



City of Richmond

May 18, 2012
File: 02-0775-50-4659/Vol 01

Business and Financial Services Department
Finance Division
Telephone: 604-276-4218
Fax: 604-276-4162

Attention: All Proponents

Dear Madame/Sir:

**Re: Addendum Two
Request for Proposal 4659P – Site Remediation Services for Triangle Road Property**

This Addendum includes items of clarification, forms part of the Contract Documents and shall be read, interpreted and coordinated with all other parts. Please review and consider the following information in the preparation of your Proposals:

I. Questions and Answers

- Q.1 Will the successful proponent be able to receive reliance for the Phase I and Limited Phase II Report issued to the City by Golder?
- A.1 The previous reporting on the Site for the City was done for due diligence purposes, and at least in part relied on data from another consultant, for which the City sought reliance. As the City's interest at the time was around characterising business risk, we did not ask our consultant or the seller's consultant to produce a report that would serve as part of submission to the Ministry. The successful proponent would be expected to deliver all reporting required for application to the ministry for a Contaminated Sites Instrument, and reliance on older reporting should not be presumed.
- Q.2 Has the City had conversations with the Neighbouring property (to the west) regarding access for remediation services, and has a Notice of Likely Offsite Migration been issued?
- A.2 To the best of the City's knowledge, there has not been a Notice of Offsite Migration delivered to the neighbouring property. There have been previous discussions with the neighbour to the west regarding delineation of the excavation work described in the Limited Phase II report, but no excavation was performed across the property line. There is no formal or informal agreement in place between the City and the neighbour to the west regarding contamination or remediation.

- Q.3 Does the City want the piping used for the dredgeate operation removed as part of this project?
- A.4 No, if the pipes or any other equipment were to be removed that would be part of the site development costs, not the remediation costs.
- Q.5 Section 9.1 indicates that the City is seeking a contractor who will "...provide remediation services for the Site". Are remediation contractors to be included as part of our team? Does the City want us to provide remediation contractor estimates?
- A.5 The City is seeking a contractor to oversee the entire investigation & remediation process, this will include any active remediation (excavating, soils treatment, etc.) or outside remediation consulting (risk assessors, etc.) that may be required. The City recognizes that specific remediation strategies cannot be developed until DSI-level investigations are completed, and anticipate that cost-benefit analysis may be required at that stage to decide on final remedial approach. For this Proposal, the City expects the successful proponent will provide order-of-magnitude estimates for one or more remedial approach (based on provided information and professional judgement) and will clearly outline the assumptions made that would substantially impact those budget and effort estimates for the remediation stage of the project.
- Q.6 Section 13.5 asks us to provide "a minimum of three (3) client references from projects of a similar size and scope undertaken by key members of the project team". Is the City requesting provision of 3 references for each of Sections 13.5 (a) through (f) inclusive – 18 references total? Or do you simply require three project references total for the bid? Please clarify.
- A.6 The City requests a minimum of three references that cover the breadth of the scope of work. If the proponent has three similar projects, where the entire project was completed from PSI to CofC, then that would be adequate. If each of the three references only covers a small portion of the entire scope of this project, then more references would be preferred. Three is considered a minimum number of references, proponents may feel free to provide more if that demonstrates their experience managing similar projects.
- Q.7 In Section 4.4.1 of the Golder Report (p. 18) second sentence: "Therefore, soil and groundwater samples collected within APEC 1 were analysed for hydrocarbons including LEPH/HEPH/PAHs, BTEX, and VPH." We agree that BTEX and VPH are potential contaminants of concern for diesel and/or waste oil; however, the groundwater tables are missing results for BTEX and VPH. Other sections of the report seem to indicate that BTEX and VPH may not have been analysed in groundwater samples. Please advise whether this data is available or groundwater samples were not analysed for BTEX and VPH.
- A.7 There were no groundwater samples analyzed for volatile hydrocarbons (VPH, BTEX) by the City's consultant during the due diligence investigation. The City further does not have any records of groundwater samples being analysed for volatile hydrocarbons by the seller's consultant. All analytical data available to the City has been provided in the Golder Report included as Addendum One (1).

II. List of Companies Represented at the Site Meeting held May 16th, 2012.

1. Biogenie Environmental
2. Core6 Environmental
3. Dillon Consulting Ltd.
4. Franz Environmental Inc.
5. Golder Associates
6. NEXT Environmental Inc.
7. Pacific Environmental Consulting
8. Pottinger Gaherty Environmental Ltd.
9. Quantum Murray Remediation Services
10. SNC-Lavalin Environment Inc.
11. Tervita Environmental Services
12. TRI Environmental Consulting Inc.

Yours truly,



Kerry Lynne Gillis
Buyer II, Contracting Specialist

KG:kg

pc: Patrick Johnstone, GIT, Environmental Coordinator
Robert Kates, Manager, Real Estate Services
Michael Allen, Manager, Property Services