

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS “RFP” NO. PS20191837
Manitoba Yards Geotechnical Design Services**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS NO. 7

ISSUED ON: April 16, 2020

<p>Q1</p>	<p>The Areas of Potential Environmental Concern (APECs) in the Stage 1 Preliminary Site Investigation, appear to be identified largely as general functional areas, and not as discreet locations of potential environmental releases of specific hazardous materials/wastes.</p> <p>Sample location layout for an efficient Stage 2 Preliminary Site Investigation, requires assessment of worst-case locations based on specific risks. The report notes that the locations of those features were identified in the site inspection and historical review. Could the specific locations of potential environmental releases, the associated potential contaminants of concern, and any preferred migration pathways that were identified be made available for all proponents to use in sample location plan layout?</p>
<p>A1</p>	<p>The investigation of the site to this point is typical of a Stage 1 investigation, and specific points of historic spills or concentrations of contaminants have not been established. The Stage 1 includes Figure 2, which gives the best estimate available of geographic areas where historic activities are likely to have caused soil and groundwater impacts (“APECs”), and it is recognized that not all APECs will actually be sources of contamination. The Stage 1 also includes Table Q, which lists the site use for each APEC and the PCOC that may be present.</p> <p>Preferential pathways have not been established for the site. The City’s understanding so far is that groundwater flow is inferred to be to the southwest following regional topography, and the site is serviced for storm drainage with drainage works in the upper permeable unit.</p> <p>The primary purpose of this investigation is geotechnical, and though the City recognizes some advantages to collecting environmental samples during the drilling program, this is a secondary goal that should not distract from or impair the geotechnical investigation.</p>
<p>Q2</p>	<p>Is the City open to negotiation on Legal Terms and Conditions included in Appendix 1 of the RFP?</p>
<p>A2</p>	<p>The City has provided “Appendix 9 - Proposed Amendments to the Form Of Agreement” for any deviations to the City’s standard terms. The City may consider alterations to these standard terms. However, the provided terms represent the City’s preferred terms used in the majority of professional services engagements.</p>

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS “RFP” NO. PS20191837
Manitoba Yards Geotechnical Design Services**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS NO. 5

Q3	If field drilling and field testing are proposed for night shifts only, is traffic control within the yard still needed? Is there a time window within the yard that traffic control is not needed?
A3	The yard is operational 24 hrs a day. The requirement for traffic control varies by location and particulars of work. Traffic control will be required at all times of day if the work has the potential to impact vehicle circulation.
Q4	The currently planned geotechnical field investigation program is not expected to be sufficient for a Stage 2 PSI requirement. As a provisional item, the proponent can expand the planned geotechnical field program with more testing locations to satisfy a full Stage 2 PSI requirement, then does a Stage 2 PSI field program and a final Stage 2 PSI report need to meet the timelines set in the RFP between May 27 and June 23, 2020 for Task 2?
A4	An expanded geotechnical field program would not need to meet the same timelines as the planned geotechnical investigation as it is a provisional item and would be negotiated later.

END OF Q&A No.7