



ADDENDUM #03

Request for Proposals (“RFP”) – Design Build Services
Re: 2805 Carlow Road

ADDENDUM ISSUED JUNE 30, 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. A copy of the City of Langford Good Neighbour Policy and Low Carbon Concrete Policy have been added to be included as part of Appendix B and this addenda, please refer to **Appendix B – COL Good Neighbour Policy** and **Appendix B – COL Low Carbon Concrete Policy**.
2. An updated copy of Appendix D – Price Form has been added to be included as part of this addenda, please refer to **Appendix D –Price Form v2**.
3. Responses provided which, in addition to questions received and responded through Addendum #02, form all the question received prior to the June 25, 2026 question deadline. Questions have been consolidated for both addendum #01 and #02 for brevity. Please note that the question deadline has now concluded.

PROPONENT QUESTION(S)

1. **Question:** Will Scope 1 (Building Shell & Ground Floor Childcare) and Scope 2 (Second Floor Foundry Tenant Improvement) be awarded to the same Proponent, or can they be awarded independently? Can a Proponent bid on Scope 1 only?

Answer: The Proponent cannot bid on only one scope. The Proponent’s submission must be a wholesome submission that encompasses both Scopes 1 & 2. Any submissions that only includes one scope will not meet the mandatory requirements for evaluation. The intent of the RFP is for both scopes to be awarded separately to the same Proponent. That being said, as noted in the RFP under Proposal Conditions, the Owner & Foundry Lessee is not compelled to accept any proposal or may accept any part of a proposal.

2. **Question:** Please confirm whether any salvage, deconstruction, or waste diversion requirements apply to the demolition scope.

Answer: No salvage, deconstruction or waste diversion is anticipated to be required for this project. The Proponent will be responsible for the demolition scope and any associated costs to complete demolition should be included in the Proponent’s budget.



- 3. Question:** Can you please confirm if the Predecessor Architect's engagement has been properly terminated, the Client has the legal right and authority to provide and authorize any future Architect the right to use the drawings, specifications, models and other Instruments of Service prepared by the Predecessor Architect and any future Architect's appointment does not result from the improper supplanting of the Predecessor Architect? Are the previously created drawing assets available to successful proponents in Revit or DWG format?

Answer: Yes, the Predecessor Architect's engagement has been properly terminated, and the City of Langford has the right to the drawings, specifications, models and other Instruments of Service. The Owner has the right to and will provide the DWG files for reference purposes to the successful Proponent, following the Notice of Award period. Please note, these would be for reference purposes only as the Proponent and project team would be required to produce their own original drawings.

- 4. Question:** Section 4.2 sets the childcare and shell budget at \$11M but describes the Foundry tenant improvement as a \$300 to \$350 per square foot range to be developed. Can the Owner confirm the funding envelope or cap for the Scope 2 Foundry tenant improvement?

Answer: Proponents should cap the Scope 2 Foundry tenant improvement at \$350 psf which is the high end of the range provided. Proposals that show budget savings will be prioritized. If the Proponent feels that the Scope 2 budget should fall outside the range provided, then reasoning should be provided.

- 5. Question:** Page 19, section 5.7 mentions that PST is to be shown separately on invoices, please confirm if this project is PST exempt.

Answer: The project is not PST exempt, as neither the City of Langford nor Thrive is PST exempt. PST exemptions may apply to certain project circumstances or services, and the successful Proponent is responsible for identifying applicable exemptions and collecting PST as required.

- 6. Question:** The RFP encourages modular/prefab. If a Proponent proposes a modular structural system, will the existing 75% design drawings be used as the basis for modular adaptation, or would a fresh schematic design be required? Would the Owner consider an extended Phase 1 timeline to accommodate modular design refinement?

Answer: For clarity purposes, this RFP encourages exploring innovative solutions to help drive the project schedule and budget, whether through traditional methods or modern means of construction. Regardless of construction method, the Proponent will need to prepare drawings. In order to achieve a construction start in January 2027, it is unlikely that the Owner will consider an extension for Phase 1 unless the Proponent can demonstrate a strong reason to support this while still maintaining the overall project schedule.



