



Request for Proposal

Slocan River and Little Slocan River Sensitive Ecosystems Inventory (SEI) Mapping

ADDENDUM NO. 1

Issued: October 21, 2026

Closing Date: 2:00 pm (PST), October 28, 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. 1**, dated October 21, 2026, the Request for Proposal documents for the Slocan River and Little Slocan River Sensitive Ecosystems Inventory (SEI) Mapping shall be amended as specified below.

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS:

1. **Please confirm that the study area does not include tributaries or ecosystems outside of the valley-bottom floodplain of the Slocan River and Little Slocan River, and that references to first-order streams and other tributaries apply only where they cross the valley-bottom floodplain.**

Confirmed. This is not a watershed-wide assessment. The study area is the historic valley-bottom floodplain and riparian zone of the Slocan River and Little Slocan River, mapped from valley wall to valley wall, as described in Part 2, Section 2.0. The survey limits are:

- **Slocan River:** approximately 59 km from the outlet of Slocan Lake to the confluence with the Kootenay River at Shoreacres. This includes the complete floodplain.
- **Little Slocan River:** approximately 10 km upstream to Little Slocan Lake, with the first 6 km as the immediate priority.

First, second and third order tributaries are included only at their confluences and lower reaches where they cross the valley bottom. Small seeps and creeks that feed the floodplain riparian zone are part of the study area. Upslope reaches of tributaries and ecosystems outside the valley-bottom floodplain are not included.

This Addendum also corrects an incomplete sentence in Section 2.0. It should read: "Indicative extent runs from the Kootenay River confluence at Shoreacres in the south to the outlet of Slocan Lake in the north along the Slocan River."

2. **Is access through private land required for field work? Who is responsible for contacting private landowners for permission? Is it acceptable to only conduct field work on accessible Crown land, as with the 2012 SEI field work?**

Much of the valley bottom is privately held. Under Sections 6.1 and 6.2, the SLRP Coordinator facilitates all contact with landowners. The consultant does not contact landowners directly without the Coordinator's authorization, and does not enter private land without the owner's permission.

Field verification on accessible Crown and public land is acceptable. Under Task 2, proponents should:

- describe the level and distribution of field effort they propose;
- explain how they will verify ecosystems they cannot access directly; and
- state any resulting limitations in the final report.

Where private land access would add significant value, the Coordinator will work with the consultant to seek permission from willing landowners. Access to private land cannot be guaranteed. Schedule A, Section 2(d) is clarified accordingly: the RDCK will facilitate access where it is able, but it does not undertake to provide access to private property.

3. **Are there any requirements by the Partnership for professional designations to complete the work? Is supervision by an R.P.Bio. acceptable? Are junior technicians and RFTs acceptable to assist with or complete field work?**

The Request for Proposal does not mandate a specific professional designation. Team qualifications and credentials are evaluated under Section 1.20. The Partnership expects the work to be led and signed off by an appropriately qualified professional with experience applying SEI or TEM to provincial RISC standards. Supervision by an R.P.Bio. is acceptable.

Junior technicians and RFTs may assist with or complete field work under the supervision of the lead professional. The lead professional remains responsible for ecosystem classification, quality assurance, and sign-off on the mapping and reports. Proponents should identify each team member's role, qualifications, and proposed hours in the cost breakdown required under Part 3, Section 3.2.2(c).

4. **Can a drone assist with field verification or be used to collect better data for SEI and analysis?**

Yes. Drones may be proposed to support field verification and data collection, and should be described in the methodology. Proponents using drones are responsible for:

- meeting all Transport Canada RPAS requirements; and
- obtaining any permissions needed to fly over parks or other managed lands.

Imagery over private property should only be collected with landowner consent, arranged through the Coordinator. All drone imagery is project data and is subject to the confidentiality terms in Section 7.0.

5. **Do you foresee any field work or professional archaeological consultation required for cultural or archaeological values?**

No professional archaeological assessment or field work for cultural values is expected within the consultant's scope. Under Task 6, this work is governed by the Sinixt and Syilx partners, and the consultant supports it only as directed by the Coordinator. Proponents do not need to include archaeological subconsultants or costs.

The work does not involve ground disturbance. If archaeological material is encountered during field work, work at that location should stop and the Coordinator should be notified. Any cultural or archaeological information shared with or encountered by the consultant is confidential under Section 7.0.

6. **Are baseline datasets available for reference?**

Yes. The following will be made available to all proponents on the same basis on request:

- Slocan River Aquatic Habitat and Sensitive Ecosystems Inventory, Slocan River Streamkeepers (2012);
- Slocan Lake Foreshore Inventory and Mapping (FIMP) (2021);
- Slocan Lake Foreshore Development Guidelines (Wood 2022); and
- The Southern Slocan Corridor and Climate Disruption: A Basic Assessment (Utzig 2025).

