



Negotiated Request for Proposals

Economic Action Plan Consultant 2026-072-ADM

ADDENDUM NO. 2

Issued: October 5, 2026

Closing Date: 11 AM (PDT), October 7th, 2026

This Addendum shall be read in conjunction with and considered as an integral part of the Contract Documents; revisions supersede the information contained in the original specifications or previously issued Addendum. Price submitted shall include all items of this Addendum.

By this Addendum No. 2, dated October 5, 2026, the Negotiated Request for Proposals for the Economic Action Plan Consultant shall be amended as specified below.

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS:

Question 1: Could you provide a little more information on the existing programs and initiatives that the successful consultant would be taking over, particularly business outreach, grant administration, tourism initiatives, physician recruitment and community event coordination?

Answer 1: The programs and initiatives identified in the Scope of Work represent ongoing economic development activities currently undertaken in support of the Creston Valley Economic Action Plan. The successful consultant will be expected to assume responsibility for coordinating, facilitating, and advancing these activities in collaboration with community partners and stakeholders.

Current activities generally include:

- Business outreach and engagement with local businesses and industry stakeholders.
- Identification and administration of grant funding opportunities that support economic development priorities.
- Support for tourism development and promotion initiatives undertaken in collaboration with tourism and community partners.
- Participation in physician recruitment support activities in collaboration with health care partners and local stakeholders.
- Coordination and support of economic development-related community events, workshops, and special projects.

The nature and extent of these activities may evolve over the contract term in response to community priorities, available funding, and direction from the RDCK and the Creston Valley Services Committee.

Question 2: Would the RDCK be open to a team-based consulting approach, with a lead consultant serving as the primary point of contact and other team members supporting areas such as economic analysis, business retention and expansion, tourism, investment attraction and grant strategy?

Answer 2: Yes. The RDCK is open to proposals that utilize a team-based approach. However, proponents should clearly identify the proposed lead consultant who will serve as the primary point of contact and be responsible for overall contract management, coordination, communication, and delivery of services. Proposals should clearly describe the roles, responsibilities, qualifications, and level of involvement of each team member, as well as how continuity of service and accountability will be maintained throughout the contract term.

Question 3: Given that the Stronger Together Economic Action Strategy dates from 2018, is the expectation primarily to implement the existing strategy, or would there also be an opportunity to review and update priorities based on current economic conditions?

Answer 3: The primary intent of this engagement is to support implementation of the existing Economic Action Plan and its strategic priorities. The RDCK recognizes that economic conditions, opportunities, and community priorities may evolve over time. Accordingly, the successful consultant may identify emerging opportunities, challenges, and potential initiatives for consideration by the RDCK and the Creston Valley Services Committee. Any recommendations regarding updates to priorities or strategic direction would be subject to review and approval by the RDCK.

Question 4: Are there established targets for the KPIs listed in the NRFP, or would those targets be developed with the successful consultant as part of the annual work plan?

Answer 4: The KPIs identified in the NRFP are intended to illustrate the types of performance measures that may be used to assess progress under the contract. Specific performance targets have not been established at this time and are expected to be developed collaboratively with the successful consultant as part of the annual work planning process. Proposed performance measures should be aligned with the objectives of the Economic Action Plan and approved by the RDCK.

Question 5: What RDCK resources would be available to the successful consultant, such as staff support, office or meeting space, historical reports and data, stakeholder/contact databases, or other existing economic development resources?

Answer 5: The RDCK will provide reasonable access to relevant background information, historical reports, planning documents, and other available resources necessary to support delivery of the contract. The successful consultant will be expected to work independently while collaborating with RDCK staff, the Creston Valley Services Committee, local governments, community organizations, and other stakeholders as required. Access to meeting space, data, stakeholder contact information, and other resources may be made available where appropriate and subject to applicable privacy, confidentiality, and operational requirements. Proponents should assume that they are responsible for providing their own office space, equipment, technology, and administrative support necessary to deliver the services.