- 7. Question:** Please acknowledge that the fixed fee for the Preconstruction Contract(s) has been prepared based on the design timelines identified in the RFP, being July 2026 to September 2026. If the design phase extends into October 2026 or beyond due to Owner-driven delays, approval delays, or other matters outside the consulting team's control, the preconstruction fee may need to be reviewed and adjusted to reflect the additional time and resources required.

Answer: Yes, the Preconstruction Contract (s) are based on the timelines provided in the RFP and is anticipated for September 2026. That being said, the Proponent's budget should allow for slight variations in the schedule. Due to the nature of the funding requirements and construction start in January 2027, the Owner does not anticipate large project delays.

- 8. Question:** Please confirm which furniture, fixtures, equipment, appliances, IT/security equipment, childcare equipment, playground equipment, and Foundry-specific equipment are to be included by the Design-Builder versus supplied separately by the Owner, operator, or Thrive / Foundry.

Answer: As per the RFP, the Proponents should include in their budget any Furnishings, Fixtures and Equipment (FF&E) for both Scope 1 and Scope 2 that would be affixed to walls, floors or the base building and FF&E items that would be required for functional Occupancy. Examples of these FF&E inclusions to the Proponent's budget would include, but are not limited to, functional lighting fixtures (opposed to decorative), playground equipment, curtains & blinds, appliances...etc. Any furniture or fixtures that are decorative, unaffixed, not part of the base building shell or similar would be excluded.

- 9. Question:** The previous Development Permit was approved but will be cancelled and/or rescinded given the previous application has now been withdrawn. A development permit covers the form and character of a new development. The term Form and character, as noted in reference to the previously approved Development Permit, refers to the general look, feel, design intent and programming of a building. This would relate to elements such as the exterior building design, the building massing and scale. For clarity, Proponents should refer to Section 2.2 Project Overview & Concept which outline the elements of the design that are set and those still to be finalized, such as the exterior design and character.

Answer: The previous Development Permit was approved but will be cancelled and/or rescinded given the previous application has now been withdrawn. Form and character refers to the general look, feel and overall design intent and programming.

- 10. Question:** Page 8 section 2 of the RFP mentions that the **Good Neighbour Policy** is to be a requirement for the project, can you please provide this policy.

Answer: A copy of the Good Neighbour Policy from City of Langford has been provided as part of this addenda and forms part of Appendix B. Please note the Proponent is still responsible for reviewing the Policy in detail and ensure any and all necessary Bylaws are complied.



11. Question: The City of Langford's Low Carbon Concrete (LCC) Policy applies. Is there a specific minimum GWP (kg CO₂e/m³) threshold or approved mix list, or does the Proponent simply need to submit a Low Carbon Concrete plan?

Answer: A copy of the Low Carbon Concrete Policy from City of Langford has been provided as part of this addenda and forms part of Appendix B, please refer to this Policy for details relating to requirements. Please note the Proponent is still responsible for reviewing the Policy in detail and any ensure all necessary Bylaws are complied.

12. Question: The RFP requires the project to have full frontage improvements in accordance with Bylaw 1000; however, there was an intent to construct a roundabout at the intersection of Carlow and Goldstream.

Answer: As per the RFP, full frontage improvements are to be in accordance with Bylaw 1000 and are required to be completed. There is a roundabout intended for the intersection of Goldstream and Carlow. however, this development will only be building out the required frontage improvements related to their direct frontage, not the full roundabout build out.

13. Question: Please indicate if there are any service upgrades required for the site (plumbing, electrical, sewer, water, gas, etc.) and if so, what are the details of the service upgrades? If you cannot provide this information, please confirm that service upgrades can be excluded from the fixed-fee price submission of this RFP.

Answer: The design engineer on the project team is to confirm if existing services are acceptable sizing for the building type and the Proponent should allow for improvement costs within their Budget. Stormwater treatment is infiltration in this area. Currently, the existing water service services the existing building, splash park, washrooms, and the irrigation system. Ideally, the City of Langford would like to see this separated so there is one service for the new building, and one service for the park (washrooms, irrigation, splash park). Sanitary for the existing building is serviced off Goldstream Avenue.

14. Question: Who on the project is responsible for applying for, coordinating and obtaining the childcare operating license from the Ministry of Education? Is this the Owner's responsibility or the Proponent's? Has the childcare concept plan been approved in principle with CCFL and the operator signed off on the plan concept?

