



## **Addendum No. 2**

City of Coquitlam

**RFP No. 25-114**

### **Community Safety Strategy**

Issue Date: December 16, 2025

Total Page Count: 3

Proponents shall note the following amendments to the RFP documents:

#### **QUESTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS**

- Q1. Workshop Outcomes & Decision Expectations: Could the City confirm the intended decision outputs from the Council workshop? For example, is the expectation to endorse a preferred strategy scope and engagement level, or to provide direction for staff to prepare a subsequent RFP? Would a single recommended approach be preferred, or a suite of options with next steps?
- A1. The expected outcome of the workshop is to receive clear direction from Council regarding the desired scope and level of engagement for a Community Safety Strategy. Staff will use this direction to guide the next steps in the development of a Community Safety Strategy. A single recommended approach from Council is preferred.**
- Q2. Comparative Analysis Priorities: Does the City have a preferred list of comparable municipalities or frameworks (e.g., Community Safety & Well Being plans) for benchmarking? If not, we will propose a shortlist balancing Metro Vancouver, BC municipalities, and national comparators.
- A2. The City does not have a set list of comparable municipalities or frameworks.**
- Q3. Council Engagement Norms & Facilitation Design: Are there standing Council workshop norms (e.g., duration, in camera vs. open, accessibility requirements) and preferred decision making techniques (e.g., dot voting, nominal group technique) we should align with?
- A3. It is the responsibility of the Proponent to design and facilitate the workshop to elicit Council participation and decision-making. The proposed facilitation process will be reviewed and evaluated as part of the RFP process. Details regarding Council workshop processes and procedures would be shared with the successful proponent.**

- Q4. Community Lens & Emerging Themes: Would the City value integrating perspectives such as CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design), community capacity building, and EDI/reconciliation principles in the workshop content—or should these be reserved for the future Strategy phase?
- A4. The workshop should focus on helping Council identify a desired scope and engagement level for a Community Safety Strategy and whether perspectives such as CPTED, community capacity building, and EDI/reconciliation principles would be included within that scope.**
- Q5. Current Affairs and Risk Resilience: Given recent developments – such as the December 2025 suspicious fire, flood risk advisories, and redevelopment disputes near Roy Stibbs – should the background analysis and workshop framing include resilience to anomalous events and stakeholder sensitivity strategies? If so, which stakeholder groups should be prioritized?
- A5. The Council workshop should focus on helping Council identify a desired scope and engagement level for a Community Safety Strategy. The outcome of the workshop will guide the topics to explore (i.e., scope), and the stakeholders to speak with (i.e., engagement level), in the development of a Community Safety Strategy.**
- Q6. Data Access & Coordination: Will staff provide access to internal documents (e.g., RCMP dashboards, program inventories, bylaws, engagement framework), and can we conduct brief interviews with division leads (Bylaw/Animal, Licensing, Risk & Emergency Management, RCMP liaison) to validate current-state summaries?
- A6. Staff will provide confidential access to internal documents and ensure the Contractor can conduct interviews with division leads to validate current-state summaries.**
- Q7. Budget, Evaluation Emphasis & Value Adds: Beyond the published scoring matrix, are there must haves (e.g., Council facilitation experience, IAP2 credentials, local presence) that could materially affect scoring?
- A7. There are no other criteria beyond the published scoring matrix. Please note that the examples provided including facilitation experience, credentials related to the work, and local presence would fall within the published scoring matrix.**
- Q8. Additionally, would the City welcome no cost cultural micro learning (values/ethics or mindfulness) co delivered at the workshop, **and/or** a menu of optional services (e.g., Council micro survey, public facing summary) **priced separately**?
- A8. The focus on the current RFP is to facilitate decision-making by Council through a workshop. Additional services are not required at this time but may be sought at a later stage.**

---

***End of Addendum No. 2***

Proponents take into account the content of this Addendum in the preparation and submission of the Proposal, which will form part of the Contract and should be acknowledged on the Proposal Submission Form.

Upon submitting a Proposal, Proponents are deemed to have received all addenda that are issued and posted on the City's website and considered the information for inclusion in the Proposal Submission.

*Issued by:*

Chris Overes  
Senior Procurement Specialist  
[bid@coquitlam.ca](mailto:bid@coquitlam.ca)