

**Walker Mountain Road Site 2 MSWL  
Phase 8 Cell Construction  
Bid No. 036-19  
Questions received as of 10-15-2019 – 5:00 p.m.**

Q: It appears the spec section 2778 is missing from the technical specifications. Can those be provided and I assume I can find answers to questions once they are uploaded to the website in the same location as the initial RFP?

A: The Proposal has been revised to include this section and has been posted on the City of Rome web Site.

Q: Is the requirement for Atterberg testing correct in Table 1 from TS-0220 relative to the Compacted Clay liner?

A: See 2019-10-4 Addendum 01w Q-R and Specs., posted on web site.

Q: Atterberg is required on the compacted clay liner borrow source at 1/5,000 CYDS, it is then required on the field testing at 1/40,000 SF/Lift, and is then required on the Undisturbed sample at 1/40,000 SF/Lift.

A: See 2019-10-4 Addendum 01w Q-R and Specs., posted on web site.

Q: Additionally, the frequency table states in several places that testing is 1/10,000 SF/Lift or 1/lift/800 LF. Is the or correct, or should this be and?

A: See 2019-10-4 Addendum 01w Q-R and Specs., posted on web site.

Q:Spec section 2510, 1.05 (Inspections and Testing) D1 requires the GAB to be density tested by means of ASTM D2167. Is use of the nuclear density gauge backscatter acceptable if the 8-inches of GAB is placed in two 4-inch lifts and tested accordingly on each lift?

A: See 2019-10-4 Addendum 01w Q-R and Specs., posted on web site.

Q: Due to the time of year that the above referenced contract is expected to be issued, holidays, and bad weather constraints (lost work days) typically encountered in the winter months November through March (See Attached Exhibit B) not including lost workdays due to wet site conditions due to low temperatures not allowing the site to dry following precipitation, it may prove to be next to impossible to complete this work in the 210 days allotted. Please consider extending the allowed days for completion of the work by at least 60 calendar days or delaying the Notice-to-Proceed until Spring 2020.

A: No extension will be made to the days to complete the project.

Q: Can the City provide information on where Soil Liner and Operational Cover materials where obtained for previous cell/cap constructions?

A: The only record we have regarding the source of the Soil Liner Materials is found within our “Report of Certification of Construction Quality Assurances Services” for Site 2 – Phase 7 by Wilmer Engineering which states, “The soil liner materials were excavated from an approved off-site borrow source.”

Q: Since UPS will only guarantee delivery before 10:00 am, if the package is delivered at 10:00 sharp it may not be received by to proper department in time to be accepted. Will the City consider moving to bid time back to at least 10:30 or later?

A: No modification will be made to the Bid Time.

Q: Specifications indicate clay line materials has to meet a classification (ASTM D2487) of MH, CL or ML. Can other classification be considered for the  $1 \times 10^{-5}$  soil liner material?

A: The specified designations of MH, CL or ML per ASTM D2487 describe general classifications related to sand/clay/silt sized particles determined during sieve analysis. The true metric is meeting the  $1 \times 10^{-5}$  cm/sec or  $1 \times 10^{-7}$  cm/sec permeability when compacted in-place as specified. The soil can also be supplemented with bentonite admixture to meet permeability as allowed in Section 01025 and 02200.

Q: To what density is the Leachate Collection Blanket required to be compacted (e.g. 85, 90, etc. Std. Proctor) to for the permeability testing and what confining pressure are the Soil Liner and Leachate Collection Blanket required to be tested at to determine Permeabilities?

A: The placement requirements of the leachate collection blanket are defined in Section 02200 Part 3.04 F. Additionally, Table 1 of Section 02200 define the requirements for permeability testing.

Q: I do not see a reference to the forms under Tabs I through VII; where should they fall in our submittal? Possibly Tab VI?

A: That will be fine

Q: I also see a reference to a Declaration of Insurance form made in the Bidder's Declaration but I do not see a form. Would this just be a copy of our Certificate of Insurance?