Answer: The childcare operator will ultimately be responsible for submitting the application and obtaining the childcare operating license, through consultation and coordination with the City of Langford. The Proponent will be responsible for ensuring the project meets licensing requirements as noted in this RFP. An initial floor plan was reviewed and approved by MECC as part of the funding agreement and the anticipated operator has reviewed and signed off on this plan.

15. Question: The RFP references an anticipated licensed childcare operator who has been part of the process to date. Can the Owner share the operator's identity and confirm their role in design sign-off?

Answer: The authorized childcare operator will be shared by the Owner with the successful



proponent following the Notice of Award. For clarity, it is intended that the Proponent will plan to coordinate with and through the Development Consultant and City of Langford representative, rather than directly with the authorized childcare provider. The City of Langford as landowner and project partner will be responsible for sign-off.

16. Question: The Conceptual Design drawings (Figure 1) shown on Page 10 of the RFP document shows an area of 853 m² for the building footprint. Please clarify whether this area excludes the wall areas. Based on our takeoff, we are getting a higher area (roughly 967 m²) for the building footprint (exterior face to exterior face of the building).

Answer: Please note that, while these drawings are helpful to the Proponent for pricing purposes, the measurements should be considered for referential, not literal, purposes. The drawings are provided for the Proponent to get an overall understanding of the building intent and sizing.

17. Question: For mandatory requirements, please confirm the Appendix E – Relationship and Conflict Disclosure Form counts for the Conflict of Interest Statement and Relationship Disclosure Form.

Answer: Yes, completing Appendix E -Relationship and Conflict Disclosure Form and stating the conflict of interests if applicable within this form will satisfy both the Conflict of Interest Statement and Relationship Disclosure form requirement.

18. Question: The RFP notes a new Development Permit will be required (due to the 2-storey re-scoping from the original 6-storey DP). Is M'akola/City of Langford taking responsibility for the DP application, or is this the successful Proponent's responsibility? What is the anticipated timeline?

Answer: The Development Consultant team will submit the Development Permit application on behalf of the Owner through coordination efforts with the successful Proponent. The City of Langford as Authority Having Jurisdiction is taking responsibility for the review and processing of the Development Permit. Please refer to the RFP Table 1 milestone dates which note September 2026 as the anticipated timelines for Development Permit application.

19. Question: M'akola Development Services is a First Nations organization. Are there Indigenous participation or subcontracting requirements (e.g., minimum percentage of Indigenous labour or subcontractors) that Proponents should plan for? Does the Owner or City of Langford apply any Indigenous procurement policy or Indigenous participation considerations in the evaluation of this RFP?

Answer: There are no specific requirements in terms of Indigenous participation that Proponents need to plan for, but Indigenous participation is encouraged wherever possible. Indigenous participation will be reviewed and scored under the social responsibilities section which represents 3% of the total score. Proponents with submissions that show Indigenous participation versus ones that do not would be scored favorably.



20. Question: Can the Owner confirm that the Phase 1 pre-construction services are compensated under a fixed-fee contract, and describe how that fee is established? What is this form of contract? Is the Scope 1 Phase 1 just for Pre-Construction to DP application?

Answer: Yes, the Phase 1 Pre-construction services will be under a fixed-fee contract, which is intended to be the same or similar form for both Scope and Scope 2 Phase 1. The form of contract will align with the intent and purposes of the CCDC 14 2013 but in an abridged version that will focus on the pre-construction services. The Phase 1 contract amount will be derived and mutually agreed upon based on the Proponents submission and budget as provided in the Price Form. The Proponent should factor in the overall budgets for Scope 1 Phase 1 and Phase 2 following the ranges provided in the RFP. Phase 1 will be a fixed fee amount that will span from project initiation to DP application.

21. Question: Appendix D refers to a CCDC 14 2013 Fixed Fee for Phase 2. Please confirm whether this amount is intended to represent the Design-BUILDER's fee only, or the full Phase 2 CCDC14 amount for each Scope. If it is not fee-only, please confirm what is to be included and excluded.

