

SPARWOOD



ADDENDUM #1

Proposal for: SPARWOOD DRIVE EXTENSION 2

Amendment – All instances - Throughout

The Closing Deadline is extended to 2:00pm (MST), **THURSDAY DECEMBER 8th, 2011.**

Amendment – Appendix B – Proposal Submittal Form.

1. Add the following to the end of the Section: Personnel
 - *Resumes should include at least 2 references from similar past projects
2. Remove “the design of” from the Douglas Fir Road Servicing Study Update under the Costs Section and replace with “recommendations for”

Clarifications & Additional Information - If you have posed a question of which you do not see a response below, please review the RFP for further information on the topic.

The work required in the RFP may cost more than your budgeted amount.

Our current budget has been provided as information only. There is no requirement to be within the budgeted amount. Proposals should address all items outlined in the project deliverables and costs should be provided based on the items in the Costs Section of the Proposal Submittal Form (Appendix B). If the final cost is more than we currently have allocated, then we will either return to Council to request additional consideration or we will revise the scope of the project to fit the budget.

Are topics that have not been addressed in the RFP within the scope of this project?

If you believe we have missed an important item, please add the item to your proposal and amend the Costs table as appropriate. This can include optional and recommended items.

What is required of the consultant in respect to bylaw amendments?

Although proposals should be based on the requirements of the current bylaws, we have begun a review of our Subdivision Servicing Bylaw. If, during the project, the successful proponent recommends amendments to this bylaw, we may consider incorporating them in the ongoing review.

Any amendments required to other bylaws will be processed by District staff. It will be the job of the consultant to propose amendments they feel are necessary.

What is the timeline the District is looking for?

We have not included a required timeline. Please provide the schedule you feel is appropriate and we will evaluate these options based on the evaluation criteria in Appendix C.

The final design of the road connecting the new Douglas Fir Road intersection to the existing Sparwood Drive will need to be done first and this will need to be done in a time to possibly coordinate the work with the MOTI Climbing Lanes Project that will be tendered early in 2012.

How much detail is required for the lot layouts?

We are looking for maximum flexibility to satisfy the demand as it comes. This will include options on lot layouts and work that can be done in phases or modules. The phases should be large enough to make the development financially feasible with the ability to create further subdivisions over time. The legal plans are not part of this project.

Will any market analysis be required to identify the type and size of lots in demand?

Market analysis is not included in this RFP. We are open to suggestion as to stakeholder consultation proposals.

What is the plan in regards to construction and sale of these lots?

The District would prefer to sell the land and have a developer complete the construction and sale of the lots, but if no arrangements can be made we will move forward to meet the demand for light industrial land in our community.

What is the status of the ALR Applications?

We have received approval from the Agricultural Land Commission that the subject area has been excluded from the ALR.

What is the scope of work associated with the MOTI work at the intersections on Highway #3?

The RFP states the following under **4. TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERING**;

“As part of the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure Highway #3 Climbing Lanes project, they will be completing the final design of the new intersections on Douglas Fir and at the Transfer Station. These will be roughed in with the MOTI work in spring of 2012. The Successful Proponent will be required to coordinate the design of all roads with the MOTI intersection designs.”

“MOTI Climbing Lanes Plan will be made available to the Successful Proponent”

“Final design of road connecting the new Douglas Fir Road intersection to the existing Sparwood Drive (immediately)”

Clarification - There are two intersections on the Proposed Infrastructure map. MOTI will be completing the intersection designs and construction (“roughed in”). The successful proponent will be required to design the connections to the intersections.

Additional Information - Although no plans are available at this time, the intersections will include right turn in and right turn out lanes. The intent is to construct the road from where Sparwood Drive currently ends to the new four way intersection by Douglas Fir Road in the spring in conjunction with the Climbing Lanes Project.

The Transportation Master Plan Appendices have now been loaded on the FTP site. Appendix M has the Model Instructions.

How much detail is the District looking for in regards to survey and geotechnical?

Clarification – We understand that a full survey and geotechnical assessment could be very expensive and time consuming. We require the information to be sufficient to prove that the development plan proposed is feasible. We are not looking for final design information on the entire project.

The geotechnical reports need to be reviewed and updated. This should include a high level assessment of Sparwood Ridge.

The aerial photo with photo interpretation of contours should be considered reliable for the scope of this project. The areas where we are looking for final design will need more detailed survey.

We are looking for recommendations only for mitigation or warning systems, not design. We will consider the risks vs. the costs to determine how to proceed. If a hazard area exists within the subject area and there are no other feasible options then the area will have to be excluded from the development.

Additional Information – The following should be included in Part III - Section 5.2;

The 1990 Report from Golder Associates Ltd. is now available on the FTP site.

The 1977 Urban Suitability Report is now available on the FTP site.

The aerial photography has not yet been received. This will be provided to the successful proponent.

There are some contradictions between the Project Deliverables and the line items in the Schedule in Appendix B.

The Schedule provided should be used only as a guide. The Project Deliverables in the RFP will be the requirements.