



ALBERNI-CLAYOQUOT REGIONAL DISTRICT

Addendum # 001

**Alberni-Clayoquot Regional District
West Coast Climate Adaptation Planning
RFP – WCCAP01-26
October 07, 2026**

The following changes in the tender documents are effective immediately. This addendum will form part of the contract documents.

Please review the following information before submitting your response to RFP – WCCAP01-26.

Addendum 001 is being raised to provide further clarification and answer the following questions:

Question theme group: Engagement

Q1:

Schedule B lists public engagement room rentals inside the \$240,000, and Schedule C assigns room bookings, food and honoraria for in-person engagements to the Clayoquot Biosphere Trust. Which engagement costs should the proponent carry in its price?

A1:

- ***Work related to booking rooms and food will be done by CBT.***
- ***However, cost of room rentals and food for engagement events should be included in consultant proposal.***
- ***CBT is highly capable at securing low-cost community engagement opportunities to maximize cost savings.***

Q2:

With regards to collaboration, reporting, and deliverables, can the ACRD clarify responsibilities between the Consultant, ACRD, CBT, participating communities, and the Cross-Community Steering Committee? Specifically, who will resolve conflicting comments/feedback on reports and deliverables, and who approves deliverables?

A2:

- ***Consultant will work with each cohort collaborator to ensure their deliverable is to their liking and standard; these will all be different because the communities are unique and each have their own Climate Adaptation Plan deliverable.***

- *The end goal will be to produce a deliverable acceptable to each community and to FCM (FCM is flexible as long as it aligns with the deliverables they approved... These deliverables are the basis of the RFP).*
- *CBT and ACRD staff are here to help make sure the consultant interface with community is smooth and set up for success, meeting needs of both the community and FCM.*

Q3:

Is there an anticipated number or level of engagement sessions that CBT has capacity to host over the course of the project?

A3:

- *CBT has 1 FTE staff person able to dedicate 2 working days/week (i.e. 15h) to the project for project facilitation for the duration of project.*
- *The engagement style for this project is more “ongoing” than it is “events.”*
- *However, we know “events” will still be needed and CBT can host a flexible number depending on what the consultant helps us decide is needed in the work, as long as it fits into the 2 FTE days per week.*

Q4:

The RFP notes that CBT can host engagement sessions without the consultant present, while also indicating that consultants will support engagement. Can you please provide further detail - is it preferable for consultants to attend key sessions or to focus on providing materials and support ahead of facilitated sessions? Will CBT provide note-takers or other means of capturing meeting content?

A4:

- *CBT staff are available to organize logistics for and host all community engagement sessions, with consultants providing support and materials (e.g. session design, questions to ask, good practices).*
- *CBT can provide notetakers or other means of capturing content where it's helpful as CBT staff will likely be present at most events and meetings. However, there may be meetings or events where it makes sense for the consultant to take notes or capture meeting content.*
- *There's value in the consultant being physically present at select sessions to build relationships and contextual understanding.*
- *Your proposal should lean on CBT to reduce the cost of travel and accommodation for out-of-region consultants but should still plan to have the consultant visit the region enough to be able to fulfill the requirements of the grant to a high standard.*

Q5:

Task 4 says CBT hosts sessions without consultant attendance, while Task 5 expects in-person attendance "while in the region." Is there guidance on how many in-person visits should be budgeted or are expected?

A5:

- *We originally discussed two visits, but then realized leaving it more open ended would be helpful... the idea is to ensure you establish a good connection required for the work, but not eat up all the budget with travel, and also leverage the strong on-the-ground capacity of the CBT as project facilitator.*

Q6:

How many CCSC meetings are expected, and are they virtual/hybrid/in-person?

A6:

- ***Monthly is expected – see pg. 27 of the RFP.***
- ***CCSC meetings will always be virtual.***
- ***There will be numerous virtual meetings with individual community staff too; individual community/organization calls will likely be a bigger part of your work than the CCSC.***

Q7:

Schedule B – Task 4 indicates that the consultant will be expected to work collaboratively with organizational/governmental/First Nation staff, Clayoquot Biosphere Trust (project facilitator), Alberni-Clayoquot Regional District (administrative host and project support), Provincial government, Island Health, and regional organizations, as relevant to the scope. Can you confirm that the project does not include any engagement with the public? If it does include engagement with the public, can you confirm that CBT would be responsible for this scope and not the consultant?

A7:

- ***Consultant will advise CBT on what kind of engagement would be helpful, questions needing answers, and techniques. We encourage the consultant to come to the region and visit in person where you think there is strategic benefit, but please lean on CBT to reduce the cost of consultant travel and accommodation.***
- ***First Nations may want to have more traditional (i.e. open house style) community engagement than municipalities.***
- ***We expect less extensive traditional public engagement for the Districts of Ucluelet and Tofino; however, we would like to see engagement with local non-profits and community groups (to build bridges between local/First Nation government and the public health, social justice, environmental sectors).***

Question theme group: Timelines

Q8:

What is the intended timeline for completing each phase of the project deliverables?

A8:

- ***The FCM grant deadline is July 2028, but the path to complete each phase is flexible and depends on community and consultant capacity. It will be hard to map steps in detail in a proposal and this project is well suited for an “adaptive” style of project management. CBT is here to help you develop and adapt timelines during the project.***

Q9:

Can the workplan, milestones and reporting dates approved by FCM be shared, so that the proposed schedule matches the grant?