Answer: The cost should be the overall sum inclusive of the full Phase 2 CCDC 14 amount for each Scope 1 and 2, and any associated costs within the budget. Exclusions are noted on the Price Form. As noted in Section 5.7 of the RFP, pricing submissions are indicative only for the purpose of evaluation, a final stipulated price will be confirmed and fixed as early as DP submission and Class C or better level costing.

22. Question: Regarding Appendix D Price Form, can you please confirm whether the Phase 1 and Phase 2 values entered are intended to be inclusive of all design consultant/team member fees shown in the Project Team table?

Answer: Yes, Phase 1 and Phase 2 values in the table on page 3 of the Price Form should be inclusive of all project costs. The Design Builder will be responsible for the entirety of the project, including but not limited to, the design consultants. Design consultants and team member fees should be broken out in the project team table on page 4. For clarity, the project team table on page 4 of the Price Form will summarize the consultant fee portion for Phase 1 and 2 which would only form a portion of the Proponents total budget as provided in the table on page 3.

23. Question: For Scope 1, Phase 2 Construction and Post-Development, wouldn't this fee be the full construction, post-tender CCDC14 value? Signing a CCDC contract based on a Class C would not entail all post-tender costs, so please confirm how this Price Form is meant to be shown. Same questions for Scope 2. It seems that the Development Phase indicated in Phase 2 should be included in Phase 1 and that Phase 2 should be the tendered full CCDC value. If this is not the intent, please clarify. Please confirm that the second row in the left column of the price form is meant to say "Scope 2 Activities"



Answer: The Price Form is intended to reflect the proponent's best estimate of all costs required to deliver the project based on the current design documentation and information, including appropriate allowances for foreseeable post-tender costs and associated risks. As part of their submission, Proponents are expected to assess, forecast, and carry such risks within their pricing. Phase 1 will entail work and fees related from project initiation to DP application and for the Design Builder to produce a Class C or better estimate to inform to execute the CCDC 14 2013 contract and Phase 2. Although a Class C Estimate would be the minimum to enter into the fixed fee contract, it is likely that the Proponent could produce a Class B Estimate. While the project does need to re-submit for Development Permit and some revisions will need to be incorporated, designs are at 75% Design and the intent per the Table 1 Milestone Schedule of the RFP is to submit for Building Permit in October 2027 to achieve a construction start in January 2027.

As noted in Section 5.7, The initial design fee forecasts and construction budgets in your proposal for Scope 1 (Phase 1 & 2) and Scope 2 (Phase 1 & 2) are not binding commitments but demonstrate your understanding of project scope and confidence in achieving the funding targets. The successful Proponent will be awarded based on best overall value (qualifications, optimized schedule, pricing reasonableness, innovative solutions etc.). Following a collaborative design development phase with the successful Proponent, a DP application submission and a Class C Estimate or better, the final scope and price negotiation will be completed and the CCDC 14 2013 Contract executed with agreed stipulated price. Yes, the second row in the left column is meant to say Scope 2 Activities and Proponents, please refer to the updated Price Form as part of this addenda.

24. Question: The RFP references up to four contracts across Scope 1 and Scope 2. For bonding and pricing purposes, can the Owner confirm whether bonding is calculated per individual contract or on the aggregate contract value?

Answer: Bonding is to be calculated based on each Scope.

25. Question: Section 5.9 indicates 100% bonding may be required if modular or modern methods of construction are proposed. Can the Owner confirm the circumstances under which 100% bonding would apply, and the rationale for the increased requirement

Answer: Bonding requirements would relate to performance bond as well as labor & material payment bond. For modular construction, 100% bonding is often required because a large portion of the project value is concentrated upfront and adds additional financial and delivery risk for the Owner.

26. Question: Please confirm the intent of this statement (RFP pg. 19/28), "*i. The Price shall include a separate cost for at minimum 50% performance and at minimum 50% labour and material payment bond.*" As we are unable to provide a separate cost within Appendix D - Price Form, should this cost be included in our fixed fee price or excluded?

Answer: Yes, all bonding costs are to be considered and included within the Proponent's budget. Bonding requirements may vary based on the construction methodology proposed but 50% will be the minimum bonding requirement for performance as well as for labour and



materials. It is the Proponent's responsibility to understand anticipated bonding requirements and budget accordingly.

