



RFSQ Facility Assessment Services – Ontario School District

Addendum # 1

Thank you for your interest in the Ontario School District RFSQ for Facility Assessment services. The following questions were received by the submission deadline. Please note that some questions were repetitive and have been consolidated for clarity and to reduce duplication.

1) Number of Facilities

Can you also confirm the total number of buildings the District intends to include in this assessment?

a. 7 Facilities

2) Can you please provide the square footage for each school?

- a. Aiken Elementary School - 36,500 sf**
- b. Alameda Elementary School - 43,700 sf**
- c. Cairo Elementary School - 22,800 sf**
- d. May Roberts Elementary - 51,200 sf**
- e. Pioneer Elementary - 13,600 sf**
- f. Ontario Middle School - 99,500 sf**
- g. Ontario High School - 146,300 sf**
- h. Total Square Footage - 413,600 sf**

3) Can the district provide the year each building was built, along with any renovations?

a. This information will be reviewed in detail with the selected firm.

4) Can the district provide the primary function of the building?

a. All buildings in the assessment are schools.

5) I would like to confirm that this assessment is only reviewing structural issues with the Facilities. It is not intended to be a full Facility Condition Assessment to include all building systems per ASTM E2018-24.

a. **This is correct**

6) For planning purposes, could you clarify the District's intended contracting method for this work? Specifically, does OSD8C anticipate awarding a negotiated contract directly to the highest-ranked proposer under this RFSQ, or is the District considering an alternative procurement mechanism such as a cooperative purchasing agreement or another contracting vehicle?

a. **Negotiated contract with the highest ranked proposer.**

7) Does the District have a preference for a replacement model versus a refurbishment model?

a. **- Refurbishing the structures is preferred.**

8) Will this be the District's first Facility Condition Assessment (FCA)? If not, when was the most recent FCA completed?

a. **January of 2025 was the most recent assessment by ODE.**

9) What is your CMMS system?

a. **School Dude**

10) How does this project align with House Bill 3409, Building Performance Standards?

a. **No connection to this bill; this assessment is intended to focus on structural integrity for insurance.**

11) ODE TAP Grant / Reporting Requirements
We understand OSD8C received the Seismic Assessment TAP Grant (2020) and the Asbestos Hazard Assessment TAP Grant (2022). Can you please confirm whether this facility assessment effort is associated with an ODE TAP Grant, and therefore requires any of the following: 1) Use of ODE Certified Facility Assessors, 2) Use of the ODE Facility Assessment Report documentation format 3) Development of an ODE Long-Range Facility Plan process and associated documentation

a. **It is not a part of either grant. This has no connection to ODE**

12) Additionally, we note that OSD8C may be eligible for the 2026 Engineered Wood Roof Systems Assessment Grant and the 2026 Long-Range Facility Planning Grant... Can you please confirm whether either of these grants are tied to this scope or anticipated deliverables?

a. **This RFSQ is not tied to any grant currently; the Engineered Wood Roof System Assessment Grant is under review by the district and may be pursued. This RFSQ is not tied to this grant at this time.**

13) Existing Drawings / Background Documentation
Can you confirm whether the District has existing drawings available for all buildings, particularly for large-span roof structures (gyms, cafeterias, corridors, etc.)?

a. Yes

14) Insurance Documentation Expectations

Since the assessment is intended to provide documentation to the District's insurance provider, are there any specific formatting requirements, templates, or documentation standards preferred by the District and/or the insurer?

a. **We are not aware of any template requirements.**

15) Proposal Size / Page Limit

Is there a preferred page limit and/or maximum file size requirement the District would like firms to follow for the SOQ submission?

a. **No; however, please keep your responses clear, specific, and concise. Lengthy narratives or discussions of only loosely related experiences or processes are discouraged.**

16) 10-Year Plan Parameters

Are there additional parameters for the "10-year plan for necessary upgrades and repairs" like the preferred level of cost estimate detail, prioritization categories, or the format for presenting the cash flow plan?

a. **We will work with the successful firm to determine a plan that will work best for the school board.**

17) Will the scope include site elements such as paving, drainage, fencing, exterior lighting, playgrounds, athletic fields, parking lots, and paved pathways?

a. No

18) Will the assessment be required to comply with any specific recognized standards?

a. No

19) Will this report serve as a full ADA and code compliance report, or is the District primarily interested in identifying and noting code violations? For example, is it the District's intent for assessors to measure each door swing and calculate ramp slopes to ensure full ADA compliance?

a. **This is not an ADA review, if the identified renovation requires an ADA upgrade to maintain code compliance, then it would need to be factored.**

20) Which specific codes would the District like included in the assessment?

a. **This RFSQ is intended for Structural Reviews only.**

21) Is it expected that the assessment team identify grandfathered code conditions that would need to be addressed should a major renovation occur? For example, would certain buildings require elevator installation if a major renovation were undertaken?

a. **Yes, we would expect the awarded firm advise the district on how any modification/renovation may result in additional work for code compliance.**

22) Will District staff be available to escort assessors during each site visit? If so, this could help expedite access and ensure a more complete and comprehensive assessment.

a. Yes

23) The RFSQ notes a “Recommendation to the Board: March 2026.” Given that the RFSQ closes on February 4, could you please clarify the anticipated timeline for vendor selection and award?

a. **We will be reviewing the Proposals in February. Should interviews be required, we plan to hold them towards the end of February and present the selection committee's recommendation at the March board meeting.**

24) Is there an estimated timeframe for when on-site assessments will begin and when the final deliverables are expected to be provided to Ontario School District?

a. **On-Site Assessments would begin immediately upon Award. We will negotiate the required timeframe with the awarded firm.**

25) Will the Project Approach be scored independently from Past Performance?

a. **Yes, see the Proposal Format Content and Evaluation criteria section in the RFQ.**

26) How heavily weighted is prior K–12 and education-sector experience in the evaluation process?

a. **K-12 projects are preferred and will be factored into the past performance score.**