

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

RFI NUMBER	NL-RFI-028
ISSUE DATE (YY/MM/DD)	February 10, 2011
PRIORITY	H <input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> L <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X
REQ'D RESPONSE DATE	February 17, 2011

Hope Bay Mining Project

Subject:	Sedimentation and Pollution Pond Clarification	Project Zone/Area:	Doris North
Company:	Nuna Logistics Ltd. (Nuna)	Station/Location:	Sediment and Pollution Ponds
Attention:	Jerry Graham/Doug Fieldings cc SRK Engineering	Discipline:	Civil

AFE:		Specification Number:	
Related Drawings:	SRK Dwg. No DN-DMC-010 to 17 (excluding No 15)	Related Documents:	

Related WBS Code	n/a	WBS Code Description:	n/a

Information Request/Description of Issue/Approval Required:

Nuna would like clarification and further information on the following points with respect to the IFC Sedimentation and Pollution Control Ponds drawings listed above.

- Dwg. No DN-DMC-011 contains a detail label "Typical Detail 7" and is referenced to Detail 7 on DN-DWC-010, however, there is no Detail 7 on DN-DMC-010.
- The Rip Rap quantities on DN-DMC-013 are stated to be 100 m³ for "Spillway Apron", however after viewing DMC-011, there seems to also be riprap on the upstream slope of the pollution pond. Does this 100 m³ capture this Rip Rap quantity entirely?
- As seen in DN-DMC-011, a trench needs to be excavated for the liners in the Pollution Pond, however, the quantity summary on DMC-013 does not include an excavation quantity for this trench nor is the excavation quantity noted anywhere else within the dwg package.

Proposed Corrective Action:

Nuna would like to receive further information and clarification on the points outlined above with respect to the IFC Sedimentation and Pollution Control Ponds Drawing Package.

Originator: Niko Heir

Print:

Sign:

Feb 10/11
Date:

Cost Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Detailed Estimate attached	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Schedule Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Source for Communication	<input type="checkbox"/> Owner Change <input type="checkbox"/> Vendor Change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clarification/Info <input type="checkbox"/> Designer Change
		<input type="checkbox"/> Constructor Change <input type="checkbox"/> Other

Note: RFI's are not authorized change documents and cannot be used to direct a change in contract requirements. If Newmont's response on the RFI has cost and/or schedule effect, it is the contractor's responsibility to immediately advise Newmont. Work undertaken without Newmont written authorization is at the contractor's risk and expense

☐ Corrective Action Approved

☐ Correct as Follows:

Response:

Thank yo for catching these edits. I am in the process of updating the drawings and new revisions will be issued.

Responsible Newmont Representative:

Lowell Wade

Print:

Sign:

February 11, 2011

Date: