



ADDENDUM #02

Request for Proposals (“RFP”) – Design Build Services

Re: 2805 Carlow Road

ADDENDUM ISSUED JUNE 25, 2026

The following provides clarifications and amendments to the RFP dated Thursday, June 4th, 2026 for design build services for the project located at 2805 Carlow Road. This information has been shared with all parties who received the RFP.

ADDENDA ITEMS

1. The Hazmat report has been added to be included as part of Appendix C and this addenda, please refer to **Appendix C – Hazmat Report_356_2805 Carlow**.
2. Below are responses to most, but not all, questions received prior to June 18, 2026. A subsequent addendum will be provided to respond to more detailed or technical questions that require further internal coordination or received late on June 18, 2026. Please note that the question deadline was extended to June 25, 2026 in Addendum #01.

PROPONENT QUESTION(S)

1. **Question:** Please provide the proposed Phase 1 pre-construction contract and the proposed CCDC 14-2013 contract, including any supplementary conditions or project-specific amendments. Please also confirm whether the contract forms or terms will differ between the City of Langford scope and the Thrive scope.

Answer: The proposed CCDC 14 2013 Draft Scope 1 Standard General Conditions have been provided on June 22, 2026, as part of Addendum #01 of this RFP. Scope 2 may also require Standard General Conditions, as determined at the contract stage. Please refer to the Canadian Construction Documents Committee (CCDC) website for a copy of the CCDC 14 2013 contract. The contract terms and conditions between Scope 1 (City of Langford) and Scope 2 (Thrive) will be substantially similar but may be subject to some minor differences or adjustments as determined following Notice of Award and at the contract stage. The Phase 1 pre-construction contract will be a short form contract that will be provided following Notice of Award.

2. **Question:** The RFP references a Class D estimate. Can you confirm the Owner & Foundry Lessee's approved budget or budget range for Scope 1 and Scope 2 separately, to assist Proponents in assessing feasibility?

Answer: The Class D Estimate is based on the six-storey concept and changes to the overall design and programming have since changed. Please refer to Section 4.2 Budget for budget information



MAKOLA DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

regarding each Scope. Scope 1 maximum Budget is approximately \$11,000,000 for Scope 1, broken out by \$6,500,000 for the childcare and \$4,500,000 to achieve a building shell that allows for a two-story project. While a firm budget is not provided for Scope 2, an estimated range between \$300-350 psf has been provided. Please note that bids that identify cost saving approaches that would reduce the overall budget cost will be prioritized.

- 3. Question:** The RFP states that the contracts for Phase 2 for both Scopes will be in the form of a CCDC 14 2013 Design-Build contract, based on Class C or better Estimates provided by GC. But the Class C Estimates are deliverables for Phase 1 for both Scopes, so we are requesting clarification on what is being asked for in the Fixed Fee fields for Phase 2 in Appendix D Price Form.

Answer: The Phase 1 contract will be a fixed fee based on project initiation to when the drawings are at DP level, can be submitted for application and a Class C Estimate can be produced. The Phase 2 contract will then be a fixed fee based on a Class C Estimate or better which will be required, at minimum, to enter into the CCDC 14 2013 contract for both Scopes.

- 4. Question:** Because the Thursday, July 2 submission deadline falls on the day after the Canada Day mid-week holiday, can the deadline be extended?

Answer: As noted in the June 22, 2026 Addendum #01, The RFP submission deadline has now been extended from Thursday July 2nd at 4 PM to Tuesday July 7th, 2026 at 10 AM. No further extensions will be granted.

- 5. Question:** Please confirm if building permit fees and development permit fees are waived by the City of Langford. Page 15 of the RFP states, "The City *may* waive certain application fees (e.g. Development Permit, Building Permit) as an in-kind contribution to the project.", whereas Appendix D states they are "Carried by Owner & Foundry Lessee". It is assumed that Development Cost Charges should be **included** in our pricing proposal.

Answer: Development Permit fees and Building Permit fees fall under permitting fees which will be carried by the Owner & Foundry Lessee, this is also referenced as an exclusion in the Appendix D Price Form. Development Cost Charges are to be included within the Proponent's budget and proposal, please refer to Section 4.2 Budget of the RFP.

- 6. Question:** The RFP notes a new Development Permit is required for the Level 2 change, achievable in approximately 4 to 6 weeks with City support. Will the Owner & Foundry Lessee and City commit to that accelerated review timeline given the March 2028 funding deadline

Answer: A new Development Permit submission will be required for the entire project, not just the upper floor changes. The Owner and Foundry Lessee are committed to achieving the accelerated review timelines as described in this RFP. The estimated timeline for the Development Permit was based on direct feedback and commitment from the City of Langford based on project assumptions as described in this RFP.



