

<b>DESCRIPTION:</b> Recreation Facility Feasibility Study  <b>RFP #:</b> CAP 7377	<b>ADDENDUM NUMBER:</b>
	<b>DATE OF ISSUE:</b> March 3, 2025
	<b>ISSUED BY:</b> Amy Bernard
	<b>PAGE(S):</b>

**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. **Question:** *Section 3.3.3. of the RFP states “OPTIONS OR EXTENSIONS — There are no identified options for additional work. Should the Town decide to proceed with a design stage and construction, a separate procurement would occur.” We understand the Town will be issuing a separate RFP for full design services—will the proponent that’s selected to do the Feasibility Study be able to bid for these services, or will they be precluded?*

**Answer:** The Proponent selected for the Feasibility Study will not be precluded to bid on potential future RFPs for design services.

2. **Question:** *Are you able to disclose the budget for this project?*

**Answer:** The Town will not be disclosing the project budget.

3. **Question:** *Page 10, 3.2, “Canmore is also a significant draw for visitors, (an additional 10,000 or more people during peak visitation), many of whom use these facilities” Will the study need to account for a certain percentage of visitor volumes using the recreational facilities?*

**Answer:** Yes; visitor volumes must be considered, as they represent a significant portion of facility users. The Town’s Recreation department keeps data of visitation from membership holders (typically people residing in the Bow Valley) and drop-ins (generally visitors).

4. **Question:** *Page11, 3.3.1, 3. Feasibility Analysis*

*“Identification of Preliminary Needs*

- *Does the project comply with the Goals and Service Outcome?*
- *Does the resource service regional residents?*
- *Have any of the feasibility plannings thresholds/triggers been met?*

*Needs Assessment to address the following:*

- *Resource provision in the market area*
- *Demographics and growth*
- *Trends*
- *Public Consultation*

*Feasibility Analysis*

- *Impacts on existing resources (e.g. Recreation, Facilities, Public Works, HR, IT, Finance, Engineering Transportation Plan)*
- *Capital and operating financial implications or resource provision*
- *Business plan*
- *Recommended course of action*
- *Co-location of other programs/services/partners*

*Initial Constructability Analysis. Explore impacts of resource development including options for:*

- *Primary and secondary components*
- *Potential sites*
- *Expansion (if existing) or building new*
- *Concept design, including drawing(s)*
- *Initial capital cost”*

*Are the five components listed here what needs to be executed for this study? (If so, are the Capital and Operating financial implications and business plan required?)*

**Answer:** Yes.

**5. Question:** *Page 12, 3.3.2, “The successful candidate will determine the need for a new facility due to population growth versus the existing population and perceived gaps in existing indoor recreation facility opportunities.”*

*Would this be to align future recommended needs and project population growth and determine a formula for it?*

**Answer:** Yes. The consultant will recommend a formula to support cost estimates for inclusion in the offsite levy.

**6. Question** *Page 12, 3.3.2, “Consideration of retrofit/additions to existing buildings versus new builds.”*

*This would typically require comparing the general capital cost and estimated land costs for each option. Is this what the Town would be looking for, or would this be more of a general review of options?*

**Answer:** Yes, the Town expects a comparison of the capital and any land costs for each option.

**7. Question:** *Page 12, Section 3.3.2 states, “Consideration of co-location of amenities and multiple sites versus single recreation specific facility”*

*While it is understood that land cost estimates would not be required, would this be to assess general candidate sites for size, location, and accessibility (i.e., road, transit)?*

**Answer:** Yes. The assessment should evaluate candidate sites based on size, location, accessibility, and potential land costs.

**8. Question:** *Also, would this be to assess if more than one site is required should a large site not be available to address all the requirements?*

**Answer:** Yes.

**9. Question:** *Page 12, Section 3.3.2 states, “Exploration of different facility development and operating models (ownership, staffing, operating).*

*Would this be a general operational business plan and would “different operating models” include such consideration as joint ownership with other partners?*

**Answer:** Yes. The Town is interested in various operating models to assess which models may be the best fit for the Recreation department and best financial fit for the Town.

**10. Question:** *Page 12, Section 3.3.2 states, “Pre-concept design (e.g. 1 page with a few details)”*

*Would this require a basic facility floor plan or conceptual architectural design?*

**Answer:** Both.

**11. Question:** *With respect to Section 4.2.C. - Proposal Submission Requirements, the page maximum is 2 pages but the bullets C10 and C3 indicate different figures.*

**Answer:** Page limits for section C should read:

C1: 2 pages

C2: 2 pages

C3: 1 page

Total Pages for Section C submissions is five (5) pages.

**12. Question:** *Section 3.3.1 identifies that a business plan is in scope whereas 3.3.4 indicates that detailed business planning is out of scope. Please clarify the extent of business planning required.*

**Answer:** Correct, in Section 3.3.1 a general business plan is requested, as also outlined in Appendix C, the Town of Canmore's Recreation Master Plan (2016).

**13. Question:** *Section 3.3.1 indicates concept design including drawings is in scope and 3.3.2 indicates pre-concept design (e.g. 1 page with a few details). Please clarify your expectations for the concept design.*

**Answer:** The Town's expects a one-page drawing that illustrates the overall vision of a potential new recreation facility, including aesthetic concepts and architectural elements, to assist with visualizing the project. They may serve as a foundation for further detailed drawings and facilitate future consultants and contractors estimate costs and resources. This should include a table of the different kinds of spaces in the facility (e.g. multipurpose room, change rooms, offices, lobby, mechanical etc.) along with approximate square footage that support the concept along with floor plans.

**14. Question:** *Is the development of a functional program for the building in scope of the project?*

**Answer:** If referring to functional recreation programming, no.

**15. Question:** *Is a class D capital cost analysis required?*

**Answer:** Yes.

**16. Question:** *Do you require a projection of annual operating revenue/costs for the facility?*

**Answer:** Yes; the Town must understand financial operating implications before proceeding with a decision to design and initiate construction. For example:

- A climbing gym may have lower overhead, high demand in Canmore, and potential for cost neutrality.
- An additional ice arena would have high operating costs and low-cost recovery (30–50%) but could be viable with the right operating model.



The study should explore the financial feasibility, potential revenue models, and cost recovery options.

**17. Question:** *Will any mechanical or electrical sub consultants be required for the scope of this study?*

**Answer:** Since this is a feasibility study and not a design, the Town does not expect to contract sub-field specialists directly. However, the successful proponent may wish to consult them as needed.

**Name of Firm**

**Authorized Signature**

**Printed Name**

---

---

---

**Date**

---