Question 6: The NRFP notes an initial one-year term with the possibility of three additional one-year renewals. Are those renewals generally expected to depend on performance, funding and continued program needs?

Answer 6: Yes. The exercise of any renewal option will be at the sole discretion of the RDCK and will generally be based on factors including satisfactory performance, continued service requirements, available funding, and the ongoing objectives of the Economic Action Plan. Nothing in the NRFP or resulting agreement should be interpreted as a guarantee of renewal beyond the initial contract term.

Question 7: The Economic Action Strategy (EAS) in the NRFP package is now approximately 8 years old, presumably some of the actions were implemented in the intervening years by some of the nine municipalities listed in the EAS. I was wondering if documentation related to actions taken by member municipalities, or Regional District Central Kootenay (RDCK) would be made available to the successful proponent?

Answer 7: Yes.

Question 8: Schedule A, Section 3(a)(iii) requires the Contractor to "deliver and/or maintain existing economic development programs." Please provide a list of the economic development programs currently funded through Services S107 and S108.

Answer 8: The RDCK does not currently operate any economic development programs under Services S107 or S108 that the successful Contractor would be responsible for assuming or directly delivering.

Creston Valley Tourism is funded through Service S108 at approximately \$22,000 annually and is delivered by the Creston Valley Tourism Society. The Creston Valley Visitor Centre and physician recruitment initiatives are administered separately from this contract. The successful Contractor is expected to maintain communication and coordination with partner organizations and stakeholders as appropriate to support implementation of the Economic Action Plan; however, the Contractor is not expected to directly operate or deliver these programs.

Question 9: Please confirm whether any program budget is captured under the estimated \$120,000 contracted services in the RFP or whether these are funded separately, for example as grants to partner organizations or pass-through funds.

Answer 9: Program budgets such as the Creston Valley Tourism Society funding referenced in Answer 8 are funded separately from the estimated \$120,000 annual contract value unless otherwise identified by the RDCK.

Question 10: The 2026 financial plan notes that physician recruitment is supported through a partnership with the Town of Creston. Please confirm:

- 3.1. whether the Contractor is expected to deliver physician recruitment directly, or to coordinate with and report on the existing program;
- 3.2. the expected level of effort;
- 3.3. whether any physician recruitment funding is included in the contract value.

Answer 10: No, the Contractor is not expected to directly deliver a physician recruitment program. The Contractor may be expected to coordinate with and support existing physician recruitment initiatives where such activities align with the Economic Action Plan. The anticipated level of effort is expected to be limited and will vary depending on opportunities and stakeholder initiatives during the contract term. No physician recruitment funding is included within the estimated \$120,000 annual contract value.

Question 11: The Creston Valley Visitor Centre (CVVC) is operated by the RDCK through S108. Does the Contractor have any role in its operation or promotion? Please also clarify the Contractor's expected role in Community Event Coordination.

Answer 11: The Contractor will not be responsible for the operation of the Creston Valley Visitor Centre. However, collaboration with tourism partners, including initiatives that support tourism promotion and economic development objectives, may be required. Community event coordination referenced in the Scope of Work is intended to refer to support, facilitation, collaboration, and coordination activities related to economic development initiatives rather than direct responsibility for organizing and operating community events.

Question 12: S107 primarily funds grants reviewed by the Area A Economic Development Commission. Is the Contractor expected to support the Commission, for example with grant intake, review, reporting or meeting support?

Answer 12: The Contractor is not expected to provide administrative support to the Area A Economic Development Commission. However, coordination and communication with the Commission or its representatives may occur where activities align with the Economic Action Plan.

Question 13: Under "grant administration" in Schedule A, will the Contractor administer any RDCK or Creston Valley Services Committee grant funds? If so, please confirm that those funds would be pass-through and excluded from the contract value.

Answer 13: If any grants are administered by the Contractor, those funds would be considered pass-through funding and would not form part of the estimated annual contract value.

Question 14: Please confirm whether the estimated \$120,000 annual value:
is exclusive of GST and includes both professional fees and reimbursable expenses.

Answer 14: Yes, the \$120,000 is exclusive of GST and includes both professional fees and reimbursable expenses.

Question 15: Does the RDCK expect the Contractor to maintain a publicly accessible office or set public hours, for example as a single point of contact for business inquiries? If so, will RDCK facilities be made available under Schedule C, or should this cost be included in the Proposal?

Answer 15: No. Office hours are not expected. RDCK facilities are not intended for dedicated office use by the Contractor; however, meeting space may be available subject to availability and operational requirements.

Question 16: Will ongoing program fees be paid by the RDCK directly or from the contract value? Examples include Imagine Kootenay and any specific software for delivery (e.g. document storage/software, performance-tracking software)

Answer 16: Ongoing memberships, subscriptions, and program-specific costs that are currently paid directly by the RDCK will continue to be managed by the RDCK unless otherwise agreed. Proponents should identify any software, tools, or subscriptions required for their proposed service delivery model and include these costs in their Proposal.

Question 17: The contract is funded from both S107 and S108. Should hours and deliverables be tracked and invoiced separately by service? If so, what allocation should proponents assume?

Answer 17: No, the RDCK will allocate costs. This is a regional contract.

Question 18: The Price Sheet requests Year 1 pricing only. May proponents include rates or escalation for the three optional renewal years?

Answer 18: Yes. Proponents may include proposed rates or escalation assumptions for the three optional renewal years.

Question 19: When the Contractor secures external grant funding, please clarify who would be the applicant of record, whether funds would flow through the RDCK, whether grant-funded work would add to the contract scope or offset the contract value and whether RDCK matching funds are available.

Answer 19: RDCK would be the applicant on record. Funds will flow through the RDCK only if the grant requires a local government to receive the funds. The grant-funded work would likely be added to the contract scope. RDCK matching funds availability would be determined on a case-by-case basis and would require approval by the Creston Valley Services Committee.

Question 20: Is Stronger Together (June 2018) the most current version of the strategy, or has it been updated or supplemented since? For example, the April 2022 EAP strategic planning session report revised the pillars. The 2018 strategy also recommends a full review every five years.

Answer 20: The Economic Action Plan strategic planning session informed subsequent project work; however, the Stronger Together Economic Action Strategy remains the primary strategic document guiding this engagement.

Question 21: Is the Contractor expected to implement the 2018 strategy as written, or should the Year 1 scope include a strategy review or refresh? Should the 2022 session report be treated as a supporting document to the Contract?

Answer 21: The primary expectation is implementation of the existing Stronger Together Economic Action Strategy. However, the RDCK anticipates that the successful Contractor will undertake a review of the strategy and recommend updates or a refresh to reflect current economic conditions, emerging opportunities, and community priorities.

Question 22: The March 5, 2026, Committee report refers to a focused Economic Development Action Plan. Please clarify whether the Annual Economic Development Work Plan deliverable is that Action Plan, whether the Committee has identified priority pillars or outcomes for 2027 and when the Work Plan would be due for approval.

Answer 22: Yes, the Annual Economic Development Work Plan is the Action Plan. No, the committee has not identified priority pillars or outcomes for 2027. The work plan would be due for approval in Q1 2027.

Question 23: What records and assets from the previous EAP contract will be made available to the Contractor? Examples include files, contact lists, the photo bank, website and domain, social media accounts, and performance data.

Answer 23: The RDCK anticipates that records and assets relevant to the Economic Action Plan will be made available to the successful Contractor where owned or controlled by the RDCK and where privacy, licensing, contractual, or operational considerations permit. The specific records and assets available will be determined during contract implementation.

Question 24: The Lower Kootenay Band / yaqan nu?kiy was a founding partner of the Economic Action Partnership. Please clarify the yaqan nu?kiy's role under this Contract and the engagement expected of the Contractor.

