



REGIONAL DISTRICT of Fraser-Fort George

October 2, 2026

Addendum No. 1

Request for Proposal FS-26-04 Asset Management Roadmap

The addendum is being issued prior to the closing of the Request for Proposal to provide further information, make changes to, or to clarify the Contract Documents and is to be read, interpreted and coordinated with all other parts of the Contract Documents. In the case of a conflict with the balance of the documents, this Addendum shall govern. **Proponents shall attach a signed copy of this addendum to their submission.** This addendum shall form part of the Contract Documents.

This addendum is being provided in clarification to RFP FS-26-04 released September 28, 2026.

Question 1: The RFP appears to contain differing insurance requirements. Section 11.1 references Commercial General Liability of at least \$2 million, while Appendix E (Sample Contract) requires Commercial General Liability and Professional Liability coverage of \$3 million. Can the Regional District confirm the minimum insurance requirements that will apply to the successful consultant?

Answer 1: The insurance requirements set out in Appendix E apply; however, Appendix E, Section 9 shall be amended as follows:

- Commercial General Liability insurance shall be maintained in an amount not less than \$2,000,000 per occurrence.
- Professional Liability (Errors and Omissions) insurance shall be maintained in an amount not less than \$2,000,000 per claim and in the aggregate.

All other insurance requirements contained in Appendix E remain unchanged.

Question 2: Appendix E, Section 22 references “RFP FS-26-01 ICBC Fleet Insurance” as forming part of the agreement. Can the Regional District confirm that this reference is a drafting error and should instead refer to RFP FS-26-04 Asset Management Roadmap.

Answer 2: Yes, this was a drafting error, and it shall be changed to read RFP FS-26-04 Asset Management Roadmap.

155 George Street, Prince George, BC V2L 1P8

ELECTORAL AREAS A, C, D, E, F, G AND H | MACKENZIE | MCBRIDE | PRINCE GEORGE | VALEMOUNT

rdffg.ca | 250-960-4400 | 1-800-667-1959

Question 3: **Meetings, workshops, and travel:** The RFP requires proponents to identify any travel requirements in their proposal, but it does not clearly state whether the interviews, workshops, and presentations must be in person. Please confirm whether all of these can be conducted virtually.

Answer 3: The Regional District's preference is the workshops and small-group interviews are conducted in person, with the option of virtual presentations.

Question 4: **Local government experience:** The RFP requires at least five years of experience as a prime consultant in asset management planning for **local** government. Please confirm whether comparable work completed for federal or provincial government departments, agencies, Crown corporations, or other public-sector organizations would also be accepted toward this requirement.

Answer 4: The Regional District's preference is for experience in asset management planning for local governments, as this experience is generally most directly applicable to municipal / regional district asset management requirements, regulatory frameworks, governance structures, and service delivery contexts.

The Regional District will consider other comparable asset management planning experiences, where the scope, complexity, and relevance of the work align with local government asset management planning objectives. Proponents should clearly describe the applicability of such experience to local government contexts in their submission.

Question 5: **Prime consultant experience (Section 8.1):** Could the Regional District confirm whether the five-year requirement in Section 8.1 applies to the proponent firm's date of incorporation or registration, or to the experience of the proposed Project Manager and key personnel?

Answer 5: Proponents may draw upon the relevant experience of their proposed Project Manager and key personnel, including experience gained with previous employers, provided that the individual(s) played a significant role in the delivery of comparable assignments and that this role is clearly described in the proposal.

Experience where the proponent firm itself acted as the prime consultant will be viewed favourably. However, the Regional District will consider the collective qualifications and relevant experience of the proposed project team when evaluating compliance with this requirement and assessing overall proposal quality.

Question 6: **Budget:** Has the Regional District established a budget or upper limit for this assignment, and is any portion grant-funded with conditions proponents should reflect?

Answer 6: The Regional District has not disclosed a budget for this project. Proponents are requested to submit a proposal that they believe will satisfactorily meet the requirements outlined in the RFP, including a detailed methodology and fee proposal. The project is not subject to any known grant-funding conditions that proponents must incorporate.

Question 7: **Financial Proposal evaluation:** How will the 30 points be allocated between total cost and the detail and treatment of potential cost overruns described in Section 10.5(c)? Is a price formula applied?

Answer 7: The Regional District does not intend to apply a prescribed price formula. Financial proposals will be evaluated comparatively, with consideration given to overall value, cost certainty, and alignment of the proposed budget with the scope of work and project objectives.

Question 8: Would the Regional District consider extending the submission deadline by one week?

Answer 8: The Regional District has considered the request and has decided not to extend the submission deadline. The closing date and time stated in the RFP will remain unchanged.

I/We hereby verify that we have considered this Addendum No. 1 in our RFP submission.

Signature of Tenderer

Name of Tenderer

Date