



Alternatives North

September 26, 2012

Richard Edjericon
Chairperson
Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board
Box 938
Yellowknife NT X1A 2N7

Dear Mr. Edjericon

Re: EA0809-001 [2008] Final Submission Giant Mine Remediation Project

Alternatives North thanks the Review Board and its staff for a well organized and efficient public hearing. We note that AN was the only party (other than the Developer and the Review Board itself) that brought forward independent experts, two in cooperation with the Yellowknives Dene First Nation. We are of the view that the AN presentations, questions and answers provided during the hearing were respectful in tone and nature, and that we put forward helpful ideas and solutions.

Potential for Significant Adverse Environmental Impacts from the Development

AN accepts the Developer's assertion that the development has the potential to result in an improvement to the environment. However, clearly some aspects of the development have the potential for significant adverse environmental impacts. Specifically, the significant adverse environmental impacts that may be caused by the development include:

- ice thinning caused by the diffuser operations;
- changes to water quality in Back and Yellowknife bays caused by the diffuser operation, as influenced by local conditions, including sediment disturbance, water temperatures, currents, ice cover, water chemistry and other factors;
- potential surface and water contamination caused by poor tailings cover design and/or performance; and
- lack of environmental management plans to properly guide project performance, mitigative measures, and no thresholds or specific actions identified for management responses, all with the potential for adverse impacts from accidents and malfunctions.

Significant Public Concern with the Development

There is more than ample evidence of significant public concern with the Giant Mine Remediation Project as expressed by the Yellowknives Dene First Nation (YKDFN), North Slave Metis Alliance (NSMA), Alternatives North (AN) and the members of the public who

spoke at the Yellowknife and Dettah public hearings. Not one person expressed support for the Development as currently conceived and planned by the Developer.

We do not understand how the Developer could “conclude that the project is not likely to be a cause for significant public concern,” (Document #563, Developer’s Overview Presentation for September 10, slide 26) and that when given the opportunity at the public hearing to indicate whether they had heard any significant public concern, the response was in the negative (Document #578, Public Hearing Transcript, September 11, pages 168-169). The Developer maintained this position despite the events of the week and would have the Review Board and the parties believe there is no legal basis for any binding measures. AN will be watching closely to see if the Developer changes its position on whether there is any basis for binding measures in its final submission, and indications whether the Developer took the concerns expressed at the public hearing seriously.

AN stands by the recommended measures and suggestions made in our Technical Report (Document #485) and during the course of the public hearing.

Engagement and Undermining the Environmental Assessment

AN has expressed ongoing concerns that the Developer has never been truly committed to the Environmental Assessment or meaningfully engaged the parties, as evidenced by;

- its failure to provide information in a timely fashion,
- its preparation of and seeking Ministerial approval for the Site Stabilization Plan in secrecy,
- the redactions it made to the Site Stabilization Plan,
- its continued efforts to tender work clearly within the scope of the ongoing Environmental Assessment (i.e., Roaster Complex demolition and underground stabilization) before the completion of this process (see attachment), and
- its unwillingness to commit to retroactively applying any measures to exempted work.

AN has stated several times that we do not object to, and in fact support legitimate emergency work required at the site including Baker Creek adjustments to prevent underground flooding and taking down roaster complex flues that contain arsenic trioxide. However, we are very concerned that the Developer will use this approach to split the project, and to avoid public scrutiny and environmental controls. AN requests that the Review Board exercise its jurisdiction over any further attempts to exempt parts of the development from the ongoing environmental assessment by requiring clear evidence of an emergency and demonstrated capacity of the Developer to carry out the work on an urgent basis, including emergency contracting by Public Works and Government Services Canada.

The Developer said several times during the public hearing that its efforts have been largely directed at managing the immediate site conditions or stabilizing the site in the short-term, rather than focusing on long-term remedial measures or even completing some of the crucial design work needed to properly assess the significance of potential adverse environmental impacts (Document #581, Public Hearing Transcript, September 13, pages 107, 116, 151; Document #582, Public Hearing Transcript, September 14, pages 138-139). As a result, what we have is a

“Stabilization Plan” rather than a real “Remediation Plan” that reflects the needs and desires of the community (Document #582, Public Hearing Transcript, September 14, pages 24-25, 72).

To carry out the Giant Mine Remediation Project and shift it from ‘stabilization’ to real ‘remediation’ will cost a lot more money to properly engage the community and work together on the perpetual care aspects of the development. This will likely require community leaders and the Project Team to convince decision-makers and funders of this necessity. AN believes there is still an opportunity to work together, but a firm, written, legally binding Environmental Agreement (see Exhibit #11 from the public hearing, not yet filed on the public registry) is needed to firm up the vague commitments made by the Developer and to begin to establish a true partnership for moving forward.

Next Steps

The Developer should complete the essential design work and properly engage all the stakeholders to form a true partnership for moving forward. Provision must be made for independent oversight, ongoing research and development, perpetual care planning and management, and other aspects already discussed as part of a legally binding Environmental Agreement. It is clear that past engagement activities have failed and the Developer should seriously consider a new approach and additional staff or expertise to carry out this important work. Clearly the Developer is not now ready to carry out this project, and will not be ready until 2017 as indicated in its August 31, 2012 letter to the Review Board (Document #569) on the matter of independent oversight.

The Board Chair recognized this is a very complex project and probably the most difficult that the Review Board has ever faced. The Review Board has several options:

1. Adjourn the public hearing with directions to submit additional information on the following topics as recommended by AN:
 - a. final designs for the frozen blocks;
 - b. water quality and ice thinning modelling to properly predict and assess environmental impacts;
 - c. tailings cover design objectives and performance criteria;
 - d. draft Environmental Management Plans developed in consultation with interested parties that contain clear objectives, performance criteria, thresholds and action levels, and further research and design details; and
 - e. a draft Environmental Agreement that covers independent oversight, ongoing research and development, and perpetual care.
2. Refer the entire project or parts of it for an "Environmental Impact Review" where alternatives and other matters can be investigated; or
3. Recommend adoption of a number of binding measures to reduce public concern and/or the potential for significant adverse environmental impacts based on the recommendations from AN and others.

Options 1 and 2 are completely within the purview of the Review Board, while option 3 requires that the Responsible Ministers accept, reject or consult-to-modify the recommended measures. We are very concerned that Responsible Ministers will simply "accept in principle" measures but then commit to do nothing or fail to act. We are not convinced there is much additional value in proceeding to an Environmental Impact Review at this point as the matters requiring further attention such as design work and meaningful engagement are in the Developer's control.

We respectfully recommend that the Board find that portions of the development are incomplete and thus not assessable for environmental impacts. We further recommend that the Board call an adjournment of the public hearing and proceedings until the Developer can truly demonstrate that it is ready to proceed with the project and that some level of 'social licence' has been secured from the community.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "K O'Reilly". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Kevin" and last name "O'Reilly" clearly distinguishable.

Kevin O'Reilly
Alternatives North

Attach.

