipt. The proposal will be evaluated based on any additional criteria included in the BAFO request. Key Personnel and other Resources consistent with those provided in the original proposal will be accepted. Alternates or additional Key personnel will be evaluated using the original RFP evaluation criteria. The price will be compared to the Class B cost estimate available for this work at the time of BAFO issuance and will be informed by the most current drilling data available at that time.

A decision to exercise the option or not, is planned for Oct. 30th, 2014 or sooner.

It was also noted that a Class B expected range of costs would be provided in Amendment #002, but a detailed cost estimates will not be released.

## **5.0 Questions**

Q.1: Given this is a Design Build RFP would PWGSC consider a proposal that is inconsistent with the structure of the RFP if we felt we had a better solution, or should we submit based on the RFP and then attempt to negotiate an alternate solution if we are successful?

A.1: We asked for the question to be submitted in writing because it is unclear exactly what they are proposing. It should be noted that any alteration to the preprinted or pre-typed sections of the Bid Form, or any condition or qualification placed upon the bid shall be direct cause for disqualification. It is best to clarify with the Contracting Authority before the RFP closing date.

Q.2: Is there anything in the RFP that clarifies the recent changes to mine site access related to the highway being rerouted off site?

A.2: We will review and add information if required.

Q.3: Are we expected to coordinate the water usage with the Roaster deconstruction project contractor?

A.3: Yes a coordinated effort will be required and we expect the IUS contractor to plan ahead for water usage.

Q.4: Do the project references count as part of the page limitation?

A.4: The client references requested for Section 2.1 and 2.2 of the Management and Organization Proposal are included in the page limitation. Please note, the references will only be used to verify information provided in the proposal and we are only requesting name, address, phone and email of client contact.

Q.5: In Section 2.1 and 2.2 of the Management and Organization Proposal are the project summaries limited to the Prime Contractor or can they be from subcontractors as well?

A.5: The project summaries extend to those completed by subcontractors.

Q.6: Can PWGSC release the cost details from the B1-18 program?

A.6: The cost details from the B1-18 program cannot be released.

Q.7: When is the anticipated date for contract award?

A.7: August 1<sup>st</sup>, 2014 for contract award with mobilization to site as soon as possible.

Q.8: Does the 20,000 m3 of tailings need to be stored in the temporary building? Is it lined?

A.8: The storage building is available for storage if the contractor chooses to use it. The storage is up to the contractor and the structure does not need to be lined since it is within the tailings basin.

Q.9: When is tailing restoration required?

A.9: As per the Terms of Reference, there is an interim (after work in 2014) and final requirement (after work in 2015).

Q.10: Are any additional crown assets available e.g. equipment?

A.10: Unless identified in the Terms of Reference, no equipment on site is available to the contractor.

Q.11: What percentage of boreholes will be available when the work starts?



A.11: All surface and underground drilling needed for this contract is expected to be completed by August 2014.

Q.12: Is the recipe for the paste mix final?

A.12: No, the Terms of Reference includes information on what was used for B1-18 but as part of the design/build process, the contractor is required to develop its own paste mix solutions.

Q.13: What is the 100KPA requirement based on and is there a maximum strength.

A.13: Performance specification determined to be sufficient for stabilization and short-term strength requirements of man-entry adjacent to backfill. There is no upper bound. This becomes the QC for strength.

Q.14: Could monitoring holes be used for backfilling?

A.14: Yes, this is possible but keep in mind the borehole is only cased and grouted into bedrock and not cased full length of the borehole.

Q.15: There seems to be a contradiction in the Basis of Payment for Paste fill volume measurement location.

A.15: Section 31 23 23.33, Item 1.10.2 details the requirements for measuring the paste for Payment Item 31 23 23.33-1. In addition, Item 3.7 includes details on the Paste Delivery Measurement Device Calibration. The Contractor will provide details including, but not limited to, measurement device, calibration frequency and location of measurement in the Backfill Method Plan. We anticipate the Contractor will locate measuring equipment for volume of paste at or near the location of paste delivery, and the details will be included in the Backfill Method Plan.

Section 31 23 23.33, Item 3.8 is not measurement of volume for the purpose of payment, but is measuring temperature of paste for quality assurance. This item does include, but is not limited to, measurement at the mixing location.

Q.16: How do we know if the stope is filled if we only measure above ground?

A.16: A Cavity Monitoring system is required during fill. Unaddressed leakage will not be paid. Contractor is to submit a plan on how they will show the stope is filled to the desired level. Examples may include: 1) cameras, 2) levelling measurements, 3) c-als surveys, 4) volumetrics, etc.

Q.17: Is a building permit from the City of Yellowknife required?

A.17: No permits will be required from the City of Yellowknife.

Q.18: Other than the possible building permit and required water license are there any other permits or licenses required and if so are they the contractor's responsibility?

A.18: There are no other permits that we are aware of, but yes the contractor is responsible for all permits and licensing required.

Q.19: Are there any provisions to supply or store fuel and lubricants on site?

A.19: No fuel or lubricants will be supplied. Fuel storage is not permitted as per the Land Use Permit.

Q.20: Who is responsible to supply Air and Water underground?

A.20: The current infrastructure is available but anything else required would be this contractor responsibility. Information will be provided to indicate what services are available at the various work fronts identified on the mitigation plans.

Q.21: If it is the contractor's responsibility then drawings of the existing air and water infrastructure underground is required.

A.21: See A.20 above.

Q. 22: Who is responsible if there is damage to the existing underground services?

A.22: Any damage to existing underground services would be the responsibility of the proponent (e.g. ventilation, water, or compressed air, services).

Q 23: Is the contractor responsible for pre-backfilling surveys?

A.23: No, but as per. Q 16., the proponent is responsible to determine a method to tell us if the void is full or not.