

Questions and Answers for RFP 1000233470

1. Is CIRNAC expecting a firm price for both AGS and Venus scopes in spite of the effort for the later phases (III) being dependent on the outcomes of Phase II?

Deviation from the bid work plan identified following Phase II of the work will be dealt with as a change order request/amendment to the contract if needed, utilizing the approved resources and rates (additional direct expenses and staff resources will be considered as required).

2. What is the desired schedule for deliverables?

We will provide a schedule as per the missing project TORs (attached within updated RFP).

3. Summer vacations are occurring now. We request a two week extension to recognize that.

*PA has re-considered and decided to extend the end date by 7 Calendar days to August 25th, 2022 at 2:00pm EDT.

4. Will access to the past reports be provided as part of the RFP phase?

Executive summaries from the reports will be provided as a part of the RFP phase (see updated RFP posting with attachments). The full reports will be provided to the successful bidder.

5. Pg 37 of the RFP refers to an attached terms of reference, yet the RFP does not provide that. When will these terms of reference be provided?

Project TORs to be provided (see updated RFP posting with attachments).

6. M2 makes reference to Section 11 Resources Required, but there is no Section 11. Please clarify.

The reference to Section 11 is erroneous and will be removed.

7. M2 refers to (2) for the Project Manager resource category. Does CIRNAC expect that each site has a dedicated Project Manager, or is the expectations to provide an alternate to a primary lead, or some other expectation?

CIRNAC expects the successful bidder to have two Senior Project Managers, two Senior Environmental Professionals, and two Senior Geotechnical Professionals able to work on either of the sites. Labour distribution between the resources and the project sites is at the discretion of the successful bidder. The intent is to have alternate resources available to ensure a successful delivery of the project.

8. Can project summaries for section M3 be from a project that was led by a sub consultant on the bidding team where both lead bidder and sub consultant had teamed previously?

In this scenario CIRNAC would accept project summaries led by a sub consultant if the sub consultant is one of the named resources in section M2.

9. The financial evaluation text in Attachment 2 to Part 4 states that the volumetric data included (estimated hours of usage per year) does not represent a commitment by Canada. However, the table in this section does not include any estimated hours of usage. Is the bidder required to estimate the hours to complete the work, or will CIRNAC be issuing a revised version with these hours included?

CIRNAC will not be issuing estimated hours to complete the scope of work, hours are to be estimated by the bidder.

10. How will the information included in the financial evaluation be used as the basis of payment for the project? Does this refer to the hourly rates, or the sub-total and total bid prices calculated in the table? If the bid prices, how will the necessary expenses and disbursements be accounted for?

The Financial Evaluation Table in Attachment 2 to Part 4 of the Bid Solicitation and in Annex "B" – Basis of Payment, will set the rates for the resource categories (R2) for year 1 and year 2 of the contract, and all hours billed to the project must fall within one of the resource categories and rates. Total hours for each resource for the project is to be estimated in the Financial Evaluation Table in Attachment 2 to Part 4 of the Bid Solicitation. Maximum Travel and Living Expenses; and Maximum Other Direct Expenses are to be included in the corresponding lines of Annex "B." Necessary expenses and disbursements must meet the stipulations in this section.

11. The financial evaluation table in Attachment 2 to Part 4 and the Basis of Payment table in Annex B refer to Year 1 as "Award to March 31, 2022" and Year 2 as "April 1, 2022 to March 31, 2023". Annex "A" Statement of Work states: "This document is an outline of the scope for work beginning in the fiscal year 2021/22 and ending March 31, 2023..." Can CIRNAC please clarify the expected duration of the scope of work?

Clarified within updated RFP

12. For both the AGS and Venus Project scopes, we will not know what field data collections program (Phase III), if any, will be needed until the Phase II Data Gap Analysis is completed. For the Venus Project scope, we understand that the remaining scope of Tetra Tech's 2019

Geotechnical Investigation will need to be completed; however, we do not have insight into what that remaining scope entails. As a result, we cannot with any accuracy provide costing/effort nor do we have an understanding of the scope for potential IOC commitments. The Consultants who prepared the documents listed in Annex A will have a significant competitive advantage over others from a cost and IOC commitments perspective, as they have reviewed the project information and developed recommendations that likely comprise the basis for this RFP. Can CIRNAC indicate how they have addressed the potential for conflict of interest and fairness for this RFP from the perspective of requesting other firms to provide competitive proposals? Will CIRNAC provide guidance in the form of a detailed task list so that Proponents may provide proposals based on equitably available data?

CIRNAC will not provide a more detailed task list, bidders are to use the scope provided in the RFP and Consulting Services Terms of Reference provided for each site. Executive summaries for each report listed in Phase I for each site have been provided to aid bidders in understanding work completed on site to date. The field data collection CIRNAC believes to be required in Phase III for the Venus site is completing the scope of the geotechnical work as identified in Tetra Tech's April 30th, 2020 memo "Results of 2019 Drilling Program and Dam Stability Update, Venus Tailings Storage Facility, Yukon" (attached) with sections reproduced below:

It was not possible to complete the full scope of the proposed field program due to scheduling and budget constraints, as summarized below and illustrated on Figure 1. Elements of the field program that were not completed included the following:

- CPT19-01 encountered premature refusal at or near the base of the tailings and was not drilled out and re-attempted.
- Proposed sonic borehole BH19-02 was not drilled.
- Proposed sonic borehole BH19-03 was not drilled.
- Proposed sonic borehole BH19-04 was not drilled, which would have had two VWP's installed.
- Proposed sonic borehole BH19-05 was not drilled, which would have had one VWP installed.

