

1. Each development horizon investigated requires the scenario modelled and infrastructure costing completed for the transportation, sanitary, storm water, water and market study reports. Each horizon is expensive to investigate as it requires 5 reports to investigate the details. Please confirm that the 5 year and ultimate development horizon is acceptable to the City or let us know if additional horizons needed to be included in the analysis.

We would like the option to have 5 year, final, and additional development horizon scenarios modelled as a value-added service. If you could provide us a quote for what services you are able offer or recommend to be undertaken, we can decide what we need based on a holistic review of the proposals and budget.

2. Confirm TIA scope.

We would like the TIA to investigate the 5 year development horizon and the ultimate development horizon as a value-added service. We would like detailed TIA for the first 755 acres, with very broad arterial road layouts, anticipated traffic generation, and anticipated improvements for full build-out (3800 acres), including connections to Highways 1 and 2.

3. Does the City have concept plans for the development?

The “concepts” the City has are broad high-level analysis on costing, rail layout, etc. This is included in the marketing package that was attached to the RFP.

4. Is there any way to clarify the scope of the market study? There is a large cost for this study depending on the scope and requirements. My understanding is you will require demand predictions, anticipated end users, lot sizes for anticipated end users, a development concept that incorporates the recommendations from the market study, residual land values based on developed land, potential lease rates for end users, development phasing and timelines for absorption of each phase. The engineering and planning studies would be based off the market study.

We would like market study services to be offered on a value-added basis. We have an informal baseline of market research, but we would like to be able to further this analysis as part of concept planning and phasing of this development. The level of detail required will be determined based on a holistic review of the proposals.

5. What is the final planning document deliverable? (e.g. Conceptual Plan Document with associated technical reports?)

The concept plan for the first 755 acres (including land use plan, servicing plan, storm-water management, traffic study, and very general and broad options for future expansion, along with supporting technical reports).

6. Will the consultant be required to advance planning document and related approvals (i.e. land use, subdivision, etc.) through Council or will this be led by the City?

The concept plan will have to be presented to and approved by Municipal Planning Commission and City Council.

7. Beyond one open house suggested in the Addendum, what is the expected level and intensity of communications and engagement given the project timelines, nature and location of development for (i) CPI/Stage 1 and (ii) Stage 2?

We anticipate that the open house and intensive engagement with other stakeholders will be conducted as part of the concept plan development for the 755 acres. We do not anticipate any significant engagement for the initial stage which is to provide the necessary infrastructure for CPI.

8. Does the project include support to meet all conditions of subdivision approval and advancing registrable plan of subdivision ?

We do not anticipate requiring plan of proposed subdivision at this stage, in order to be as flexible as possible with lot sizes.

9. What existing pre-screening technical studies have been completed for (i) CPI site and adjacent lands (ii) all the subject lands? Has a Heritage Resource Review screening been completed for the subject lands?

All technical studies for the CPI site is being completed by CPI. We have not completed any pre-screening for the remainder of Phase 1 (755 acres).

10. Given the tight timeframes for the CPI / Stage 1, what is the expectation for pre-screening/technical investigations (i.e. level of detail) prior to July 2017?

The technical investigations prior to July will be only that which is required to ensure that CPI's plans for construction will be compatible with the infrastructure for the rest of the industrial park. We expect to start construction on the infrastructure required to service CPI (sewer, water, road) in the fall of 2017/spring 2018, so some minimum amount of technical investigation and pre-screening will be required to accommodate this first phase of infrastructure. That being said, we don't expect the concept for the full 755 acres to be complete by that time, but some preliminary evaluations will need to be made in order to proceed with construction.

11. What is the expected level of background studies and intensity of investigation with respect to such nuisance factors as noise, dust and odor, aesthetics?

We expect the consultant to make recommendations based on federal/provincial regulations as well as best practices for industrial development, given site conditions and proximity to residential areas.

12. For industrial developments there could be effluents discharged which may not be treatable by the lagoons. Will there be a need to have an expert available to solve special effluent treatment problems?

This is not necessary. The City will work directly with industry if these issues arise in the future.

13. Are there general Moose Jaw background engineering reports available (water, sanitary sewer, storm water, transportation) which explain how the existing systems function?

We have modelling for the existing systems (storm, sanitary, and water) completed in 2016 as part of an infrastructure master plan. We also have an ongoing study specifically for the water needs of the SE sector of the City which will be made available to the successful proponent.

14. Are there models of the various existing utilities that can be used to assess required utilities for the industrial sites?

See answer to a) above

15. Is it possible to discharge storm water to soak aways?

There is no existing storm-water system so this will have to be designed as part of the concept planning.

16. Can storm water be discharged to the adjacent ravines and, if so, are there environmental approvals required?

As far as we know this is an option, but there would likely be environmental approvals required.

17. Are there any geotechnical studies available for the area that could be sent to us?

Nothing available at this time. We expect geo-tech work to be completed as part of this contract – see addendum 1.

18. Is the land use concept referred to as Stage II of the RFP intended to be formally presented to MPC and subsequently adopted by Council as an amendment to the Official Community Plan bylaw as described in Sections 4.2.1 and 6.2.1 of the OCP?

Yes we would like the option to have the concept plan presented to MPC and Council and adopted to the OCP.

19. Can you provide a higher resolution copy of the figure shown in the Moose Jaw Industrial Park – Site Catalogue showing the Conceptual railway/track arrangement to access City of Moose Jaw and RM of Moose Jaw No. 161 Industrial Lands? The image in the RFP attachment cannot be read.

See addendum 1.

20. Does the City's LiDar data encompass the full 755 acre area? Our data on file ends on the ¼ section to the west of CPI's land. If LiDar is not available, is this component to be provided by the Consultant?

You are correct, the LiDAR data does not cover the entire study area – see attached map showing the covered areas in the red squares. The consultant is to provide information and background required to complete the concept and servicing study. We are not specifically requesting LIDAR, but would like the consultant to propose what they feel is required to complete the concept.

21. What size of water and sewer connection is required for CPI? Where do we anticipate making the sewer and water connections to service CPI?

We are assuming that adequate water for fire protection will be required, we do not know the exact size of service connections at this point. A drawing showing existing City sewer and water lines is attached for reference. The City expects the consultant to analyze our existing infrastructure and propose the most effective and efficient way to service the site.

22. Is it possible to get any record drawings for the adjacent water & sewer infrastructure on Coteau Street East?

See attached and above.

23. Do water main in the area have sufficient capacity to serve the area or will a primary supply line be needed?

We want the successful consultant to analyse our water system and make recommendations to meet both short and long term water needs.

24. Is gravity sewer required to serve all the new industrial lots or will other options be considered?

Gravity is preferred but we are open to options.

25. Can you please confirm we are reading this correctly

Phase 1 – 755acres (including the 100acres for CPI)

Phase 2 – the remaining of the 3800acres (3045acres)

If you refer to schedule B of the RFP, broadly speaking we have stage 1: as expedited servicing design and related tasks for CPI development, stage2: concept design, infrastructure phasing for 755 acres (this is the land being considered for immediate development), with broad consideration to long term future expansion to the remaining approx. 3000 acres.

26. Our engineers would like to know how far the potable water source is from the Phase 1 lands. We know MJ gets its water from Buffalo Pound, but where is the nearest pickup point which would serve the SE Industrial Area?

See question 21 above.

27. Is there current traffic information (counts) (AM and PM peak hour volumes) available for Highway 1, Highway 2, and Highway 39 in the vicinity of the development?

We do not have recent traffic counts for these roads, however they may be available through the Ministry of Highways. 2012 traffic counts are attached for reference.

28. The City's Transportation Master Plan study is underway. Is it available (even a draft version) for review?

See attached.

29. Is Geotechnical information available for the development area? Or does this need to be included in the submission? We are assuming that a GeoTech of the study area is required.

CPI is completing their own Geotechnical work, however at a minimum we would like a desktop geotechnical for the first 755 acres, as well as field work geotechnical to evaluate the conditions of Coteau Street and determine if immediate upgrades are required.

30. The RFP does not mention completing the legal subdivision and corresponding Plan of Survey and raising of titles. We strongly suspect that a surveyor would be needed to create the CPI site at a minimum. Would the city like this service included in the scope?