RETURN BIDS TO:
RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Suite 1650
635 - 8th Ave. S.W.
Calgary
Alberta
T2P 3M3
Bid Fax: (403) 292-5786

LETTER OF INTEREST
LETTRE D'INTÉRÊT

Title - Sujet Roaster Deconstruction	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EW699-130732/A	Date 2012-08-23
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client EW699-130732	GETS Ref. No. - N° de réf. de SEAG PW-\$NCS-008-9516
File No. - N° de dossier NCS-2-35105 (008)	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2012-10-03	
Time Zone Fuseau horaire Mountain Daylight Saving Time MDT	
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Twomey, Margaret	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur ncs008
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (403) 292-4450 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (403) 292-5786
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: Public Works and Government Services Canada Giant Mine Yellowknife, NT	

Comments - Commentaires

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

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

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

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Northern Contaminated Site Program
Telus Plaza North, 5th floor
10025 Jasper Avenue
Edmonton
Alberta
T5J 1S6

LETTER OF INTEREST AND QUALIFICATION

Roaster Complex Deconstruction at Giant Mine, Yellowknife, NWT

for

Public Works and Government Services Canada

PROJECT NUMBER: R.052308.003

SOLICITATION NUMBER: EW699-130732/A

CLOSING DATE: October 03, 2012

DIRECT INQUIRIES TO:

Margaret Twomey

Public Works and Government Services Canada

Acquisitions/Giant Mine

Suite 1650, 635 - 8 Ave. SW

Calgary, AB T2P 3M3

E-mail: margaret.twomey@pwgsc-tpsgc.gc.ca

Facsimile: (403) 292-5786

PART 1 - PROJECT INFORMATION

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Project Description and History
- 1.3 Building and Site Information
- 1.4 Design and Construction Scope
- 1.5 Constraints and Challenges
- 1.6 Schedule

PART 2 - PROCUREMENT PROCESS INFORMATION

- 2.1 General Procurement Approach
- 2.2 Description of Pre-qualification
 - 2.2.1 Pre-qualification of the Proponent
- 2.3 Submission Requirements and Evaluation
 - 2.3.1 Evaluation of Submittals
 - 2.3.2 Experience - Qualification Rules
 - 2.3.3 Format of the Submission
- 2.4 Phase Two - Request for Proposal (RFP)
 - 2.4.1 Admissibility
 - 2.4.2 Tender and Contract Documents
- 2.5 General Instructions to Proponents
 - 2.5.1 Closing Date
 - 2.5.2 Submission Receiving / Return Address
 - 2.5.3 Post-qualification Conference
 - 2.5.4 Enquiries
 - 2.5.5 Contracting Officer
 - 2.5.6 Checklist

PART 3 - GENERAL INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR PRE-QUALIFICATION

- 3.1 General
- 3.2 Definitions
- 3.3 Mandatory Requirements
 - 3.3.1 Identification of Proponent Team
 - 3.3.2 Insurance and Certification
 - 3.3.3 Code of Conduct and Certification
- 3.4 Rated Requirements
 - 3.4.1 Phase 1 - Management and Organizational Proposal
 - 3.4.1.1 Proponent Team Qualifications and Experience
 - 3.4.1.2 Project Understanding
 - 3.4.1.3 Proponent Team's Accomplishments
 - 3.4.1.4 Client References
- 3.5 Evaluation and Rating

Appendix "A" Key Plan and Project Work Area

Appendix "B" Identification of Proponent Team

Appendix "C" Experience Certification

Appendix "D" Experience of Proponent - Hazardous Materials Project

Appendix "D" Experience of Proponent - Building Deconstruction

Appendix "E" Checklist

PART 1 - PROJECT INFORMATION

1.1 Introduction

On behalf of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC), Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC) is initiating a process to pre-qualify design-build proponents for the deconstruction of all structures within a "Project Work Area" at Giant Mine, Yellowknife, Northwest Territories (Giant Mine Site). For the purposes of this document, the "Project Work Area" is defined as the Roaster Complex and the immediately surrounding area that will accommodate deconstruction activities, as currently shown on the Key Plan presented in Appendix A.

The Roaster Complex is considered to represent a risk to human health and safety if left unabated; and as such, is to be deconstructed as part of a Giant Mine site stability plan. The Roaster Complex contains significant quantities of hazardous materials, the most notably being arsenic/arsenic trioxide (a bi-product of the ore roasting during the gold extraction process). The Project requires the design and execution for multiple disciplines, in stages or phases carefully coordinated to ensure protection of the workers, public and the environment. Extremely hazardous building materials and environments will require specialized equipment and decontamination processes during deconstruction. Deconstruction waste will require packaging, handling and storage until permanent on site disposal locations are designed and constructed under a separate Giant Mine Site project.

This Letter of Interest and Qualification (LOIQ) document provides necessary information and submission requirements for Proponent qualification. Interested proponents must submit all necessary information for pre-qualification in accordance with the requirements stipulated in this LOIQ document. Only those proponents considered by PWGSC to meet the pre-qualification requirements as defined in this document will be eligible to submit a proposal for this project in the Phase Two Request for Proposal (RFP) process.

1.2 Project Description and History

The objective of the project is to deconstruct the Roaster Complex and temporarily store the waste material on site until such time as it can be appropriately disposed through the main Giant Mine remediation program. Other site stabilization and care and maintenance activities will be conducted concurrently with this project and all project activities must not disrupt these other activities.

The Roaster Complex includes, but is not limited to the following main structures:

- Mill Pipe Shop/AC Roaster Building
- Cottrell Precipitation Building
- Roaster Stack and Roaster Stack Fan House
- Calcine Plant
- Dorrco Roaster
- Silo Load-Out and Weight Scale
- Bag House
- Exterior Flue Network

An Edwards type multiple-hearth roaster, built by Allis-Chalmers (AC), began operation at the Site in January 1949. A two-stage fluo-solids roaster (known as the No. 1 Dorrco roaster) was commissioned and put into operation in May 1952. The No. 1 Dorrco initially operated in parallel with the original Allis-Chalmers roaster. A new fluo solids roaster (known as the No. 2 Dorrco) went into operation in

November 1958, replacing the two other roasters. The No. 2 Dorrco roaster remained in operation until ore processing ceased at the end of 1999.

At the start of roasting operations in 1949, off-gas management was limited to the provision of a stack for release of gases and particulates to the atmosphere. Mine management concluded that arsenic fume emissions needed to be controlled and an electrostatic precipitator (an "ESP", also known as the "Cottrell Precipitator") was commissioned in October 1951, and the first large-scale arsenic trioxide collection program began. The efficiency of the cold ESP dropped dramatically when the first fluo solids roaster (the No. 1 Dorrco) was installed in May 1952. A second ESP was installed in February 1955. This "hot" unit operated above the temperature at which arsenic trioxide would condense, and was placed in front of the cold ESP. Eventually, both ESPs were operated as cold units to improve the arsenic collection efficiency while additional research was undertaken. A baghouse filtering system ("Dracco Baghouse") began operating in November 1958, as the sole dust collection device in the system. Once the new roaster was operating efficiently, one ESP was put on-stream as a hot unit, to remove fine calcine dust in advance of the baghouse. In 1963, the original cold ESP was converted to a hot unit and was put in parallel operation with the other hot ESP. This system, consisting of two hot ESP's operating in parallel, followed by a baghouse, was used until roasting operations ceased in 1999.

Repairs/modifications were performed on the 46 metre (150 ft) roaster exhaust stack in the late 1970's, followed by removal of the top 1.5 metre (5 ft) repairs in approximately 1985. Another stack inspection was performed pre-roaster shutdown in 1997, which indicated signs of weathering to the bricks and mortar. The potential primary cause of the deterioration on the interior of the stack was reported to be precipitate that had accumulated and mixed with natural precipitation to form an acid solution. It was also reported during the 1997 inspection that the steel ring (cap) on the top of the roaster stack had come apart.

The majority of flues within the Roaster Complex were constructed in 1950 to 1960 and are currently in various states of disrepair. The outer insulation on many of these flues is comprised of asbestos material and the flues themselves contain arsenic trioxide dust residue.

A report prepared by Northwest Consulting Limited in February 2003 entitled "An Examination of Arsenic Contamination in the Roaster and Gas Handling Complex at the Giant Mine", indicated that abandoned exhaust flues from early roasting operations contain substantial quantities of arsenic, as do the carbon in pulp (CIP) tanks, the AC roaster floor, and the Cottrell electrostatic precipitator. It was indicated that cleanup of these areas will require a significant effort before deconstruction can take place. Using bulk density and volume data, Northwest Consulting calculated that the abandoned flues contain approximately 60 tons of material having an average arsenic concentration of 40%. Using an arbitrary cutoff of 5% arsenic, it was calculated that the entire mill/roasting complex (including the highly contaminated roaster flues) contains more than 275 tons of arsenical material. If no cutoff is used, the report indicated that an estimated 3,080 tons of material containing arsenic at concentrations ranging from <1% to > 50% is contained within the mill and roaster complexes. Asbestos was also identified throughout the building. No sampling/characterization of any other hazardous materials was conducted during the Northwest Consulting Limited investigation and the accuracy of the estimated quantities cannot be confirmed.

A structural inspection was performed by PWGSC on the Roaster Complex in 2007 to assess the structural stability. Results of the investigation are presented in the document entitled Structural Inspections, Giant Mine Various Buildings, Yellowknife, NT and included the following:

- ◆ The wood structure of the Old Roaster Building does not show any significant signs of rot. The fasteners do not appear corroded. The exterior wood finish shows signs of wear but this is to be expected.

-
- Some of the exterior asbestos paneling on the walls of other buildings is not securely fastened in some areas. Some of the fasteners appear to be corroded. Those panels do not appear to be at risk of being completely detached from the main structure. In other locations, panels have been physically damaged or removed from the structure.
 - The visual inspection of the underside of the roof showed the presence of some gaps between panels and some holes in the panels. This is likely due to some corrosion of the fasteners or panels or differential settlement of the structure causing some gaps. There is no evidence based on the visual inspection that roof panels are lifting off the main structure.
 - However, a more detailed analysis of the wind loads applied on the roofs based on the existing conditions of missing or corroded fasteners would be required to assess the probability of any roof panel being lifted off the main roof structure.
 - Partial (small) areas of the catwalk system appear to have corroded over time and may be unsafe. Caution should be taken when walking anywhere on the catwalks.
 - Some catwalk areas on the 3rd level are heavily corroded and should be out of bounds for anyone. It was indicated by site personnel that those areas used to be for the storage of sulphur.
 - There is no major sign of corrosion or deflection of the main structural elements such as beams and columns and trusses. Some corrosion is to be expected but what was observed is not expected to be sufficient to compromise the stability of the superstructure.
 - No visual inspection of the foundation system was performed since the foundation system is inaccessible.

Additional assessments/evaluations conducted recently on the Roaster Flue Network are summarized as follows:

- An evaluation completed by AECOM in March 2010 concluded, due to the deteriorated condition of the exterior flues as well as the reported volume of arsenic trioxide remaining in the abandoned flue network, that there is a considerable risk of a release of arsenic trioxide from the site. The assessment recommended that flues be lowered and/or removed. It was also recommended that capping all building openings will also help prevent the further release of asbestos and arsenic into the environment.
- Visual evidence of roaster stack deterioration has also been reported at the site (i.e. portions of the steel cap ring have been dislodged and have fallen off onto the roof of the fan house).
- A hazardous materials and deconstruction audit is currently being completed for the Site to characterize and quantify non-hazardous and hazardous materials at the site. Results of this investigation, including the characterization and quantification of the building materials, will be provided during the Phase Two RFP solicitation documents.

The scope of work of this project generally is described as:

- Prepare detailed health and safety plan, decontamination and deconstruction plans
- Collection and removal of arsenic trioxide dust located in exterior flues and building interiors
- Containerization and onsite storage of arsenic trioxide dusts
- Construction of a storage facility
- Abatement and containerization of hazardous building materials and building contents
- Onsite storage of asbestos wastes
- Offsite disposal of non arsenic and non asbestos containing hazardous wastes
- Cleaning of non-hazardous wastes to remove arsenic residue

- Onsite stockpiling and/or containerization of non-hazardous wastes
- Disconnection of building utilities
- Deconstruction of building structures to slab-on-grade (unless otherwise specified)
- Onsite storage of non-hazardous deconstruction wastes

1.3 Building and Site Information

The following provides a summary of the Roaster Complex and its components.

Building Name	Approximate Building Dimensions (m)	Approximate Average Height (m)	Construction Method
Mill Pipe Shop/AC Roaster Building	18x70	10	Multi level wood structure, concrete floor and foundation, pitch felt roof, asbestos containing exterior paper siding, various types of asbestos pipe insulation in poor condition throughout, calcine buried below concrete floor. Building contains process equipment and leach and process tanks. Cyanide has also been identified in the building.
Cottrell Building	28.5x17.5	9	Steel frame, multi level structure, rigid transit board siding and roofing, sprayed on asbestos insulation, concrete floor. Building contains Cottrell electrostatic precipitator. Cottrells contain approximately 8,400 rods that are coated with arsenic trioxide scale. Exterior walls insulated with crocidolite and chrysotile.
Dorrco Roaster	30x25	12	Steel frame, multi level structure, rigid transit board siding and roofing, various types of asbestos insulation on process equipment and sprayed on building components. Building contains arsenic trioxide waste. Cyanide has been identified as being used in the building.
Calcine Plant	12.5x5 22.5x9 23x14	5.2 6.5 11	Steel frame, rigid transit board siding and roofing, multi levels, various types of asbestos insulation on process equipment and sprayed on building components. Building contains arsenic trioxide waste. High airborne asbestos fiber content.
Baghouse	12.5x12.5	9	Robertson style steel frame building, double walled, metals siding, concrete foundation. Building contains arsenic trioxide waste.
Roaster Stack	4.9 dia base	45.7	Brick structure, potentially contains arsenic trioxide dust. Portions of steel collar have fallen off top of stack.
Fan House	10x6	5	Steel frame, rigid transit board siding and roofing, concrete floor. Building potentially contains arsenic trioxide dust

Silo load out and Weight Scale	Silo 7.3 m dia Scale 21.5x6	Silo 20 Weight Scale 5	Steel silo, potentially contains arsenic trioxide dust. Pre-fabricated steel structure, asbestos containing transit board in electrical room. Arsenic trioxide dust located in scale house
Exterior Flue Network	72" dia Length unknown		Elevated steel pipe - wrapped in asbestos containing insulation in poor condition, steel and wood supports are in poor structural condition. Flues are reported to contain arsenic trioxide dust. Flue from Baghouse to Fanhouse is fiberglass wrapped in insulation and metal siding. Arsenic trioxide dust located in building

The roaster complex is not energized; however, an electrical source will be available to the successful contractor within 500 m of the complex. There is no water service to the Roaster Complex.

As indicated previously, the Project Work Area is shown on the Key Plan presented in Appendix A.

The Roaster complex is known to be contaminated with large amounts of arsenic trioxide and asbestos containing materials. In some areas these items are known to be mixed together. Due to the length of time since these buildings were used there has been degradation of some of the wall and roof components, allowing precipitation to enter the structures. Other hazards include damaged and/or missing catwalks. Numerous interior tripping hazards are expected to be present. Due to the number of onsite hazards and contaminants a detailed Site Specific Health and Safety Plan will need to be developed and followed. This comprehensive plan will need to meet the legislated requirements for the Northwest Territories and the Canadian Labour Code. The plan will need to detail the proposed engineering, administrative, and personal protective equipment that will be utilized during the implementation of the project. A three stage decontamination trailer will be onsite and utilized during the Phase 2 mandatory site visit; however individuals will be required to provide their own Personal Protective Equipment (PPE).

1.4 Design and Construction Scope

A general overview of the design and deconstruction scope is as follows. Please note this is not an exhaustive list and the full scope of work with performance specifications will be represented in the RFP documents and conveyed to Proponents during Phase Two of the procurement process.

- I. Work under this Contract comprises the supply of all design, labour, equipment and materials required to decontaminate and deconstruct the Roaster Complex, associated facilities and equipment and ancillary structures, as indicated, including, but not limited to, the following:
 - a. Supply, mobilization and demobilization of all personnel, equipment, support facilities and materials required to complete the Work.
 - b. Maintenance and management of Contractor equipment and materials, as required to complete the Work.

-
- c. Preparation of Decontamination Plan, which is to be reviewed and signed/sealed by an appropriate and recognized qualified professional. At a minimum, the plan is to be signed by a qualified Certified Industrial Hygienist.
 - d. Preparation of Deconstruction Plan, which is to be reviewed and signed/sealed by an appropriate and recognized qualified professional. At a minimum, the Deconstruction Plan is to bear the stamp of a qualified Professional Engineer registered in the Northwest Territories. The qualified Professional Engineer must work for a firm that is a permit holder to practice in the Northwest Territories
 - e. Establishment/construction and operation of a Material Storage Area, which includes a Hazardous Materials Area.
 - f. Establishing of temporary facilities including, but not limited to a Wastewater Collection and Storage Facility, temporary enclosures and decontamination facilities required to carry out the Work.
 - g. Within the Project Work Area, collection and containerization of scattered debris, scraping up of the ground with mixed debris, and regrading.
 - h. Decontamination, removal, containerization, and on-site transport to Material Storage Area of all mine process waste, contaminated waste, and hazardous waste materials, including asbestos and arsenic trioxide, from facilities to be deconstructed. **Priority is to be given to the activities related to the stabilization and/or decontamination of the Roaster Flues and Stack.**
 - i. Deconstruction of buildings and associated facilities/equipment, on-site transportation and stockpiling of resulting waste at the Material Storage Area. **Priority is to be given to the stabilization and/or deconstruction of the Roaster Flues and Stack.**
 - j. Off-site transport and disposal of non-asbestos and non-arsenic containing Hazardous Waste Material.
 - k. All personnel must vacate the Project Work Area following the completion of the Work. In addition, all equipment and materials used and generated during the Work, must be removed at the completion of the Work.
2. Deconstruction processes are to be in accordance with accepted deconstruction practices and comply with all rules and regulations applicable by Authorities Having Jurisdiction (AHJ).
 3. Work is to be carried out in a manner that satisfies the AHJ, so as to protect the environment, the health and safety of workers and the general public.

1.5 Constraints and Challenges

Some of the constraints and challenges of the project are noted below; others may exist.

- Very specialized requirements and processes for working in extremely hazardous environments/conditions.
- Limited site infrastructure to support project activities.
- Required to supply fuel for Project.
- Storage restrictions.
- Required to remove/abate/decontaminate materials highly impacted by arsenic and other hazardous materials. Cyanide and cyanide dust has been identified in buildings.
- Care required concerning site aesthetics, hoarding, and equipment/material storage.
- Public and political sensitivities with Project.

-
- Possible hazardous substances not characterized or identified may exist. Note: A Deconstruction Audit report will be provided with the Phase Two solicitation documents. The report will provide detailed information on the materials at the site.
 - Possible aesthetic, physical, schedule, or other constraints concerning land use, water use and work area.
 - No support facilities such as lunch rooms, washrooms, office space for contractor personnel for the duration of Project.
 - Several other contractors will be working on the Mine site throughout the period of this contract. Required to work cooperatively with these other contractors.
 - The Care and Maintenance (C&M) contractor for Giant Mine is currently the Mine Manager for the Giant Mine Site under the Mine Safety Act. Under the Mine Safety Act, the successful Proponent's senior person on-site will assume the role and responsibility of a Supervisor Level 2 with respect to the Project Work area.
 - The approved C&M contractor health and safety plan currently governs all activities on the Giant Mine Site. The successful Proponent must develop and implement a Site Specific Health and Safety plan and Standard Operating Procedures for the Project Work Area that comply with the minimum requirements of the C&M contractor health and safety plan. The successful Proponent must work co-operatively with the Care and Maintenance contractor to gain access to the "Project work Area.
 - The successful Proponent must submit their Site Specific Health and Safety Plan for review and approval to the Workers' Safety and Compensation commission (WSCC), C&M contractor and PWGSC.

1.6 Schedule

An estimated and anticipated schedule is provided below to assist the proponents in planning for the project. Given the scope and magnitude of this project, this schedule is subject to change, in which case PWGSC will not be bound by these timeframes or dates indicated. Also note that regulatory permitting and licensing requirements are currently under review for this project. Due to the complexity of the project, it is possible that permitting/licensing requirements and/or other factors may cause significant delays to the proposed project timelines.

Posting of Solicitation (Phase 1):	August 24, 2012
Closing of Solicitation (Phase 1):	October 3, 2012
Distribution of Request for Proposal (Phase 2):	October 2012
Closing of Request for Proposal (Phase 2):	November 2012
Design/Deconstruction (End Date):	Winter 2015

PART 2 - PROCUREMENT PROCESS INFORMATION

2.1 General Procurement Approach

Given the nature of the Work, it is essential that the successful Proponent have the qualifications and experience to execute the project. A Two Phase procurement approach will be followed.

Phase One – Pre-Qualification: This Letter of Interest and Qualification (LOIQ) is part of the process to pre-qualify proponents based on defined requirements specified in this document. These requirements include the technical capability, the qualifications and experience of the project team, the capacity of the Proponent to obtain Commercial General Liability Insurance, and Professional Liability Insurance as specified in Part 3.

Phase Two – Request for Proposal (RFP): An RFP will be sent to those proponents that succeed in pre-qualification under Phase One. Only those proponents who have been pre-qualified by PWGSC in Phase One will be eligible to submit a Phase Two proposal. The decision to participate in Phase Two is the decision of each eligible Proponent. Proposals will be evaluated against the stated criteria in the RFP.

All costs for preparation of the Phase One LOIQ is borne by the submitting firm(s). The results of this Phase One proposal will form 12% of the total point value toward the award of the contract, the other 88% will result from the Phase Two proposal submission. Successful Phase One proponents will be given both their score and ranking among all valid submissions, to assist in their preparation for Phase Two. **The four highest-ranking compliant proponents, based on their total overall score, will be eligible to receive an honoraria in the amount of \$15,000.**

The Proponents must carefully examine the RFP and related project documents in order to submit an all-inclusive Design-Deconstruct proposal. The criteria for the evaluation of proposals will be issued only to pre-qualified proponents after Phase One. A mandatory site tour and post-qualification conference will be scheduled. The evaluation committee will recommend the Top Rated (score and price) Proponent for contract award. Proponents are to be aware that the Phase Two evaluation process will include an Aboriginal Opportunities Consideration (AOC) submission. The criteria and scoring scheme for AOC has not been finalized. However, it is anticipated that the AOC will be evaluated based on the proponents commitment and firm guarantee for: 1) training and apprenticeship programs for aboriginal people from the impacted area of the contract; 2) firm guarantee to use aboriginal employment content from the impacted region to carry out work; 3) firm guarantee to use aboriginal sub-contractors or the procurement of equipment/supplies from the impacted area of the contract; and 4) have offices or other facilities in the Northwest Territories. There will be no minimum score requirement for AOC.