27. Question: Would it be acceptable for the consultants (ex. Geotechnical, survey) to provide a lump sum fee rather than breaking their fees down by phase where deemed appropriate? The phase breakdown does not appear to align particularly well with their scope of work, as they would have limited involvement in Scope.

Answer: The intent is to get an accurate understanding of costs associated which each Phase to help inform contract pricing, as well as the overall budget. We ask that Proponents break down their fees as described in the Price Form to the best of their ability to help streamline review and evaluations, the main consideration will be the overall cost for the consultant work. If a Proponent feels that a particular consultant scope should be in the form of a lump sum and allocated to only one Phase, that is fine. The Owner understands that following Notice of Award, the allocation between disciplines and phases may adjust, but the intention the overall budget for consultants is not likely to change.

28. Question: Please update the Project Team form in Appendix D to match the Project Team from in Appendix H to ensure that the bid submissions are appropriately levelled.

Answer: Proponents should refer to Appendix D Project Team Form for the purposes of the RFP. Please note that, while the information in the Project Team Form should be consistently filled out and the expectation would be for all Consultants noted to be included and budgeted for within the scope, the Proponent can include additional consultants and scope on their project team (which may be required based on construction methodology) as long as they are within the required budget amounts. The project team form in Appendix H is in draft form and can be formatted to align with the successful Proponents team at contract stage.

29. Question: Do any special provisions need to be put in place or are there any construction limitations (time/safety provisions) to allow for standard operations of the childcare center to proceed during construction of Phase 2 (Foundry TI) (between Jan 2028 and Jan 2029)?

Answer: The expectation is that both the childcare and Foundry space will be operational and complete at the same time, by March 2028, which should preclude or minimize any construction limitations.

30. Question: Regarding the wayfinding and graphic package, are there any environmental graphics anticipated over and above code and operational wayfinding, and typical exterior signage?

Answer: Proponents should allow for a small cash allowance for additional signage above and over code related and operational wayfinding. Two exterior building signs, one for the childcare and one for the Foundry space are anticipated for the project.

31. Question: There was a recently completed Legal Survey, would you like another one completed?



Answer: A new Legal Topographic Survey should not be required to be completed given the recent completion. The Proponent should still forecast any required survey work and costs for the entirety of the project through to Phase 2.

32. Question: Section 5.7 requires including in the Price design and connection fees for shallow utilities (electrical, internet, phone). This Section also requires including in the Price fees payable to the City of Langford, but municipal fees will be paid by the owner. Please clarify which fees are paid by the owner and which are to be included in the Price. Are all the fees noted under 4.6.3 to be carried by the Owner?

Answer: The City of Langford can waive all permit fees as in-kind contributions, Proponents do not have to Budget for these permit fees. Everything else needs to be included in the Budget such as Development Cost Charges, bonding, utility connections...etc.

33. Question: Please confirm whether the Project will be considered “in stream” as referenced in the Thurber Engineering report (dated 2025 11 17) and be permitted to follow the seismic loading requirements of the 2018 BC Building Code.

Answer: The Proponent should not assume the project is “in stream” as referenced in the Thurber Engineering report dated 2025-11-17. Proponents should expect that the project will need to comply with current BCBC requirements and budget and plan accordingly. The Owner can discuss in further detail with the successful Proponent following Notice of Award.

34. Question: Please clarify whether the shell scope will exclude the following:

- Mechanical - Terminal units and secondary ductwork (central air handling equipment and primary ductwork assumed to be part of the shell scope)
- Mechanical – Building automation
- Electrical – Lighting and lighting controls
- Electrical – Branch circuit wiring and receptacles
- Electrical – Structured cabling and data distribution lines
- Electrical – Security systems

Answer: Yes, all of those components would be considered an exclusion as part of the building shell. The building shell is considered to encompass everything from “paint inwards” and required for functional occupancy.

35. Question: Acknowledgement of deliverables section of Appendix D – Price Form lists Appendix B as Project Requirements. The RFP Documents included as Appendix B are related to Foundry space. Are there any documents providing requirements for the childcare space?