A9:

- *The RFP was developed with all deliverables (and the July 2028 completion date) drawn directly from the FCM grant agreement – proposals aligned with the RFP will match the grant.*
- *CBT staff—in partnership with the 5 communities—developed the FCM grant applications and maintain a working relationship with FCM staff because this “multi-community regional cohort” approach is novel and doesn’t cleanly fit the mold of FCM’s funding programs – CBT staff will work with the consultant to ensure the work aligns with the grant.*
- *We’re also aware that FCM funding criteria and requirements aren’t always aligned with the needs and contexts of small communities – CBT is working with FCM to ensure we do the work that communities need, while still allowing FCM to develop their funding programs to better serve rural and remote communities and encourage regional level systems thinking required for effective climate adaptation.*

Q10:

Does the contract end date of July 2028 relate to the Consultant submitting final reports, or should the consultant allow for additional time for Board or other approvals and/or FCM submissions and financial reporting in advance of July 2028?

A10:

- *All grant deliverables are to be fulfilled by July 2028 – please leave time in the workplan for board approvals and financial reporting in advance of July 2028.*

Question theme group: Pre-existing work and background report

Q11:

The RFP notes that two participating communities already have plans that only require updating. Is the project team satisfied with the level of risk/vulnerability assessment completed for these plans, or should the updates include a more in-depth assessment?

A11:

- *The project team is generally satisfied with the level of assessment completed for the existing plans, but the chosen proponent will be expected to review them and connect them to current priorities, projects, contexts, to consider questions like: are the plans functional (and if not, why), have Council priorities changed, how do the recommendations sit today compared to when they were made?*

Q12:

Will the background documents in Schedule B that are not posted online be shared with proponents before closing?

A12:

- *All that we can share at this time is the list on p. 23 of the RFP. It is a partial, non-exhaustive list. If there are plans that are mentioned in the list, but not linked, they are not publicly available, but may be available to the chosen proponent if the community agrees and is satisfied with the consultant’s approach to maintaining data confidentiality. There are also relevant documents not listed. One of the reasons small communities struggle to do this kind of work is that staff turnover*

and low capacity mean there can be great work done in the past, but there is sometimes no capacity to access and re-connect previous work to current contexts. Ideally, consultants will be familiar with this reality and can help us navigate it.

- *We know it's hard to make a detailed plan if you don't know exactly what documents are available, but unearthing them is part of the work; please plan to be adaptive and responsive in your work plan; CBT will help you work closely with community staff to prioritize activities that are most helpful to each specific community, advancing projects with better planning support through a climate adaptive lens.*

Q13:

Task 2 says "the following communities have created reports with relevant data," but no list follows. Are these the reports listed at the end of Task 1? From our work in the region, we also note some missing reports (e.g., Long Beach Community Wildfire Resiliency Plan).

A13:

- *Yes, these are the reports listed at the end of Task 1.*

Q14:

Task 2 in Schedule B reads "Note that the following communities have created reports with relevant data", and no list follows. Could that list be provided?

A14:

- *Same as above. The reports are listed at the end of Task 1.*

Question theme group: Miscellaneous

Q15:

Is there a page limit for proposals?

A15:

- *No.*

Q16:

Is any GIS mapping required, and if so, is there regional asset (and/or hazard) data readily available?

A16:

- No need to map – see p. 24 of RFP for details.
- There is hazard/data available from previous project work.
- There may be gaps that you can identify for specific communities.
- ACRD iMap resource <https://acrdimap.imaptoo.ca/imap/>
- DoT resource <https://cgis.com/cpal/Default.aspx?Map=Tofino>
- Ukee map <https://www.cgis.com/publicmaps/?c=Ucluelet&m=UkeeMap>
- Proponent awarded the contract can dive into more proprietary data after data sharing agreements are signed.

Q17:

What is the role of the ACRD in the project? Are regional infrastructure and services in scope for the project?

A17:

- **This RFP asks consultants to create deliverables for each of the 5 specific communities but notice where regional overlaps between communities exist; flag these and summarize within each community deliverable to help communities collaborate better and outline where priority alignment exists.**
- **The role of ACRD is twofold:**
 - **Administrative: to award contract at the recommendation of the 5 collaborating communities and administer funds throughout project.**
 - **Project support: there is a dedicated ACRD staff member assigned to the project to co-facilitate with CBT and connect community-level work with regional planning processes.**
- **The plans created will also help inform future ACRD planning and service delivery.**

Q18:

What are the public health interns' anticipated duties in relation to this project and the consultants' roles and responsibilities?

A18:

- **Intern is supervised by CBT and Island Health, and their work will be completed by the time the contract is awarded.**
- **Their work will create a robust climate and health related asset map for the region that can boost the quality of the background report created by the consultant.**

Q19:

Is the consultant expected to undertake original health-data analysis, or primarily synthesize existing evidence and integrate it with community input?

A19:

- **Primarily synthesize and integrate with community input.**
- **Focus will be on strengthening the connection between public health and climate within community-level planning.**

Q20:

Is there flexibility on the desired climate projections or planning framework?

A20:

- **Yes, the workplan is very flexible but everything needs to be agreed upon by the respective community and the consultant – the goal is to be adaptive in our work to meet community needs, be practically helpful and connected to current community priorities and contexts.**

Q21:

Is the \$240,000 maximum exclusive of GST?

A21:

- **Yes, it is.**