

## ADDENDUM

<b>DESCRIPTION:</b> <b>FireSmart Municipal Document Review</b>  <b>RFP #: PS 2024-02</b>	<b>ADDENDUM NUMBER:</b> 01
	<b>DATE OF ISSUE:</b> January 6, 2025
	<b>ISSUED BY:</b> Caitlin Miller
	<b>PAGE(S):</b> 2

### INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Amend your copy of the proposal in accordance with the detail below.
2. Retain one (1) copy for your file; sign a 2nd copy and attach to your submission as confirmation that the Addendum was taken into account in your proposal submission.
3. Failure to sign and attach this form with your submission may result in a non-compliant proposal.

### DETAILS OF ADDENDUM:

**1. What is the closing date of the RFP?**

The closing date of the RFP is January 23, 2025.

**2. Section 3.4.1 General Scope of Work: this section suggests the review of various documents. Among those documents, it makes reference to the Urban Forest Management Plan and the Open Spaces and Trail Plan. Does the review of these require a Registered Forest Professional? I am assuming this section is more about written recommendations based on FireSmart Best Practices versus FireSmart fuel management plans (prescriptions)?**

No, a Registered Forest Professional is not required. This section is related to FireSmart Best Practices and not fuel management plans or prescriptions.

**3. Section 3.4.1 General Scope of work: This section also makes reference to “other relevant documents or legislation”. Can you elaborate on what these other documents and legislation are? This is important to understand in order to grasp the amount of time that would be required.**

Other relevant documents could include bylaws or policies that, in dialogue with the successful proponent, would have merit in making recommendations for amendments. This could include the Tree Protection Bylaw, Community Standards Bylaw, or other bylaws or policies if deemed relevant. This will be decided in the kick-off meeting.

**4. In Section 3.4.1, the RFP states “...including an evaluation or prioritization matrix that assesses the impact of each recommendation, and recommendations for consistency across Bow Valley communities”. Can you elaborate a bit more about what the Town wants in this regard? For instance, what criteria should be used for the evaluation or prioritization?**

We are looking for guidance on how to evaluate the recommendations for implementation timing. This could include an evaluation on the recommendations provided for which would make the biggest impact within the community, or which ones need to be implemented in a more timely manner. The successful proponent should have a system for ranking the recommendations they provide in the final report and be able to speak to why they have prioritized the recommendations as they have.



5. Also regarding section 3.4.1 and the above-referenced requirement, what are the Bow Valley Communities to be included/ This could add a lot of work to the project in that a review of each of the Bow Valley communities corresponding regulatory documents (MDP, LUB, engineering guidelines, etc.) have to be reviewed and there are four municipalities close to the Town of Canmore (MD of Bighorn, ID No. 5, ID No. 9, and Town of Banff) as well as federal Banff National Park documents. Or is the Town thinking of “communities” as being the Hamlets of Harvie Heights, Dead Man’s Flats, Exshaw, Lac Des Arc, and the Town of Banff?

The Town is thinking of “communities” as being the Hamlets of Harvie Heights, Dead Man’s Flats, Exshaw, Lac Des Arc, the Town of Banff, and the Kananaskis Improvement District area surrounding Canmore that includes buildings, such as the Canmore Nordic Centre area.

6. Finally, the RFP asks for a Fixed Price for the work (Appendix A) as well as an hourly rate (Appendix B). Do you want both and, if so, which has a priority for the RFP evaluation?  
The fixed price has priority for the work.

Name of Firm \_\_\_\_\_  
Authorized Signature \_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_