



RFP Addendum #1

Shoreline Naturalization – Phase 2

Date of Addendum: March 13, 2026

Link to Request for Proposals:

<https://www.tlaaminnation.com/rfp-shoreline-naturalization-phase-2/>

NOTICE TO ALL POTENTIAL RESPONDENTS:	
The original RFP documents remain in full force and effect. Respondents shall take this Addendum into consideration when preparing and submitting their Proposals. This Addendum includes all questions received from potential respondents and answers provided for clarification.	

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Question 1:	Since the response to questions will not be posted until March 6, can the Nation allow for a two-week extension for the responses to questions to be thoroughly considered in the development of the proposals?
Answer 1:	The Nation has amended the RFP to allow for a closing date of March 27 th to accommodate integrating information from the addendum and Phase 1 report into the proposals.

Question 2:	As access to the Phase 1 report was provided midway through the original timeline, can the Nation allow for a one-week extension of the question period?
Answer 2:	The Nation has allowed a one-week extension of the question period. All inquiries had to be submitted by March 6 th . The Addendum was posted on March 13.



Question 3:	The RFP states that “Tla’amin Nation Will Provide: Leadership in drafting and preparing deliverables and directing drafting support from other TN staff and consultants.”, does the Nation expect the consultant to provide input to TN staff to allow for development of the IFP design drawings by the Nation’s staff or does the Nation expect that the consultant can develop the design drawings entirely in-house?
Answer 3:	<p>The referenced RFP line applies to engagement materials, policy documentation, and supporting written deliverables. It reflects the Nation’s role in leading content development and coordinating input from TN staff and other consultants for those materials.</p> <p>It does not apply to the IFP design drawings. The Nation expects the consultant to prepare and deliver the IFP design drawings in-house, with TN staff providing background information, coordination, and review input as needed.</p>

Question 4:	The RFP mentions the desire to establish a nature-based (Green Shores) approach to shoreline risk management. However, the RFP does not specify whether a desired outcome of this project includes an application to Green Shores for formal assessment and certification. Can you please clarify whether this is a desired deliverable or whether the deliverables should be framed to allow for this to be completed by the Nation at a later time?
Answer 4:	<p>At this stage, the focus of the project is on developing a shoreline risk management approach that meets Tla’amin Nation’s specific needs and priorities, using nature-based and Green Shores principles as appropriate.</p> <p>The RFP does not require a formal application to Green Shores for assessment or certification as a deliverable. While the Nation may choose to pursue certification at a later time, there is currently no confirmed direction on this.</p>



	Deliverables should therefore be structured to align with Green Shores principles and keep the option open for a future application, but formal certification is not required under this scope of work.
--	---

Question 5:	What are the CEPF funding constraints and reporting timelines for this project?
Answer 5:	<p>This project is funded through the UBCM Community Emergency Preparedness Fund and must comply with CEPF Disaster Risk Reduction – Climate Adaptation requirements. The contract must commence upon award and be completed no later than February 28, 2027. Deliverables, phasing, and invoicing must align with the approved scope of work and grant conditions. Proponents should structure their work plan, schedule, and cash flow to meet these fixed completion timelines and standard CEPF reporting requirements.</p> <p>For clarity, the available budget for the consultant scope is approximately \$135,000. Proponents should structure their fee proposals accordingly and demonstrate clear alignment between scope, effort, and value.</p>

Question 6 :	Are there preferred formats for the community-facing materials (e.g., infographics, fact sheets, slide decks)?
Answer 6:	At this stage, specific formats for community-facing materials have not been prescribed. Preferences will be confirmed with the successful consultant during project initiation. These may include items such as infographics, posters, information pamphlets, or fact sheets, depending on what is determined to best support the community engagement process.

Question 7:	Is there a preferred readability level or language style (e.g., plain language guidelines)?
--------------------	---



Answer 7:	Proponents should anticipate preparing plain language, clear, accessible materials to support Nation-led engagement.
------------------	--

Question 8:	What is the expected number of in-person Nation-led engagement sessions?
--------------------	--

Answer 8:	Engagement under this scope is intended to be focused and limited. At this time, no in-person Nation-led engagement sessions are anticipated as part of the consultant’s scope. Engagement will be targeted and primarily supported through materials and internal coordination, rather than through multiple public or in-person sessions.
------------------	---

Question 9:	The contract must conclude by February 28, 2027. Should proponents plan for all design changes, permitting submissions, and phasing plans, and implementation of the pilot/demonstration sites to be finalized before this date? (We note that implementation of the pilot/demonstration site is not included within the scope of this proposal but want to understand the timelines that the Nation is working with).
--------------------	--

Answer 9:	<p>The approved scope includes development of design concepts, costing, and permits/licensing preparation, not construction or implementation</p> <p>All Phase 2 deliverables within this RFP, including IFP-level design drawings, Design Basis Memorandum, Class D cost estimates, permitting submissions, and the phased implementation roadmap, must be completed by February 28, 2027 in order to comply with the funding agreement.</p> <p>Implementation of any pilot or demonstration sites is not included within this scope and is not required to be constructed prior to that date. The expectation is that Phase</p>
------------------	---



	2 will position the Nation to proceed to implementation in a subsequent phase, subject to future funding and approvals.
--	---

Question 10:	Does the Nation have an internal budget range that proponents should be aware of when structuring their fee proposal?
Answer 10:	The Nation has established an internal budget consistent with the available funding and project scope. For clarity, the anticipated budget available for the consultant scope is approximately \$135,000. Proponents should structure their fee proposal based on the scope of services outlined in the RFP and demonstrate clear value for money. Proposals will be evaluated on overall cost, transparency of pricing, and alignment with the required deliverables.

Question 11:	Should previous deliverables to support the proposal be provided as full reports, excerpts, or summaries?
Answer 11:	Proponents should provide concise, relevant examples that clearly demonstrate the quality and applicability of past work to this scope. Full reports are not required unless they are necessary to illustrate a specific technical capability.

Question 12:	How many examples of previous deliverables would the Nation like to be included in the proposal?
Answer 12:	Proponents are encouraged to include two to three relevant examples of previous deliverables. Examples should be closely aligned with the scope of this RFP, particularly IFP-



	level design work, coastal or shoreline projects, and permitting-ready documentation.
--	---

Any questions related to the RFP and this Addendum can be emailed to:
russell.brewer@tn-bc.ca