We are not anticipating legal subdivision and plan of survey to be completed as part of this project. The CPI parcel is being subdivided independently.

31. We understand the rezoning of this area is underway and will be conducted by the City, is the subdivision approval to be conducted by the consultant, or will that be handled by the City? If handled by the Consultant, will the City waive the application fees?

The subdivision approval will not be part of this project. The rezoning is being completed by the City, however we anticipate the consultant to provide recommendations as to the appropriate zoning for the area as part of the concept planning.

32. Is there topographic survey or LIDAR data available for the site?

LIDAR data is available for only a portion of the site – see attached map.

33. Has any previous servicing design work (conceptual/preliminary) been completed for this area?

See question 3.

34. The RFP alludes to a lot layout in the Site Catalogue, however we could not find any lot layouts. Are these available?

The image showing the rail concept did not show lot layouts, however it was assumed that lots would be arranged to have maximum access to rail. The main point is we want to be flexible with lot sizes to accommodate industries specific needs – this is part of the reason why subdivision is not included in this project.

35. Is any consultation with the General Public expected? It is understood that all affected stakeholders and property owners will be consulted, but we are unsure if the City expects the General Public to be involved as well.

It is expected that at least one public open house will be held as part of this process.

36. Does the City expect an industrial/employment market analysis report to be prepared? It looks like a fair amount of work has already been done by the Economic Development office.

We would like the consultant to propose market analysis to build on what we have already to inform the development of this area as a value-added service. Additionally

the City is requesting proposal for services to provide quotes to assist with lot pricing and marketing.

37. Is the concept plan approval process through City Council and MPC part of the scope of work?

Yes

38. If so, is it expected that the consultant will attend MPC and/or City Council for the approval process?

Yes, we would like this included as an option in the proposal.

39. Is there a reason why the R5 and AR parcels are not included in the rezoning?

The decision was made to proceed with rezoning only City-owned and RM-owned land at this time, because this is the land being considered for immediate development.

40. Does MJ have a policy for MR dedication in industrial areas?

We do not have a specific policy for MR dedication apart from following the regulations in the Planning and Development Act.

41. We would like to obtain the standards regarding cross-sections for all types of roads - local, collector, arterial... are these available?

See attached.

42. Have any discussions taken place with CPI regarding the configuration of site they need? We understand they need 100 acres, but have discussions gone any further than that? Or, will this be determined by the consultant in discussions with CPI about their service requirements?

The subdivision and location of CPI site has been approved – the Plan of Proposed Subdivision is attached as part of Addendum 1. The successful consultant is expected to work with CPI and the City to determine the ideal servicing arrangement.

43. In regard to future parcel sizes. The site catalogue references parcel sizes as ranging from 50 acres to up to 114 acres . We are wondering if the city would consider smaller parcel sizes depending on the client's needs? We are also wondering if there were any marketing research studies available on optimal lot sizes/ market demand in this regard.

Our goal is to be flexible with lot sizes in order to accommodate both large and small industry. I don't believe we have any formal market demand research other than conversations with potential developers. We would like market research to be quoted as part of the proposal.

44. Regarding the above RFP, I am wondering if you can let me know how many land descriptions are included in the area to be planned?

Unfortunately I do not know the exact number of land descriptions within the study area. It is quite a large number because two quarter sections were previously

subdivided into 25 foot lots. I have attached our notice for rezoning of the study area (this contains a simplified legal description) along with the map for your reference.

45. What will be the Evaluation criteria? i.e. Is it most likely that the consultant with the lowest fee will be selected?

The City of Moose Jaw uses an overall “best value” standard when evaluating proposals. Cost is only one factor and the weighting of each factor has not been pre-determined.

46. The following two clauses imply the City will negotiate fee amendments with short listed consultants:

- *“Moose Jaw may short-list proponents and conduct interviews with short-listed proponents at its sole discretion. Furthermore, Moose Jaw may negotiate any and all aspects of a proposal, including but not limited to the fee proposal, and the Services Agreement terms”.*

AND

- *“negotiate any and all aspects of any proposal and the provisions of the Services Agreement (including, without limitation, those provisions relating to fees and/or any scope of services) with any one or more proponents at any time in its sole discretion, whether before, during or after the selection and evaluation process;”*

Does this imply that the City will adjust the Scope of Work which impacts fees, or negotiate fees with proponents until they get the lowest price? Will they keep our fees confidential during the negotiations?