The score of Phase One will be carried over to Phase Two. To be eligible to submit a proposal for Phase Two, proponents must be pre-qualified by PWGSC at Phase One.

Should there be an insufficient number of pre-qualified proponents after Phase One to permit a competition in Phase Two, PWGSC reserves the right to cancel Phase Two or to modify the requirements and re-publish the solicitation using the same or a different approach.

2.2 Description of Pre-qualification

2.2.1 Pre-qualification of the Proponent

The proponent must demonstrate that it meets all requirements defined in Part 3 of this document by providing all necessary information. PWGSC will evaluate and score each proponent's proposal to determine their pre-qualification status. PWGSC reserves the right to verify information and references submitted for this LOIQ.

2.3 Proposal Requirements and Evaluation

2.3.1 Evaluation of Proposals

All proposals will be reviewed and evaluated by PWGSC. PWGSC may accept or reject any or all proposals.

This LOIQ document contains both mandatory and rated requirements; mandatory requirements will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis and Rated Requirements on a system of awarded points with mandatory minimum score requirements. Failure to provide necessary information in accordance with specified requirements will render the pre-qualification proposal as non-responsive. PWGSC reserves the right to request clarifications concerning LOIQ submission content.

Following completion of the proposal evaluation, PWGSC will send notices to proponents individually to notify them of the result of the evaluation as it pertains to their proposal. Debriefing for unsuccessful proponents will be provided, if requested, only following award of a contract. Should a proponent desire a debriefing, the proponent should contact the Contracting Officer. The debriefing will include an outline of the reasons the submission was not successful, making reference to the evaluation criteria. Confidentiality of information relating to other proposals will be protected.

Upon the completion of the process for Phase One, PWGSC will retain all submissions for its records.

2.3.2 Limitation of Submissions

- a. A proponent may not submit more than one proposal. This limitation also applies to the persons or entities in the case of a joint venture. If more than one proposal is received from a proponent (or, in the case of a joint venture, from the persons or entities), all such proposals shall be rejected and no further consideration shall be given.
- b. A joint venture is defined as an association of two or more entities which combine their money, property, knowledge, skills, time or other resources in a joint business enterprise agreeing to share the profits and the losses and each having some degree of control over the enterprise.
- c. An arrangement whereby Canada contracts directly with a prime contractor who may retain sub-contractors or specialist consultants to perform portions of the services is not a joint venture arrangement. A subcontractor or specialist consultant may, therefore, be proposed as part of the Contractor's Team by more than one Proponent.
- d. Notwithstanding subsection (a) above, in order to avoid any conflict of interest, or any perception of conflict of interest, no person or entity acting as an individual Proponent or as part

of a joint venture Proponent, shall be proposed as a member of another Proponent's Contractor Team, either as a subcontractor or specialist consultant or as part of another joint venture Proponent. Failure to comply with this limitation will result in all submissions so involved being rejected.

- e. During the Phase Two process, proponents will only be allowed substitutions to the Proponent Team named in Phase One, if 15 days prior to the closing of the Phase Two solicitation process: 1) the Proponent submits the name, qualifications, experience and other applicable information of the proposed replacement team members; and 2) the proposed replacement team members are deemed equivalent (or better) by the Contracting Authority to the original proposed Proponents Team named in Phase One. Failure to comply with the above will render the Phase Two portion of the proposal as non-responsive.
- f. Any joint venture entered into for the provision of professional services or other services must be in full compliance with the requirements of any provincial or territorial law pertaining thereto in the Province or Territory in which the project is located.

2.3.3 Format of the Phase One Proposal

In order to facilitate the evaluation of proposals, proponents are to adhere to the following instructions:

- Proposal should not exceed thirty (30) pages single side or fifteen (15) double sided). After an introductory page or letter stating the interest of the proponent concerning this project, the proponent must provide the Mandatory Requirements (Refer to Part 3.3 and Appendix B and C) and Rated Requirements (refer to Part 3.4 and Appendix D). Note an additional page for each project is allowed, but not required. The Mandatory Requirements and the Client Reference letters will not count in the total number of pages.
- The proponent is to submit one (1) original (signed) and four (4) copies of the Phase One proposal. Printing on both sides is allowable and preferable. Simple binding or stapling is acceptable.
- The original Phase One proposal must include an original signature in Appendix "C".
- Proposals for pre-qualification may be submitted in either English or French.

2.4 Phase Two – Request for Proposal (RFP)

2.4.1 Admissibility

Only those proponents that qualify through a Phase One LOIQ submission will be eligible to submit a proposal at Phase Two. Successful submission is defined as the satisfaction of Mandatory Requirements and a minimum or higher scoring of Rated Requirements.

2.4.2 RFP Documents

The complete RFP package, including solicitation and contract documents, performance specifications and additional information will be provided to qualified proponents in preparation for Phase Two proposal submissions.

Schedules of Wage Rates for Federal Construction Contracts is included by reference and may be accessed from the Website:

http://www.hrsdc.gc.ca/eng/labour/employment_standards/contracts/schedule/northwest_territories/schedule.shtml

The following documents will be incorporated by reference into, and will also form part of the RFP and contract documents to be used at Phase Two:

GC1	General Provisions	R2810D	(2012-07-16);
GC2	Administration of the Contract	R2820D	(2012-07-16);
GC3	Execution and Control of the Work	R2830D	(2010-01-11);
GC4	Protective Measures	R2840D	(2008-05-12);
GC5	Terms of Payment	R2850D	(2010-01-11);
GC6	Delays and Changes in the Work	R2860D	(2012-07-16);
GC7	Default, Suspension or Termination of Contract	R2870D	(2008-05-12);
GC8	Dispute Resolution	R2882D	(2008-12-12);
GC9	Contract Security	R2890D	(2012-07-16);
GC10	Insurance	R2900D	(2008-05-12);
Supplementary Conditions			
Insurance Terms		R2910D	(2008-12-12);
Fair Wages and Hours of Labour - Labour Conditions		R2940D	(2012-07-16);
Allowable Costs for Contract Changes Under GC6.4.1		R2950D	(2007-05-25);

Clauses referred to by number above (ie R2890D) can be found at the following web site:

<https://buyandsell.gc.ca/policy-and-guidelines/standard-acquisition-clauses-and-conditions-manual/5/R>

NOTE: Bidders should be aware of the full text and requirements of the above noted General Conditions; in particular, GC 9 - Contract Security, clause R2890D. Also, Bid Security, in accordance with General Instructions GI09 Bid Security Requirements, clause R2710T.

2.5 General Instructions to Proponents

2.5.1 Closing Date

The closing date for receipt of Phase One pre-qualification proposals is 14:00 hrs on October 03, 2012.

2.5.2 Proposal Receiving / Return Address

Proposals by facsimile or electronic means WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED. In order to be considered, pre-qualification proposals of this LOIQ shall be submitted to:

Public Works and Government Services Canada
 Bid Receiving Unit
 Suite 1650, 635 - 8 Ave. SW
 Calgary, AB
 T2P 3M3

Ensure the following information is clearly written on the proposal:

Roaster Complex Deconstruction, Giant Mine
Solicitation No.: EW699-130732/A
PWGSC Project No.: R.052308.003

Timely and correct delivery of proposals is the sole responsibility of the proponent.

2.5.3 Post-qualification Conference

During the Phase Two RFP stage, a mandatory site visit and conference will be held on site for proponents that successfully qualify through this LOIQ. This conference is intended to answer questions concerning the design, deconstruction, and performance specifications, and to allow proponents to more accurately prepare their Phase Two proposal.

2.5.4 Enquiries

Enquiries regarding this pre-qualification must be submitted in writing to the Contracting Officer named below as early as possible within the solicitation period. Enquiries should be received no later than ten (10) calendar days prior to the closing date to allow sufficient time to provide a response. Enquiries received after that time may not result in an answer being provided.

To ensure consistency and quality of the information provided to the proponents, the Contracting Officer shall examine the content of the enquiry and shall decide whether or not to issue an amendment.

All enquiries and other communications related to this pre-qualification request sent throughout the solicitation period are to be directed ONLY to the Contracting Officer named below. Non-compliance with this requirement during the solicitation period may result in disqualification of the firm.

2.5.5 Contracting Officer

The Contracting Officer is:

Margaret Twomey
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Suite 1650, 635 - 8th Ave SW
Calgary AB T2P 3M3
Telephone: (403) 292-4450
Facsimile: (403) 292-5786

2.5.6 Checklist

The checklist included in Appendix E will serve as a quick reference tool for the Proponent's use only. The use of the checklist may prevent omission of any required documents or information which could render the submission non-responsive.

PART 3 - GENERAL INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR PRE-QUALIFICATION

3.1 General

Part 3 of this document sets out specific information, documents and other items to be provided with the pre-qualification submission against which responses received will be evaluated.

All information, documents and all other items identified in 3.3 – Mandatory Requirements must be completed and submitted with the Proponent's LOIQ proposal.

Failure to meet all requirements shall render the proposal non-responsive.

3.2 Definitions

Evaluation Committee: An impartial team of qualified PWGSC/AANDC employees responsible for determining evaluation criteria and for scoring LOIQ submissions.

Terms of Reference / Specification Documents: is the complete set of performance specifications that define all project parameters, including the project schedule; this will be delivered to Phase One pre-qualified proponents in order to prepare proposals for Phase Two submission.

Completed project: means a project where all the terms and conditions of the contract were met and where a final certificate of completion has been issued or a final invoice paid and where the date on the certificate or payment instrument indicates the date of completion.

Project: The Project is the full and complete design and implementation of the demolition/deconstruction of the Roaster Complex, Giant Mine Site, Yellowknife, NT as specified in the Terms of Reference/ Specification document.

Giant Mine Site: Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC) Giant Mine, Yellowknife, Northwest Territories.

Project Work Area: The area that comprises the Roaster Complex and the surrounding area at the Giant Mine Site that will accommodate demolition/deconstruction activities, as currently shown on the Key Plan presented in Appendix A including any Roaster Complex material storage areas and potential boundary modifications approved in writing by the Departmental Representative at a later date.

Underway project: means a project currently in progress to perform construction activities of a similar nature to that outlined in this pre-qualification document.

Phase One: Phase One is defined by the current document, the Letter of Interest and Qualification (LOIQ).

Phase Two: Phase Two is the Request for Proposal (RFP) process, available to proponents who have satisfied Mandatory Requirements and scored the requisite minimum points or more for Rated Requirements of the Phase One process.

Proponent: The entity (or in case of a joint venture, the entities) submitting a proposal. The successful Proponent will be the Contractor upon award of contract.

Proponent Team: The Proponent and any subcontracted firms by the Proponent named in the form enclosed in Appendix B

Departmental Representative: means the person designated in the Contract, or by written notice to the Contractor, to act as the Departmental Representative for the purposes of the Contract, and includes a person, designated and authorized in writing by the Departmental Representative to the Contractor.

3.3 Mandatory Requirements

To be considered compliant, a proposal must meet all of the mandatory evaluation criteria. Proposals not meeting all of the mandatory requirements will be rejected as non-compliant and will be given no further consideration

3.3.1 Identification of Proponent Team

The Proponent shall:

Complete and submit Appendix B. – Identification of Proponent Team

Requirements:

The Proponent, all sub-contractors/sub-consultants, and all entities of a joint venture must be identified in Appendix B. **All parties and project roles must be clearly identified.**

In the case of a joint venture, identify the existing or proposed legal form of the joint venture.

3.3.2 Insurance and Certification

The Proponent shall:

A. Provide proof, in the form of a letter from Insurer, stating that the proponent is capable of providing Commercial General Liability Insurance coverage of at least five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00) each occurrence limit and general aggregate limit of at least ten million dollars (\$10,000,000.00)

B. Provide proof, in the form of a letter from Insurer, stating that the proponent is capable of providing Environmental Impairment Liability Insurance (including Contractors Pollution Liability, and Asbestos Abatement) coverage for not less than one million dollars (\$1,000,000.00) per accident or occurrence.

C. Provide proof, in the form of a letter from Insurer, stating that all the Professionals have Professional Liability Insurance coverage of at least one million dollars (\$1,000,000.00).

D Provide proof, in the form of a letter from Insurer, stating that the proponent is capable of providing Automobile Liability Insurance coverage for no less than two million dollars (\$2,000,000.00) per occurrence or accident.

E. Complete and submit Appendix "C" - Experience Certification.

Failure to provide the “mandatory” information requested in 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 will render the proposal non-responsive.

3.3.3 Code of Conduct and Certification

1. Bidders must comply with the *Code of Conduct for Procurement*. In addition to the *Code of Conduct for Procurement*, bidders must a) respond to bid solicitations in an honest, fair and comprehensive manner, b) accurately reflect their capacity to satisfy the requirements stipulated in the bid solicitations and resulting contracts, c) submit bids and enter into contracts only if they will fulfill all obligations of the Contract.
2. Bidders further understand that, to ensure fairness, openness and transparency in the procurement process, the commission of certain acts or offences will render them ineligible to be awarded a contract. Canada will declare non-responsive any bid in respect of which the information herein requested is missing or inaccurate, or in respect of which the information contained in the certifications specified hereinafter is found to be untrue, in any respect, by Canada. If it is determined, after contract award, that the Bidder made a false declaration, Canada will have the right to terminate the Contract for default. The Bidder will be required to diligently maintain up-to-date the information herein requested. The Bidder and any of the Bidder's parent companies, subsidiaries and affiliates, will also be required to remain free and clear of any acts or convictions specified herein during the period of any contract arising from this bid solicitation. Canada may verify the information provided by the Bidder, including the information relating to the acts or convictions specified herein, through independent research, use of any government resources or by contacting third parties.
3. For the purpose of this section, business concerns, organizations and individuals are Bidder's affiliates if:
 - a. directly or indirectly either one controls or has the power to control the other, or
 - b. a third party has the power to control both.

Indicia of control, include, but are not limited to, interlocking management or ownership, identity of interests among family members, shared facilities and equipment, common use of employees, or a business entity created following the acts or convictions specified in this section which has the same or similar management, ownership, or principal employees, as the case may be.

4. Bidders must submit the following as part of their bid:

- a. a complete list of names of all individuals who are currently directors of the Bidder;
- b. a properly completed and signed Consent Form 229 attached, for each individual named in the aforementioned list.

The above should be completed and submitted with the bid by the bid solicitation closing date. If the above is not completed and submitted with the bid by the bid solicitation closing date, the Contracting Authority will so inform the Bidder and provide the Bidder with a time frame within which to meet the requirement. Failure to comply with the request of the Contracting Authority and meet the requirement within that time period will render the bid non-responsive.

5. The Bidder must diligently maintain the list up-to-date by informing Canada in writing of any change occurring during the validity period of the bid, and must also provide Canada with the corresponding Consent Forms. The Bidder will also be required to diligently maintain the list and to provide Consent Forms during the period of any contract arising from this bid solicitation.

-
6. By submitting a bid, the Bidder certifies to be aware, and that its parent companies, subsidiaries and affiliates are aware, that Canada may verify the information provided by the Bidder, including the information relating to the acts or convictions specified herein, through independent research, use of any government resources or by contacting third parties.
 7. **By submitting a bid, the Bidder certifies that neither the Bidder nor any of the Bidder's parent companies, subsidiaries or affiliates have directly or indirectly, paid or agreed to pay, and will not, directly or indirectly, pay a contingency fee to any individual for the solicitation, negotiation or obtaining of the Contract if the payment of the fee would require the individual to file a return under section 5 of the *Lobbying Act*.**
 8. By submitting a bid, the Bidder certifies that except for those offences where a criminal pardon or a record suspension has been obtained, capacities restored by the Governor in Council, or leniency granted as further described in subsection 9 herein, neither the Bidder nor any of the Bidder's parent companies, subsidiaries or affiliates has ever been convicted of an offence under any of the following provisions:
 - a. *section 45 (Conspiracies, agreements or arrangements between competitors), 46 (Foreign directives) 47 (Bid rigging), 49 (Agreements or arrangements of federal financial institutions), 52 (False or misleading representation), 53 (Deceptive notice of winning a prize) under the Competition Act, or*
 - b. *section 121 (Frauds on the government and Contractor subscribing to election fund), section 124 (Selling or Purchasing Office), section 380 (Fraud) for fraud committed against Her Majesty or section 418 (Selling defective stores to Her Majesty), section 462.31 (Laundering proceeds of crime) or sections 467.11 to 467.13 (Participation in activities of criminal organization) of the Criminal Code of Canada, or*
 - c. *paragraph 80(1)(d) (False entry, certificate or return), subsection 80(2) (Fraud against Her Majesty) or section 154.01 (Fraud against Her Majesty) of the Financial Administration Act, or*
 - d. *section 239 (False or deceptive statements) of the Income Tax Act, or*
 - e. *section 327 (False or deceptive statements) of the Excise Tax Act, or*
 - f. *section 3 (Bribing a foreign public official) of the Corruption of Foreign Public Officials Act, or*
 - g. *section 5 (Trafficking in substance), section 6 (Importing and exporting), or section 7 (Production of substance) of the Controlled Drugs and Substance Act.*
 9. In circumstances where a criminal pardon or a record suspension has been obtained, capacities restored by the Governor in Council, or leniency granted pursuant to a formal program (similar to the Competition Bureau's Leniency Program) for offences other than sections 121, 124, 380 for fraud committed against Her Majesty and 418 of the Criminal Code of Canada or offences under the Financial Administration Act, the Bidder must provide with its bid a certified copy of confirming documentation from an official source.

Verification of this requirement will be done prior to an award of a contract.

3.4 - Rated Requirements

The Phase One LOIQ provides the opportunity for each proponent to present the work experience of its project team in the context of the proposed project; projects of a similar size and nature (construction value over \$5 million) that were completed using a different method of procurement or delivery may also be represented. The following section allows interested proponents to submit to PWGSC a history of their Proponent Team's accomplishments and experiences in order to represent the capabilities of each member of the Team.

Proposals that fail to achieve the mandatory minimum score for each section will be given no further consideration.

3.4.1 Phase 1 - Management and Organizational Proposal

3.4.1.1 Proponent Team Qualifications and Experience

(Maximum Points: 25; mandatory minimum score: 15 points)

Requirements:

Provide a clear, concise and complete proposal that is well organized and prepared in the format outlined in the LOIQ. Include with submission an Organizational Chart showing, company roles, organizational structure of the proponent team, lines of communication and proof of working together or in a team environment on previous projects.

Include descriptions of applicable Health and Safety Management Systems and/or Certificates of Recognition or Equivalent.

Include descriptions of systems in place to ensure schedule, budget, quality and safety controls are maintained at all times with a team environment

3.4.1.2 Project Understanding

(Maximum Points: 15; mandatory minimum score: 10 points)

Requirements:

Demonstrate an understanding and appreciation of projects that involve deconstruction and hazardous materials handling, relative to but not limited to the constraints of working in a relatively isolated area and the limitations to project resources. Detail an understanding of the requirements with working as the responsible contractor within a work area that falls within a larger site that is under the care and control of another contractor as well as the regulatory environment. The Proponent shall identify its interpretation of the top five key success factors for the successful completion of a project of this nature. Zero points will be awarded for simply restating information presented in LOIQ document.

3.4.1.3 Proponent's Team Accomplishments

A. Proponent's Team Accomplishments - Hazardous Materials Project: (Maximum Points: 30; mandatory minimum score: 20 points)

Complete and submit Appendix D - Experience of Proponent Team- Hazardous Materials Project, ensuring all reference projects conform to the following requirements.

Requirements:

Provide 3 project summaries that describe the Proponent's Team accomplishments, achievements, and experience in the handling, abatement, collection and disposal of a variety of hazardous materials located on building demolition sites. Reference projects to be of similar size and value (i.e. construction cost over \$5 million). Emphasis on projects that have been completed within the last five years and extended over a minimum 9 month duration.

Proponents are to be aware that the Phase Two evaluation process will include a submission of qualifications for key individuals for the project. During Phase Two, Proponents will be required to provide evidence that the key individuals used in Phase Two have been involved in one or more of the above hazardous materials projects or an equivalent hazardous materials project.

B. Proponent's Team Accomplishments - Building Deconstruction: (Maximum Points: 20; mandatory minimum score: 15 points)

Complete and submit Appendix D - Experience of Proponent Team - Building Deconstruction, ensuring all reference projects conform to the following requirements.

Requirements:

Provide 3 project summaries that describe the proponent's team accomplishments, achievements, and experience in demolition/deconstruction of structures located in industrial areas or in populated urban environments. Reference projects should be of similar size and value (i.e. construction cost over \$5 million). Emphasis on projects that have been completed within the last five years and extended over a minimum 9 month duration. The same projects may be used as in A above, with emphasis on building demolition/deconstruction

Proponents are to be aware that the Phase Two evaluation process will include a submission of qualifications for key individuals for the project. During Phase Two, Proponents will be required to provide evidence that the key individuals used in Phase Two must have been involved in one or more of the above building deconstruction projects or an equivalent deconstruction project.

3.4.1.4 Client References**(Maximum Points: 10; mandatory minimum score: 5 points)****Requirements:**

Provide 3 client letters of references for projects listed in Section 3.4.1.3 (A) and 3 client reference letters for projects listed in Section 3.4.1.3 (B), demonstrating the location, value and nature of the project. Letters are to clearly identify the Project Team being addressed. Letters are to be signed and dated by the client and the signature dates must be within the solicitation period of this LOIQ.

Each Letter of Reference to clearly indicate the following:

- Extent to which the Project Team member(s) delivered services on budget
- Extent to which the Project Team member(s) project scope of work was performed on schedule
- Extent to which the Project Team member(s) met objectives of the project

Points will be awarded to proponent for degree of overall achievement in the 3 sub-categories, and are not awarded on a letter-by-letter basis.

