



Lancaster School District

July 10, 2025

Request for Proposals – Geotechnical Engineering for Desert View Elementary, Lincoln Elementary, Mariposa TK-8, & Sierra Elementary Modernization and New Construction

ADDENDUM #2

1. Seeing as the engineer is responsible for selecting the proposed boring locations, their quantities, and identifying any possible subsurface utility conflicts, does the district have As-Built plans they can share to better understand the known utility runs prior to calling DigAlert and conducting out own utility locating at the designated boring locations?

The District has not provided as-builts at this time

2. CGS has identified Lancaster to be within a known liquefaction zone, however we are not seeing a request for a liquefaction study to be performed. Does the district expect the need for a liquefaction study to be performed? If so, we will be looking at additional equipment to be utilized and CGS review of the findings / report.

It is anticipated that CGS will require that liquefaction is factored into the final geological report for the site.

3. Does the district plan on having any soil exported from the site? This will adjust how we proceed with proposing chemical testing as part of Section 7:11.

The project documents have not been developed to the point where this question can be answered.

4. Will the turn around time for this RFP allow for us to conduct our geotechnical investigation while school is out on break or will we need to adjust our scheduling to work around school being in session (ie. After-Hours / Weekend Work) ?

Given that the first day of school is August 12, the work would need to take place on a minimum day dismissal which is every Tuesday or weekends.

5. Please clarify whether the term “subconsultants” refers only to professional service providers (e.g., specialty engineers), or if it also includes field sub-*contractors* or vendors such as drilling contractors that support site exploration work?

It includes all persons associated with the services to be provided.

6. Due to limited driller availability, the scheduling of field work is currently outside our direct control. As a result, we anticipate that meeting the current deadlines tied to Notice to Proceed (NTP) may not be feasible. Specifically, we are requesting an adjustment to the due date schedule to allow us to deliver accurate, quality reporting based on actual field progress rather than fixed NTP dates. Please let us know if the District would be open to this schedule revision for each school site presented below:
 - C. Draft Geotechnical Engineering Report for District Review and Comments – proposed due date: Field Work Completion + 25 calendar days
 - D. Final Geotechnical Engineering Report for District Approval – proposed due date: Field Work Completion + 30 calendar days

The proposed adjustments are acceptable as maximums.

7. The title of Section B of Exhibit B to the Sample Agreement dealing with insurance requirements refers to “Abuse/Molestation Coverage.” However, there is no Abuse/Molestation coverage limits included in the Sample Agreement. Please advise if the District will be hiring the awarded Consultant to carry Abuse/Molestation coverage and if so, what minimum limits are required?

\$2,000,000 per occurrence with minimum \$4,000,000 per occurrence for general Aggregate. The specific endorsement is not needed is the General Liability portion of coverage includes this provision.

8. If the District is requiring Abuse/Molestation coverage, if the awarded Consultant and its subcontractors (if any) have no interaction with students given their scope of work, is the District open to waiving Abuse/Molestation coverage? **Yes.**

9. If the District is requiring Abuse/Molestation coverage, please advise if the District can agree to waive its primary and non-contributory and waiver of

subrogation requirements with respect to any carried Abuse/Molestation coverage? **Yes**

--End Addendum #2--