



Request For Proposal

Facility and Building Condition Assessments PRJ# 26015

ADDENDUM NO. 2

Issued: April 17, 2026

Closing Date: 2:00pm, Local Time (PST), April 23, 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 April 17, 2026 the Request for Proposal documents for the PRJ26015: Facility & Building Condition Assessments shall be amended as specified below.

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS:

Q1: Are the roof cut tests intended to confirm the presence and condition of thermal anomalies as determined by the thermographic scan, or are the roof cut tests meant for a generic assessment and minimum 4 cut tests per roof section >10yrs old required regardless?

Typically cut tests will be done where thermographic scans show an anomaly. These are typically at low spots, or near complex geometries or near penetrations on the roof, as these typically are higher risk areas for failure. It is generally recommended to reduce the number of unnecessary penetrations or cuts made in the roof membrane, especially for single-ply membranes.

A1: *The cut tests should provide a generic assessment of the general composition of the roofing on "flat roofs" areas i.e. number of plies, insulation thickness, etc.*

Cut tests can be reduced from four (4) to One (1) cut test per roof area (roof area can be determined by a distinct separation of the roofs typically being an 8" divider) and should be completed at a transition area, different top layer of the roofing materials, etc.

The consultant should provide the expected number of cut tests per facility and provide a price per additional cut test if and when required.

Additional cut tests to clarify thermal anomalies should be completed at the additional cut test prices provided in the proposal.

The RDCK does not have any “single-ply” roofing e.g. TPO, EPDM, etc.

Q2: Can RDCK please confirm which roofs are 10yrs old and older and what type of roofing materials are present? We assume the prior reports may have mentioned this information. If RDCK has prior condition assessment reports of the facilities with ages of the roof sections, can these roof areas be shared to help determine how many roof cut tests we should account for and the types of roofs that are present? This will help with costing the cut tests.

A2: Yes, the prior Roth Lam’s reports provide information regarding roof ages of the facilities. The CDRD has most recently had roof sections replaced with additional roofing sections to be completed this year. Please refer to answer 1.

A list of reports, drawings, etc. was provided in Appendix B: Supporting documentation and can be requested by the Consultant prior to the RFP closing date, otherwise it will be provided to the successful proponent.

Q3: Is RDCK looking for a Certified Thermographer to perform the IR scans? If so, which Level: 1, 2, or 3? Typically, clients ask for Level 1, and sometimes Level 2, and rarely a Level 3, as a point of reference. This will help ensure a qualified and trained individual is performing the scans, knows how to use the IR camera, knows what to look for, when to perform the scan, how to perform the scan, and how to properly analyse and interpret the IR images.

Typically, the IR scan/roof cut tests are performed as a separate activity from a BCA and can be a separate project. The IR scan is used to obtain a general overview of the condition of the roof, and the cut tests are used to verify the anomalies observed in the IR scan.

A3: Please provide a minimum of Level 2 certification for thermography. Please refer to answer 1.

The RDCK has had previous condition assessments completed and are requiring more comprehensive assessments.

Q4: Project Scheduling / Phasing: Is the Consultant permitted to conduct assessments for multiple facilities concurrently, or does the RDCK expect the assessments to be completed sequentially by site?

A4: Yes, the Consultant would be permitted to conduct the assessments concurrently to ensure the completion date is met.

Q5: Roof Access: Can the RDCK confirm whether all facility roofs are safely accessible for inspection and testing purposes, or should the Consultant include provisions for access equipment (e.g., lifts, fall protection systems) in their scope?

*A5: NDCC roof access via door to main roof areas – 6’ ladder required for upper roof areas
CDRD internal roof access ladder with hatch – extension ladder required for upper roof area (pool).
CDCC internal roof access with hatch to access majority of roof areas.
Rotacrest – extension ladder required
Creston Public Library – extension ladder required.*

Q6: Extent of Destructive Testing: The RFP indicates that destructive testing may be required as part of the investigation. Could the RDCK clarify the expected extent, limitations, and preferred methodologies for destructive testing (e.g., types of systems, depth of investigation, and acceptable level of disruption)?

A6: Destructive testing beyond cut testing should only be completed on an as required basis to further determine extent of damages, ingress, etc. The Consultant should provide their methodology of what, when and how destructive testing should be undertaken. If extensive testing is required, this should be flagged by the Consultant at the time of review and brought to the attention of the RDCK project manager to determine next steps and additional funds if required.

Q7: Roof Cut Test Requirements: The RFP specifies that “cut tests [are] to be completed at a minimum of 4 locations per roof section” for roofs over 10 years old. Could the RDCK clarify how a “roof section” is defined (e.g., by construction phase, area, or system type), and whether additional testing beyond the minimum is anticipated?

A7: This should be per roof area. See Answer 1 above.

Q8: Prioritized Schedule and Cost Indexing: The RFP requires “a prioritized schedule for the work and an estimated budget indexed for Castlegar, BC.” Could the RDCK elaborate on expectations for:

- o The level of detail required in the prioritization (e.g., by system, deficiency, or project package), and
- o The methodology for cost indexing (e.g., use of specific regional cost databases, inflation indices, or escalation assumptions)?

A8: Prioritized by building system (envelope, electrical, structural etc) according to safety and code requirements, condition/lifecycle needs, aesthetics

Regional cost comparison – use indexing for Kootenay region – inflation cost escalations.

Q9: Do you anticipate the need for a roof cut test on the Creston Library and Rotacrest Hall, as they both contain sloped roofs with asphalt shingles? Please confirm, as typically these are not done.

A9: No, cut tests are not required on shingled roof areas. However, roof composition should be determined i.e. decking type, eaves protection, underlayment, flashings, ventilation, etc.

Q10: Is RDCK requiring a roof cut test for roof sections with metal panel coverings? Please confirm, as typically these are not done.

A10: No, metal roof sections do not need to be cut test. However, roof composition should be determined i.e. decking type, insulation, ventilation, etc.

Except as modified by this Addendum No. 2 issued April 17, 2026 and Addendum No. 1 issued April 10, 2026, the Request for Proposal documents for PRJ26015 shall remain unchanged.



Carolyn Hogan
Project Manager

- END OF DOCUMENT -