3.5 Evaluation and Rating

All proposals will be evaluated and rated by a PWGSC Evaluation Committee according to the table below. Successful proposals must score the mandatory minimum points or more to qualify for the Phase Two Request for Proposal process.

CRITERION	MANDATORY MINIMUM POINTS	MAXIMUM POINTS
<u>Proponent's Qualifications and Experience:</u> Provided a clear, concise and complete proposal that is well organized and prepared in the format outlined in the LOIQ. Included with submission an Organizational Chart showing, company roles, organizational structure of the proponent team, lines of communication and proof of working together or in a team environment on previous projects. Included descriptions of applicable Health and Safety Management Systems and/or Certificates of Recognition or Equivalent. Included descriptions of systems in place to ensure schedule, budget, quality and safety controls are maintained at all times with a team environment	15	25
<u>Project Understanding:</u> Demonstrated understanding and appreciation of the unique nature of the project, scope of the work, relative to but not limited to the constraints of working in a relatively isolated area and the limitations to project resources. Detailed an understanding of the requirements with working as the responsible contractor within a work area that falls within a larger site that is under the care and control of another contractor as well as the regulatory environment. The Proponent identified its interpretation of the top five key success factors for the successful completion of a project of this nature.	10	15
<u>Proponent's Team Accomplishments - Hazardous Materials Project:</u> Provided 3 project summaries that describe the proponent's team accomplishments, achievements, and experience in the handling, abatement, collection and disposal of a variety of hazardous materials located on building demolition/deconstruction sites. Reference projects to be of similar size and value (i.e. construction cost over \$5 million). Emphasis on projects that have been completed within the last five years and extended over a minimum 9 month duration.	20	30

Proponent's Team Accomplishments - <u>Building Deconstruction:</u> Provided 3 project summaries that describe the proponent's team accomplishments, achievements, and experience in deconstruction of structures located in industrial areas or in populated urban environments. Referenced projects should be of similar size and value (i.e. construction cost over \$5 million). Emphasis on projects that have been completed within the last five years and extended over a minimum 9 month duration.	15	20
<u>Client References:</u> Provided 3 client letters of references for projects listed in Section 3.4.1.3 (A) and a minimum of 3 client reference letters for projects listed in Section 3.4.1.3 (B), demonstrating the location, value and nature of the project. Letters are to clearly identify the Project Team being addressed. <u>Letters are to be signed and dated by the client and the signature dates must be within the solicitation period of this LOIQ.</u> Each Letter of Reference to clearly indicate the following: - Extent to which the Project Team delivered services on budget - Extent to which the Project Team project scope of work was performed on schedule -Extent to which the Project Team met objectives of the project	5	10
TOTAL POINTS	65	100

Proponents who meet mandatory requirements and who achieve the mandatory minimum points or more automatically qualify for Phase Two and will receive notice within approximately two (2) weeks of the LOIQ closing. A mandatory site visit and post-qualification conference will be conducted on site to further assist Phase Two proposal development.

The contract award at the end of Phase Two will be based upon both this Phase One LOIQ submission (12%), and the Phase Two proposal (88%); thus, a carryover from this submission will affect the final total score for each Proponent.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EW699-130732/A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

ncs008

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client

EW699-130732

File No. - N° du dossier

NCS-2-35105

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

Appendix “A” Key Plan and Project Work Area

See Attached

Appendix "B" Identification of Proponent Team

The Proponent/Contractor, Sub Contractors and Sub Consultants, and other members of the Project Team shall be, or eligible to be, licensed, certified or otherwise authorized to provide the necessary professional services to the full extent that may be required by provincial/territorial law. Please provide essential information for:

I. PROPONENT/CONTRACTOR:	
Firm or Joint Venture Name:	
Primary Contact:	
Business Address	
Address 2	
City, Province/Territory, Postal Code	
Phone	
Fax	
Email	
II. Key Sub Contractor(s):	
Firm:	Role
Firm:	Role
III. Key Sub Consultant(s)	
Structural Engineer	
Firm:	Professional Licensing Status in NWT & Registration Number

EW699-130732/A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

ncs008

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client

EW699-130732

File No. - N° du dossier

NCS-2-35105

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

Deconstruction Specialist
Firm:
Industrial Hygiene Consultant
Firm:
Environmental/Hazardous Materials Consultant
Firm:

Appendix "C" Experience Certification

We certify that all statements made with regard to the experience of the company is accurate and factual, and we are aware that the Minister reserves the right to verify any information provided in this regard and that untrue statements may result in the proposal being declared non-responsive.

Should verification by the Minister disclose untrue statements, the Minister shall have the right to treat any resulting contract from this proposal as being in default and to take the Work out of the Contractor's hands.

This Appendix C should be completed and submitted with the Phase One proposal, but may be submitted afterwards as follows: if Appendix C is not completed and submitted with the proposal, the Contracting Authority will so inform the proponent and provide the proponent with a time frame within which to meet the requirement. Any proposal that fails to comply with the request of the Contracting authority and meet the requirement within the requested time frame will render the proposal non-responsive. Any non-responsive proposal will be rejected as non-compliant and will be given no further consideration

Legal Operating name of the Proponent: _____

Authorized Name (print): _____

Capacity:

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Phone Number: () _____ Fax Number: () _____

Email: _____

Appendix "D" Experience of Proponent Team - Hazardous Materials Project

Contractor: **Project Profile as per Section 3.4.1.3 A**

Project Title	
General Description	
Location	
Duration of Contract	
Client Name	
Client Representative Telephone No. Facsimile No. E-mail Address	
Consultant Name Telephone No. Facsimile No. E-mail Address	
Describe project's hazardous materials scope of work in additional detail	

Appendix “D” Experience of Proponent Team - Building Deconstruction

Contractor: Project Profile as per Section 3.4.1.3 B

Project Title	
General Description	
Location	
Duration of Contract	
Client Name	
Client Representative Telephone No. Facsimile No. E-mail Address	
Consultant Name Telephone No. Facsimile No. E-mail Address	
Describe project's demolition / deconstruction scope of work in additional detail	

Appendix “E” Checklist

The checklist included herein will serve as a quick reference tool for the proponent's use only. The use of the checklist may prevent omission of any mandatory document(s)/information which could render the submission non-responsive.

Mandatory Requirements Checklist	See Section	(ü)
Complete and submit Appendix B – Identification of the Proponent Team	3.3.1	
Submit letter from Insurer for Commercial General Liability Insurance coverage	3.3.2 (A)	
Submit letter from Insurer for Environmental Impairment Liability Insurance coverage	3.3.2 (B)	
Submit letter from Insurer for Professional Liability Insurance coverage	3.3.2 (C)	
Submit letter from Insurer for Professional Liability Insurance coverage	3.3.2 (D)	
Complete, sign, and submit Appendix “C” - Experience Certification	3.3.2 (E)	
Rated Requirements Checklist	See Section	(ü)
Complete requirements of Company/Joint Venture/Consortium Qualifications and Experience and submit Appendix B: Identification of Project Team	3.4.1.1	
Complete requirements of Project Understanding	3.4.1.2	
Complete requirements of Contractor's Accomplishments - Hazardous Materials Project and submit Appendix D	3.4.1.3 (A)	
Complete requirements of Contractor's Accomplishments - Building Demolition/Deconstruction Project and submit Appendix D	3.4.1.3 (B)	
Complete requirements of Client References	3.4.1.4	

