

ADDENDUM

PROJECT #:	20230428	ADDENDUM #:	1
		DATE OF ISSUE:	August 15, 2023
PROJECT NAME:	Environmental Consulting Services	ISSUED BY:	Caitlin Van Gaal
		PAGE(S):	3

INSTRUCTIONS:

- 1. Amend your copy of the Request For Proposal (RFP) in accordance with the details below.
- 2. Retain one copy for your file; attach a second copy to your submission as confirmation that the Addendum was taken into account in your submission.

DETAILS OF ADDENDUM:

This addendum is issued to include the following:

A. RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS RECEIVED

Item No.	Questions	
1.	Question:	Regarding Items 3-6 of the Proposal Mandatory Requirement Checklist in Section 4.2.1. (which relate to various required letters), will it be sufficient to provide the signed Signature and Waiver Sheet from Section 5 to cover these items? This Waiver sheet implies that all provisions have been read and understood, which we believe would include the items listed in the Mandatory Requirement Checklist.
	Response:	Please send a signed letter for each mandatory requirement
2.	Question:	Regarding the Urgent Response scope in Schedule B of Section 3.4.2., can you
2.	Question.	confirm if the consultant is expected to provide specialized spill response equipment such as equipment trailers with booms and absorbent pads, socks, and pillows? Or will the scope be typically limited to the activities mentioned, i.e. overall response management, impact characterization, impact remediation, and material management?
	Response:	The Urgent Response team will be expected to respond to and manage a spill. This may require the materials to contain a spill if not already contained, or the means to procure or contract another firm to contain the spill. The Town has limited access to its own spill containing materials through spill kits in vehicles and within the Fire Department.
3.	Question:	Is the Town of Canmore open to proposals to only provide third-party review services (i.e., Schedule A on page 10 in the RFP)? I ask this question because separating Schedule A work from the work specified under Schedules B and C could avoid potential conflicts of interest. Also, the work specified under each of the three schedules suggests different roles: Schedule A would benefit from an owner's consultant or trusted advisor.



		 The work under Schedule B is the role of an environmental contractor.
		Schedule C comprises work for an external consultant.
	Response:	The Town is looking to maintain one contract for environmental services, it is expected that the successful proponent would be able to perform all tasks outlined in the RFP
4.	Question:	The clarification is with respect to the 'describe your firm's ability to respond within a one hour's notice'. The response within one hour, would this be for returning the call should it be missed, or having someone on their way to site within an hour.
	Response:	The intent is the successful proponent would be able to have someone on their way within an hour.
5.	Question:	In terms of the environmental emergencies, contaminant discovery and/or release, would this be work being done on behalf of the Town or by a third-party such as a developer or truck rollover
	Response:	This could be for work being completed by or potentially on behalf of the Town. This may also include spills discovered on Town land caused by another party (if unknown).
6.	Question:	The form in this section is the proposed fixed price form and because the services will be on an as-needed basis, we cannot provide a fixed price. Could you please confirm that the included form is an example of what the town expects the successful proponent to provide for a proposed scope of work.
	Response:	The form included is an example of how we would like to see pricing provided. The Town understands that a fix price is not possible given the tasks of this RFP. Billing rates for those that will respond is required.
7.	Question:	Our team is qualified to meet all of these safety requirements, with the exception of H2S Alive. Commonly H2S Alive is not a valid training requirement for municipal assessments, as H2S is rarely a concern in these settings. Is there a particular concern for H2S in Canmore that requires this training? We have no concern with qualifying our team to meet these requirements if needed, but is it acceptable to state within the RFP that our team will be qualified to meet this requirement following award of the Project and we will supply the Town of Canmore with documentation to prove that field staff have been trained in H2S Alive to satisfy the requirements?
	Response:	That is a reasonable approach. H2S is not a known concern in Canmore, however, familiarity with the required safety measures is an asset.
8.	Question:	How will the Town of Canmore evaluate cost (Hourly Rate) given consultants will have different level descriptions and rate structures?
	Response:	We understand that this is a bit difficult, so we are looking to evaluate in general terms the basis for costs associated for a call out – e.g. hourly rate of the staff to



		respond on site, hourly rate of manager review, mileage rate/trip to Canmore, hourly rate for report review.
9.	Question:	Is there an anticipated volume or work and/or mix of the type of assignments to be completed under this contract (i.e. Phase I/II ESA's, third-party report reviews, EIA reviews, contaminated sites work, spill response, etc.)?
	Response:	The volume of work will be dependent on incidents and development. It is expected to be minimal and an even mix of type of work. For example, in 2022 there were two/three minor spills, 3 development applications that may have required third party ESA review and one municipal site that may have required a review of past environmental work.
10.	Question:	Are the requirements for experience related to coal mining and methane assessment related to current contaminated sites within the town or general items of potential concern?
	Response:	There were historic coal mining activities in Canmore and the likelihood of encountering coal related impacts is high, understanding of naturally occurring "impacts" and mining impacts related to coal/coal mining is an asset. Methane concerns are listed as a general item to be as inclusive as possible with this RFP.
11.	Question:	Regarding the mandatory requirement of "A letter signed by an authorized corporate officer agreeing to complete and sign Alberta Environment's Application for a Remediation Certificate on behalf of the Town of Canmore". When a consultant prepares a remediation certificate application and supporting documentation, it is the normal course of business and professional obligation to sign the professional declaration on the application. However, the Town would also be required to sign of as the applicant, the consultant cannot sign on behalf of the Town as the applicant. Can we state this on our RFP response or is a letter required?
	Response:	Please state this in your signed letter.
11.	are not to be	Section 4.2.2 Proposal Submission item b states that proposals are to be no n (10) pages and that appendices, organizational charts, and personnel resumes considered in the number of pages. Would Canmore allow for our cover page to be excluded from this 10 page count? Would Canmore allow for our Table of Contents to be excluded in this 10 page count? Please confirm that the Signature and Waiver Sheet (Section 5) and associated affidavit of execution and affidavit of authority are excluded from this ten page
	c	count. I. Please confirm that the Proposal Mandatory Requirement Checklist is excluded from this ten page count.
	e	e. Please confirm if the Safe Work Practices and Procedure table from Section C Safety Performance item d is excluded from the page count.
	Response:	These items are ok to exclude from the final page count.
	<u>.</u>	



ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED