

**GEORGETOWN COUNTY
CLASS THREE LANDFILL CELLS 8-12 &
CLASS TWO LANDFILL CLOSURE PROJECT
PROJECT BID #18-041**

The following is a compilation of all questions received by 3:00 PM on Wednesday, June 6, 2018:

1. Please provide a detail showing the tie-in of the Leachate Force Main to the existing facilities.
 - A) Please see addendum 1.
2. How is the Force Main to be terminated for future expansion, end cap, blind flange, etc.?
 - A) Please see addendum 1.
3. Please provide specifications for the Flow Meters. If they are to be furnished by others, please provide the "cut sheets" so that we can determine what will be needed for installation.
 - A) Please see addendum 1.
4. Are the bottom horizontal sections of the sideslope risers to be perforated? If so, please provide the perforation pattern.
 - A) Please see addendum 1.
5. There is a detail for an ARV inside of a Manhole on Sheet 7. Where and how many of these are required for this project?
 - A) Please see addendum 1.
6. The Valve inside of the Valve Box closest to the sideslope riser is specified as being both a check valve and a gate valve. Please clarify.
 - A) Please see addendum 1.
7. Are PVC Valves acceptable for use inside of the Valve Box? If not, please specify the valves.
 - A) Please see addendum 1.
8. At the pre-bid it was mentioned that the contractor would be allowed to mix the soil in place in lieu of using a pug mill, what are the approved methods for mixing in place?

A) The techniques and procedures are described in detail in Section 02275. (With regard to a question asked at the pre-bid meeting, where the term “tiller” and “bentonite” was used in the question, the response to this question did not modify Section 02275).

9. There is only one test pit in the portion of the borrow area shown to be excavated on the borrow area development plan. If necessary, can we develop other areas of the pit if needed to find the proper soil types required to complete this project?

A) Yes, see borrow area notes on drawings for borrow area use/development requirements

10. Were there any permeabilities run on any of the test pit materials - both sands and clays? If so, can you share that information with us?

A) All laboratory test data was provided in the “Information Available to Bidders.”

11. Are the soils in the proposed on-site borrow area approved for used on this project?

A) As stated in the project manual, the “County borrow area shown on the drawings made available to the contractor for the contractor’s use at the contractor’s option, see borrow area notes on drawings for borrow area use/development requirements”

12. Will the soils from the proposed on-site borrow area require amendment with bentonite?

A) It is the responsibility of the bidder/contractor to make this determination.

13. Per Detail 5/7 shows a 60 mil HDPE Rub Sheet. Will this rub sheet be measured and paid or is it considered incidental to the scope of the work?

A) Please included this cost in line item 13.

14. Per detail 5/7 shows an 8 oz geotextile (double layer) over the 60 mil HDPE rub sheet. Under what bid item are we to place the cost associated with this geotextile?

A) Please included this cost in line item 13.

15. Per detail 6/7, is the temporary 40 mil FML to be extrusion welded to the bottom 60 mil textured geomembrane?

A) No

16. Is CCR a component of waste in this landfill? There are mentions of CCR in the documents – but this is unclear. If so, will the GCL need to be tested with site specific leachate? Or can synthetic leachate chemistry be provided to the manufacturers to base the GCL material on?

A) No CCR waste material will be disposed in Cells 8-12; therefore, in reference to specification Section 02277, paragraphs 1.04 A.8, 2.01 D, and 2.03 B will not be required.

17. Also, does this project have wage scale (davis bacon) or union requirements?

A) I did a word search of the pdf "Bid 18-041 Project Manual" and the term "wage scale" or "union" did not appear.

18. Is limestone acceptable for use in the leachate system?

A) No. See section 02700.

19. After review of the provided geotechnical report for the possible onsite borrow area, it appears that the onsite soils fail to consistently meet all criteria required (either gradation, PI or LL) for soil needed and may not be usable. Furthermore, it appears that many of the off-site soil pits may also fail to meet the spec also. For example, in an effort to find protective cover, it will be very difficult and expensive to locate soil that consistently meets the gradations limits of the eight sieves of table 1 (section 02700) as well as being classified as C-33 Sand. As one sieve is obtained, another sieve will likely go out of range. With so many sieve requirements on one product, it will be difficult to meet specification, consistently, throughout the project. Will it be possible to delete the middle sieve requirements for all soils, including the backfill soils, protective cover soils, protective cover (C-33) sand, protective cover gravel (#57), and Final Cover Soil specifications?

A) Sieve requirements will remain as stated in Section 02700 without modification.

20. In part 2 (Products) of the protective cover spec (02700), there is mention that both products (#57 stone and C-33 Sand) "will be used for filtration around the leachate collection pipes.." Please clarify which product shall be used against the LC pipes.

A) See Detail 6, Sheet 7 for aggregate filter required around leachate collection pipes.

21. In part 2 (Products) of the Final Cover spec (02290) paragraph B lists the requirements of the soil to be acceptable for Final Cover. Item 3 requires organics in the upper 6" layer only. The pH range mentioned is normally for topsoil and item 7 requires a permeability which usually cannot be achieved with topsoil. Please explain how this single 24" layer is to be placed and tested.

A) Permeability requirement has been removed. Refer to Section 02290 as included in Addendum 1.

22. Please see the enclosed link to KanaPipe. As you know, our primary focus is HDPE pipe. We also have an environmental pump division. As of the beginning of this year, we are the exclusive distributor in the Carolinas, for KanaPipe, too. KanaPipe is a steel reinforced, corrugated HDPE pipe that is as strong as RCP, with a 20 PSI bell &

spigot joint. The steel is encapsulated in the single corrugation that spirals linearly down the pipe. The pipe can be buried up to 50' in depth. Only class V RCP exceeds this burial capacity. The 20 PSI joint exceeds the requirement for gravity sewer.

We plan to send separate quote for KanaPipe in lieu of RCP, to the Georgetown County Landfill bidders, as value added engineering. The material cost of KanaPipe is significantly less than RCP. The installation cost of KanaPipe is also significantly less than RCP, because it so much lighter in weight, than RCP.

A) We will not allow Kanapipes on this project. Thank you for passing on the information. We will consider it for future projects.

23. Please clarify whether all the CQC geotechnical & Surveying documents (as-built drawings, reports, and documents) for all soil work, layers, liner work and SCDEQ documents are to be provided by the Contractor.

A) Please refer to Section 01400 and appropriate technical specifications.

END OF QUESTIONS