- 7. Question:** The RFP notes that a Hazmat Report was completed by TerraWest on November 6, 2024, and that hazardous materials must be handled in accordance with the report. Please confirm whether the full Hazmat Report will be provided to proponents for review prior to submission.

Answer: The Hazmat Report has been included as part of this Addenda and forms part of the Appendix C due diligence documents.

- 8. Question:** The RFP states that proposals should be no longer than 20 pages, not including appendices. Please confirm whether proponents may include their own supplementary appendices beyond the required submission forms. If permitted, please confirm whether these proponent-generated appendices will be reviewed as part of the evaluation or treated as supporting information only.

Answer: The 20-page limit refers to the main content of the proposal to limit overall proposal length. Proponents are welcome to include their own appendices but we kindly request that the length and number of additional appendices are limited. For clarity, the following pages will not be included in the 20-page limit:

- i. Appendices
- ii. Cover Letter
- iii. Table of Content
- iv. Divider Pages

- 9. Question:** Regarding the **Appendix E - Relationship and Conflict Disclosure Form**, Does this form need to be submitted with the RFP if we do not have any conflicts? If this form does need to be submitted, will it count as a page in the 20-page limit?

Answer: We kindly request that all Proponents sign and include the Relationship and Conflict Disclosure Form in their proposal submission. If the Proponent has no conflict of interest, then they can just not "N/A" in the table on the form. This form would be included as an Appendices and therefore not included in the 20-page count limit.

- 10. Question:** Is the proponent responsible for the demolition of the existing building?

Answer: Yes, the Proponent will be responsible for demolition.

- 11. Question:** When will the existing building be available for demolition?

Answer: While the exact date for when the existing building is available for demolition has not yet been confirmed, the City of Langford has made the existing tenant aware of the project timelines and is committed to ensure a Construction Start can occur in January 2027. The City of Langford will work with the Design Builder and existing tenant to coordinate as necessary to allow for demolition in a timely manner.

- 12. Question:** Please confirm whether the geotechnical recommendations prepared for the previous six-storey concept remain applicable to the current two-storey concept.



MAKOLA DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Answer: The Proponent should consult with their proposed Geotechnical Engineer to determine if the report remains applicable for the current two-storey concept. As noted in Section 2.4 of the RFP, the successful Proponent will be responsible for additional geotechnical work if required.

13. Question: Please confirm whether a preferred structural system has been established for the building, or whether proponents may propose the structural system as part of their Progressive Design-Build approach.

Answer: A preferred structural system has not been established for the building, and the Owner & Foundry Lessee are open to any alternate structural system from what was shown in the Appendix A 75% design drawings. Proponents are encouraged to freely propose the structural system that they feel would be best suited for the project in their proposal.

14. Question: To maximize the structural and shipping efficiencies of true volumetric modular construction, some modifications to layout, wall thicknesses, and spatial dimensions may be required. Will the Owner & Foundry Lessee allow the Progressive Design-Build team to adapt and refine the current schematic layout to fit a volumetric module configuration, provided we maintain the required 73 childcare spaces, specific programmatic zones, and minimum outdoor play areas? To what extent is the Owner and Foundry Lessee open to modular or panelized adaptation of the ground floor childcare floorplate where it delivers schedule and cost savings?

Answer: Yes, the Owner and Foundry Lessee are open to minor modifications to the layout in order to adjust the design to a modular build. The building floorplate and ground floor design, layout and programming are at 75% design and the intent is not to make major revisions that would warrant a large re-design. We understand that some modifications and adjustments may be required for modular, while still maintaining the overall design intent and layout as best possible as well as adhering to the project requirements as set out in this RFP. A Proponent who is proposing a modular design that would entail larger scale modifications to the building to deliver cost, and schedule savings should clearly outline and identify these adaptive solutions.

15. Question: For section **D. Construction Management Team Experience with Similar Projects**, please advise if we can provide relevant projects that were completed under a Progressive Design-Build Contract.

Answer: Yes, the Proponent can include projects that were completed under a Progressive Design-Build contract as a relevant project. It is up to the Proponent to determine what they consider a relevant project that best reflect this RFP and their proposal submission.

16. Question: Is Lowe Hammond Rowe Architects (LHRA) available to continue as the Architect of Record under the successful Proponent's team, or is the Proponent required to engage their own architect from scratch? Is the Lowe Hammond Rowe work provided solely for reference?

Answer: Proponents are required to reach out and form their own project team as part of their proposal submission. There are no restrictions against including specific subconsultants, including



M'AKOLA DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Lowe Hammond Rowe Architects (LHRA). The designs provided in Appendix A by LHRA are for reference purposes only.

End of Amendment.

The question submission deadline remains Thursday June 25, 2026 at 4 PM.
The RFP Closing date remains Tuesday July 7, 2026 at 10 AM.