Answer 24: The Lower Kootenay Band / yaqan nu?kiy is a partner in the Economic Action Plan and should be considered a key stakeholder. The successful Contractor will be expected to engage and consult with yaqan nu?kiy on initiatives where appropriate.

Question 25: Schedule A refers to advisory committee meetings. Is there a current EAP advisory committee? If so, please clarify:

18.1. its membership

18.2. whether the Contractor is expected to maintain it or re-establish it;

18.3. who appoints its members.

Answer 25: The EAP advisory committee is dormant at this time, and its re-establishment is not certain.

Question 26: Who will serve as the RDCK main point of contact and/or Agreement Administrator? How often is the Contractor expected to present in person to the Creston Valley Services Committee?

Answer 26: The main point of contact is Stuart Horn, CAO of the RDCK. Presentations will likely be expected quarterly.

Question 27: Schedule A lists potential Key Performance Indicators. Will targets and baselines be confirmed during contract negotiation or during the delivery of the services?

Answer 27: During delivery of services.

Question 28: What authority will the Contractor have for public communications and media relations? May the Contractor use Economic Action Partnership or RDCK branding?

Answer 28: Public communications, media engagement, and use of RDCK or Economic Action Partnership branding will be subject to RDCK policies and approval processes. Specific requirements will be established with the successful Contractor during contract implementation.

Question 29: Are subcontracting arrangements or joint proposals permitted, including with existing local organizations?

Answer 29: Yes. Subcontracting arrangements and joint proposals are permitted. Proponents should clearly identify all team members and their respective roles and responsibilities.

Question 30: What privacy and data-handling requirements, including those under the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, apply to business contact and inquiry information collected on the RDCK's behalf?

Answer 30: Business contact information collected on behalf of the RDCK must be appropriately safeguarded and managed in accordance with applicable records management, confidentiality, and privacy requirements established by the RDCK.

Contact information collected for the purpose of communicating with a business (for example, business names, business telephone numbers, business email addresses, and business mailing addresses) will generally be treated as business records collected on behalf of the RDCK and must be appropriately safeguarded and managed throughout the contract term.

Where information collected constitutes personal information, including an individual's personal email address, personal telephone number, personal mailing address, or other personal details, the consultant must ensure that such information is:

- Collected only where necessary for the purposes of delivering the Economic Action Plan services;
- Used only for authorized purposes related to the contract;
- Accessed only by individuals authorized to perform work under the contract;
- Protected through appropriate administrative, physical, and technical safeguards; and
- Not disclosed to third parties except as authorized by the RDCK or required by law.

All records and information collected, created, or maintained on behalf of the RDCK remain the property of the RDCK. The successful consultant will be responsible for maintaining records in a secure manner, implementing appropriate access controls, and returning or securely disposing of records in accordance with RDCK requirements at the conclusion of the contract.

To the extent that personal information is collected, used, or maintained on behalf of the RDCK, the consultant will be required to comply with the applicable requirements of British Columbia's *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (FIPPA). Records created or maintained on behalf of the RDCK may also be subject to disclosure requirements under FIPPA.

Question 31: Please clarify the evaluation and award process, specifically, what are the anticipated contract award and Board approval dates? Are interviews planned? How will the 30 Financial points be scored?

Answer 31: Anticipated contract award date will be the December Board date. Currently there are no interviews planned but the NRFP has this as an option, if required. Financial points will be evaluated out of 30 points based on the pricing information submitted in the Price Sheet. The evaluation will consider the Proponent's proposed level of effort, hourly rates, overall cost, allocation of resources, and the reasonableness of pricing relative to the proposed approach and understanding of the Scope of Services. The RDCK reserves the right to assess financial value based on the overall value offered to the RDCK and not solely on the lowest proposed cost. Lowest cost will not necessarily receive the highest financial score.

Except as modified by Addendum No. 2 issued October 5th, 2026, the Negotiated Request for Proposal documents for the Economic Action Plan Consultant shall remain unchanged.

Mark Braithwaite
Senior Procurement Specialist

- END OF DOCUMENT -