Therefore, we recommend that the remaining scope of the field program be completed in order to achieve the following:

- Delineate the geometry of the dam embankment.
- Delineate the stratigraphy of the native soils beneath the dam embankment.
- Collect SPT N-values from the remaining boreholes to collect additional information that can be used to refine soil strength parameters. The drilling contractor retained for any future work should provide a drilling rig is equipped with either an integral SPT drop hammer or other means to keep the hammer plumb and collect reliable, repeatable SPT N-values. It not acceptable to conduct SPT by suspending the hammer from a winch line with no other restraint.
- Collect representative soil samples from the dam embankment and foundation soils for laboratory testing to evaluate material behaviour and potential for susceptibility to liquefaction and/or piping and internal erosion.
- Install VWPs in the native foundation soils on either side of the Waterloo Barrier, to detect potential artesian pressures confined beneath the clay layer and/or to estimate the hydraulic gradient through the dam for evaluation of potential for piping and internal erosion.

The results of the remaining fieldwork would be used to further refine the updated slope model and to carry out an evaluation of potential for piping and internal erosion through the dam and foundation soils; the evaluation of piping potential was intended to be carried out as part of the current scope of work, but was not possible to complete since sonic boreholes BH19-04 and BH19-05 were not drilled.

Updates to the slope model will consist of changes to model geometry and material parameters based on the conditions observed in the remaining boreholes, a refined estimate of the extent of liquefiable soil which may result in the model achieving the target FS for post-seismic conditions, and an updated estimate of seismic displacement, which may suggest that the expected displacement will be acceptably small to avoid significant adverse impact to the dam and/or release of tailings from the TSF.

Bidders should include only the scope to complete the above program in their bid. No field data collection is anticipated for the AGS site but may be identified in the Phase II data gap analysis. Additional field investigations identified as being required at the Venus or AGS sites during Phase II will be addressed through the change order process.

13. In Attachment 1 to Part 4, on page 19 of the RFP, it states that R3.2 Indigenous Sub-Contractors/Suppliers is worth 45.5 points, and on page 20 it states that R3.3 Indigenous Labour is worth 13 points. However, the Points Summary table on page 22 states the opposite.

In this case it is a typo in the table, the order was mixed up. It should read:

R3.2 Indigenous Sub-Contractors/Suppliers 45.5 points and R3.3 Indigenous Labour 13 points (see updated RFP)

14. The Senior Environmental Professional position specifies professional accreditation that is limited to Engineering, Biology, Chemistry, or Geology. We request the addition of a Diplomate of the American Board of Toxicology (DABT) accreditation to this category.

We will accept the additional accreditation.

15. The Senior Environmental Professional position specifies professional accreditation that is limited to Engineering, Biology, Chemistry, or Geology. We request the addition of a Professional Agrologist (P. Ag.) accreditation to this category.

We will accept the additional accreditation.

16. **ATTACHMENT 1 TO PART 4 OF THE BID SOLICITATION, M3 PROJECT SUMMARIES, PAGE 13: “PROJECT MUST BE COMPLETED”**: What is meant by a “completed project”. For example, does this mean: (1) a project scope completed under a current contract regardless of whether mine closure has yet to be achieved (for example, a project taken to the remedial options phase but not yet closure), OR (2) a project scope where the site has achieved closure and aligns with the full 7 phases of scope described in Annex A Statement of Work.

A completed project is a completed contract. It does not necessarily mean that mine closure has been achieved.

17. **ANNEX A STATEMENT OF WORK: PHASES IV, V, VI & VII (CONCEPTUAL MODEL, SITE SPECIFIC STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT, REMEDIAL OPTIONS ANALYSIS, CLOSURE OPTION SELECTION), PAGE 32 & 33, bullets 6, 7, 10, 16 & 18** : Can you provide more detail on the role of the proponent in the open houses and various workshops? For example, is the proponent’s scope related to the open house solely making presentations based on feedback from the workshop and attending the community open house? More specifically, can you confirm that the following are not in the proponent’s scope for either the open houses or workshops: scheduling, invitations to attendees, agenda, honoraria for community members, meeting venue, food/bev, meeting notes, handouts, facilitation, etc.

The role of the proponent regarding workshops and open houses is to present information, distill information learned, incorporate ideas and feedback to the community. It may include creating presentation material such as handouts and taking meeting notes and facilitating the workshop. It will NOT include booking venues, organizing food/drink, paying honoraria, inviting attendees as all logistical activities will be provided by the First Nation Development Corp.

18. **ANNEX A STATEMENT OF WORK: PHASE V SITE SPECIFIC STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT, PAGE 32 & 33, BULLET 9**: Can you confirm that meaning of the statement “the consultant will not be required to scope in the determination of closure goals”. Does this mean that consultation and/or engagement with the CTFN regarding closure goals and end land use objectives is outside of the proponent’s scope for this project?

Closure goals and end land us objectives will be developed with the First Nation and the community outside the scope of this contract and hence it is NOT part of the proponent scope.