Information held by the Sinixt and Syilx partners, including fish and wildlife survey results, will be shared with the successful proponent at the partners' direction and under the confidentiality terms in Section 7.0.

Provincial datasets are publicly available, including the Freshwater Atlas, VRI, BC CDC records, and PMBC parcel data. Some datasets carry use or distribution restrictions, which will be identified when they are provided. Under Section 7.0, proponents may not assume rights to third-party data.

7. **We do not expect to need any permits or licences to complete the deliverables. Are you able to confirm?**

The Partnership does not anticipate that permits or licences will be required for the deliverables as scoped. Under Schedule A, Section 1(h), the consultant remains responsible for any permits, licences, or certifications related to its own methods, such as drone operation.

8. **What is the budget for this project?**

The RDCK is not disclosing a budget for this contract. Proponents are asked to price the scope as described, with the task-level cost breakdown required under Part 3, Section 3.2.2(c).

9. **Can you please clarify the Community Mapping Network data requirement?**

The final spatial dataset should be delivered so the RDCK can archive it with the Community Mapping Network without rework. This means:

- the formats in Section 4.0: an ESRI file geodatabase plus an open format, in NAD 1983 UTM Zone 11N;
- attributes consistent with provincial SEI and TEM standards;
- complete metadata and a data dictionary; and
- sensitive layers delivered separately from layers suitable for public release.

The consultant is not responsible for uploading or hosting the data on CMN. For the education tools under Task 5, CMN compatibility is preferred but not required.

10. **Will previous mapping data referenced in Section 1.1 Background be provided?**

Yes. The 2012 Slokan River Streamkeepers Aquatic Habitat and Sensitive Ecosystems Inventory will be provided to the successful proponent and is available to all proponents on the same basis on request. Later mapping of the Little Slokan River and Little Slokan Lakes will be released, subject to the data holder's written permission. Please also see the response to Question 6.

11. **Does high-resolution LiDAR-derived elevation data (DEM/DTM) exist for the study area to assist in delineating floodplains, fluvial fringes and riparian benches, and will this data be supplied to the consultant?**

Where the RDCK holds LiDAR for the study area, it will be supplied to the successful proponent subject to any licence terms. Proponents may also use provincial LiDAR available through LiDAR BC. Proponents should not assume coverage beyond what is confirmed here, and should describe how their method will address any gaps.

12. **Will the RDCK provide the successful proponent with current, high-resolution aerial photography or orthoimages for the study area, and are digital stereo-paired air photos available for 3D ecosystem mapping and photo-interpretation?**

The RDCK most recent orthoimagery for the study area is available [here](#). Provincial air photos, including historical imagery, are available through the Province of BC. Proponents who intend to use stereo photo-interpretation should include any costs to acquire stereo imagery in their proposal.

13. **Regarding the Story Map style product specified for educational tools and outreach materials: Is Esri ArcGIS Online an acceptable and compatible platform for the online map viewer and/or Story Map**

product? Does the RDCK have ArcGIS Online and can it host the tool and associated layers? Is this a CMN compatible product?

Yes. ArcGIS Online is an acceptable platform for the online map viewer and Story Map product. The tools should be delivered so the Partnership can host and maintain them after the contract ends, and are built from non-sensitive layers only, subject to partner review before public release.

A Story Map is not itself a CMN product. CMN compatibility applies to the underlying data layers, which should be the same CMN-ready layers described in the response to Question 9.

14. **Regarding the statement in Section 2.0 that the total mapped area will be confirmed at project inception: Could the RDCK share a ballpark or maximum estimated hectare area for the study area to serve as a uniform baseline for cost estimates?**

The RDCK is not providing a hectare estimate. The study area is defined in Part 2, Section 2.0, and proponents should estimate the mapped area based on that description. Proposals must state the assumed mapped area in hectares and the method used to estimate it, and provide a unit rate per hectare. The total mapped area will be confirmed at project inception, and the contract value may be adjusted using the unit rate if the confirmed area differs materially from the proponent's assumption.

Except as modified by Addendum No. 1 issued October 20, 2026, the Request for Proposal documents for the Slokan River and Little Slokan River Sensitive Ecosystems Inventory (SEI) Mapping shall remain unchanged.

Paris Marshall Smith

Coordinator, Slokan Lake and River Partnership/Sustainability and Resilience Supervisor, RDCK.

- END OF DOCUMENT -