A: A copy of a Certificate of Insurance is not required as part of this Proposal. We only require a Certificate of Insurance from the Contractor selected to complete the project.

Q: Pay Item 17 – Temporary Stormwater Controls. Where is the detail for the Temp. Stormwater Berm, Temp. SW Valve Assembly, and Temp. SW Sump located. Please clarify.

A: Item 17 would be constructed per the "Temporary Leachate Berm" Detail on sheet C-702 absent of the rock toe shown on sheet C-201. The location of this berm is not shown on the grading plan as it represents a contingency plan to construct a partial cell if construction runs longer than expected due to unforeseen conditions (e.g. weather, rock excavation, etc). If used, the length would be adjusted per in-place quantity.

Q: Per Dwg. C-701, Perimeter Berm Anchor Trench Detail, shows the Temporary Stormwater Cover terminating at the toe of slope with a "sand filled ballast tube", adjacent to the Perimeter Berm. Does this detail apply to the Temporary Stormwater Cover anywhere on this project? It appears per Dwg. C-201 that the Temporary Stormwater Cover is continuous in all shaded areas at the South and terminates at elevation 820. It does not appear that this "sand filled ballast tube" Detail will be required. Please clarify.

A: The sand filled ballast will be required at the lower termination of the stormwater diversion cover (i.e. along elevation 820).

Q: Per Dwg. C-701, Perimeter Berm Anchor Trench Detail, will the "sand filled ballast tube" be required continuously across the cell at elevation 820?

A: See response to question 1 above.

Q: Will Measurement & Payment of the surface area for geomembrane and other liner items be based upon two or three dimensional measurement?

A: As stated in Section 01025 "Payment quantities shall be the actual geomembrane surface area, but shall not include overlaps, patches, repairs or extension of material beyond the required limits." Therefore, the three dimensional measurement will apply.

Q: Will the sand bag ballast for the Temporary Stormwater Cover require roping? One direction or two directions?

A: Yes. Section 02775 Part 3.01 B requires the sand bags to be tied. Two directions is preferred.

Q: Per Dwg. C-703, Rock Toe-Drain Detail, this detail shows a requirement for an extra layer of 60 mil HDPE geomembrane. Please provide location where this detail is required. Also, please provide approximate surface area requiring extra layer of geomembrane.

A: The Rock Toe Drain is to be located at the Temporary Leachate Berm as shown on Sheet C-201.

Q: Based on addendum 1, Questions and Responses No. 1, Bullets 1 – 3 it appears to indicate that the Contractor is required to perform laboratory and field testing but it was stated ant the pre-bid meeting this was performed by CQA contracted separately by the Owner. Please clarify testing required performed by CQA and the Contractor for this project.

A: The information in Addendum 1 does not state that the Contractor is to do the testing. This is information for third party CQA.

Q: Per the specs, horizontal seams will not be allowed on the slopes for GCL and Geocomposite. The manufacturers do not have the capability of producing rolls to cover the length of the NW slope. Will this remain a requirement or is there an acceptable alternative method to this?

A: Horizontal seams not being allowed is a standard spec for slopes, and they should always be avoided, but in cases like this project, where they will happen, the below is how we handle them to comply with the EPD approved requirements:

1. If seams must occur on the slopes, they have to be staggered, and we would like that staggering to be at least 10 feet apart.

2. Just because the horizontal seams have to occur, does not mean the EPD requirements can be ignored. We will have to treat each seam as a failed seam because it does not comply with the EPD approved requirements. We require a cap strip to be placed over the seam to effectively repair the defective seam. This also provides a reinforcement (or secondary seam) for that slope seam (which we both know should be a strong, successful weld all on its own). This approach keeps us in compliance with the EPD approved requirements, and lets us get the long slopes covered.

We have been using this strategy since 1990, and EPD (nor any other State) have ever taken issue with it.