We will keep proponent’s fees confidential during the evaluation process, even if we are negotiating fees and scope of work.

47. Please clarify the following statement: *“Proposals may be withdrawn or amended by proponents at any time by written notice to Moose Jaw prior to Moose Jaw and a proponent signing a formal contract”.* Will the Proponent have the ability to reduce fees after discussing issues with the City? This relates to the above concerns as well.

That’s correct, there is no obligation on either party until a contract is signed.

48. Has the City or CPI conducted environmental and/or heritage field studies for the lands and areas within 500 m of the property that they intend to sell to CPI? If so, can they share that information with the consultants?

See question 9 and 10.

49. Have preliminary discussions with regulatory authorities been conducted to address environmental approvals?

No

50. Have preliminary noise and air quality studies been conducted by or for CPI and can this information be shared with the consultant?

CPI will be required to meet all relevant regulatory approvals but they will be handling that themselves.

51. It is unclear if the City wants field assessments to be conducted and environmental permitting / approvals to be expedited for CPI or if the City and/or CPI will be addressing this – please clarify. What has been done already? What is required?

See questions 9 and 10.

52. To what level of detail is the CoMJ expecting for the ‘identifying best practices’ for noise? There is a large range of services and associated costs depending on the level of detail required or expected.

We are looking for recommendations from the consultant as to what might be appropriate given the conditions of the proposed industrial park.

53. The RFP indicates the existing lagoons are underutilized and that excess storage capacity in the sewage lagoons exists. Does the City anticipate that these existing lagoons have the capacity to accept peak wet weather flow from the proposed industrial development at full build out?

The Wastewater Treatment Plant is operating at approximately 50% capacity. We have identified the lagoons as an asset. We expect this to be analysed as part of the servicing study portion of the concept plan.

54. Will the City be providing existing system capacities (water and sanitary) at potential tie-in locations to facilitate development of the industrial development? If not, will the City be providing hydraulic models of the water distribution and sanitary collection systems from which capacity details can be reasonably extracted for the existing condition?

We have modelling showing the capacity of existing systems which was completed as part of the Infrastructure Master Plan.

55. The City Owned Land – Proposed Industrial Use drawing provided with the RFP used two different shades of yellow font to delineate land ownership (i.e. RM Owned Land & City Owned Land). As such, it is difficult to differentiate between these two types. Can an updated figure be provided to distinguish between these stakeholders?

Attached.

56. Does the CoMJ have a Transportation Master Plan and accompanying model? If so is it available for use?

Attached.

57. As per Question 2 of Addendum 1, the concept plan is just for the 755 acres with general consideration for the 3800 acres, however regarding the TIS, it is important to consider all potential growth. Will the TIS be required to cover the entire 3800 acres? Or is it included in the TMP (if one exists)?

We want to anticipate infrastructure needs for a reasonable growth horizon based on market demand. We would like a recommendation from the consultant as to what is

appropriate, and options for what should be done in the short and long term. This area was at least partially addressed in the TMP. Refer to question 2.

58. In the Schedule E addendum, could you clarify what specific components would be expected in a brokering strategy? We wanted to make sure we were addressing elements most important to the city.

We know we want some assistance in determining market demand, lot pricing, and sales strategy in general. This would tie into recommendations on timing, costing and phasing of infrastructure. I don't think we know what specific elements would be included in brokering specifically, other than a strategy of how to market the development.

59. Can the City of Moose Jaw provide any information on construction budget?

We can confirm that approximately \$2,000,000.00 has been budgeted for construction for 2017, based on a high level estimate to accommodate CPI. However, there could be additional construction contemplated for subsequent years under this contract.

Attachments: LiDAR Coverage Map, 2012 Traffic Counts, Surrounding Sewer and Water Map, City-owned land map, Notice of Intent to Rezone, Transportation Master Plan, Road Cross-Sections