Answer: Please refer to the Project Requirements as noted in Section 2.1 of the RFP for the Childcare requirements, which note the following requirements: The childcare centre must be licenced for 73 childcare spaces, including 24 Infant and Toddler, 25 3-5 year old spaces and 24 Out of School Care spaces. The childcare must meet the minimum health and safety standards within the Community Care and Assisted Living Act and the Child Care Licensing



Regulation. The childcare must be designed in alignment with the B.C. Ministry of Education and Childcare Design Guidelines for Childcare Centres, meet the Childcare BC Design Guidelines, current accessibility standards and principles and Childcare licensing regulations under the Community Care and Assisted Living Act.

36. Question: Are floor drains required in washrooms, kitchen and custodial rooms?

Answer: Yes, Proponents should allow for floor drains in their budget.

37. Question: It is stated that we are to comply with Step Code. There is however no step code TEDI and TEUI energy density requirements for a Childcare facility in the BC Building Code. Are we to assume Part 8 NECB-2020 or will an energy density target be provided, and what level of step code is required?

Answer: The City will not be providing an energy density target. The building must meet the minimum energy efficiency requirements set under Section 10.2 of the BC Building Code. Where a building contains one or more major occupancies listed in Subsection 10.2.3. of BC Building Code, those major occupancies shall conform to the requirements of Energy Step Code. As stated in Langford Building and Plumbing Bylaw No.1160, Langford's current minimum requirement is the minimum requirement in the BC Building Code for Part 3 buildings: Step 2. Where the building contains major occupancies not listed in Subsection 10.2.3., those remaining major occupancies shall comply with ANSI/ASHRAE/IES 90.1, "Energy Standard for Buildings Except Low-Rise Residential Buildings" (except Subsection 8.4.2.), or the NECB. Please refer to Subsection 10.2.2.1 of the BC Building Code to determine which compliance options apply to this project based on the major occupancy types contained in the building.

38. Question: Please confirm is any acoustic-related testing or engineering will be required. If so, please update the Project Team submission form accordingly to include this requirement.

Answer: Acoustic related scope items and testing are not anticipated for the project. If the Proponent has additional consultants from what is noted in the project team form, they can fall within the miscellaneous consultant section of the team form and can be touch on within the Proponents submission.

39. Question: Please provide any available drawings/documents related to other disciplines (mechanical, electrical etc.) for the preliminary design carried out so far.

Answer: The Owner has carefully reviewed all the drawings and documents produced to date and has shared all the necessary information that is available and required for the purposes of the RFP. Regarding mechanical system, the previous design allowed for central roof mounted heat pumps with individual fan coils for the main floor daycare designed around a two-pipe hydronic loop served by rooftop Water-Source Heat Pumps (WSHPs). For primary heating security and to meet peak heating loads, a central electric boiler was also provisioned



alongside the hydronic pumps and accessories to provide supplementary and backup heat to the main hydronic loop. For clarity, this system was proposed for initial budgeting purposes. The Proponent can propose the mechanical system they feel is best suited and optimal for the project. Should there be any additional information available, the Owner will share with the successful Proponent following the Notice of Award.

40. Question: The RFP states that the Design Builder will be granted access to the site in January 2027, which we infer to be January 1, 2027. Should the site not be vacated by that date, please confirm that the construction schedule will be extended accordingly, and commercial relief provided from any liability for the funding deadlines cited in the RFP.

Answer: The exact date of access in January 2027 is to be confirmed but the City of Langford has informed the tenant of project deadlines and is committed to providing site access to facilitate construction and will coordinate with the Design Builder as required. The funding deadlines cannot change as the childcare will need to be operational by March 2028 to secure funding. The Owner and Foundry Lessee have committed to expedited review times, and The City of Langford has committed to expedited processing times to facilitate the project schedule. Schedule is the largest evaluation consideration for the project so Proponents and submissions that can demonstrate achieving these milestone dates comfortably will be prioritized. Further discussions between the Owner and successful Proponent can occur following the Notice of Award but the Proponent should review and be comfortable with the terms and conditions of the CCDC 14 2013 contract and the Standard General Conditions provided in Addendum #01.

End of Amendment.

The question submission deadline was June 25, 2026 at 4 PM and is now closed.
The RFP Closing date remains July 7, 2026 at 10 AM.