

Answers to RFI's for LAAF Drainage Basin Repair – Phase 1:

Questions from 6/26/2020:

Question 1:

At the site walk, the government stated that an archeologist would be required as part of the contract. Please provide details on this scope of work, including a list of approved archeologists if possible.

Answer 1 (Ron Hobgood):

Details of the SOW for the archeological requirements are now listed in Addendum #1 to original SOW, pages 13-18 specifically.

List of cultural resources companies who may be able to provide the monitoring services:

The NDN Companies

<http://thendncompanies.com/>

Shawna Newman

11200 St. John's Industrial Parkway N

Suite 2

Jacksonville, Florida 32246

(904) 800-2671 Office

(904) 503-8401 Direct

(850) 232-6299 Cell

(904) 212-2684 Fax

New South and Associates

LG2 Environmental Solutions

AECOM

Edwards-Pitman Environmental

Terra-X (Provided monitoring services previously) Southern Research Brockington & Associates TRC

Panamerican Consultants SEARCH

New South and Associates

<https://newsouthassoc.com/>

6150 East Ponce de Leon Avenue Stone Mountain, GA 30083

Phone: (770) 498-4155 ~ Fax: (770) 498-3809

LG2 Environmental Solutions

<https://lg2es.com/>

10475 Fortune Parkway, Ste. 201

Jacksonville, FL 32256

800-435-0072

AECOM

<https://aecom.com/>

1999 Avenue of the Stars

Suite 2600

Los Angeles, CA 90067

United States

T +1 (213) 593 8000

F +1 (213) 593 8178

Edwards-Pitman Environmental

<http://www.edwards-pitman.com/>

2700 Cumberland Parkway, Suite 300

Atlanta, Georgia 30339

p. 770-333-9484

f. 770-333-8277

TERRAXplorations

<http://www.terraxplorations.com/>

3130 University Blvd E • Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35404 • 205-799-5638

Southern Research

<https://southres.com/>

Post Office Box 1630 • Pine Mountain, Georgia 31822 • 706-489-3247

Brockington & Associates

<https://brockington.org/>

4000 DeKalb Technology Parkway, Suite 400 Atlanta, Georgia 30340

770-662-5807 tel

770-662-5824 fax

TRC

<https://www.trccompanies.com/>

4155 Shackleford Road

Suite 225

Norcross, GA 30093

United States

T (770) 270-1192

Panamerican Consultants

<http://www.panamconsultants.com/>

3064 Palisades Court

Tuscaloosa, AL 35405

MAILING ADDRESS

Post Office Box 20884

Tuscaloosa, AL 35402

Phone: 205-248-8767

Fax: 205-248-8739

Question 2 (Ron Hobgood):

Please provide clarification on where excavated dirt from this project must be placed.

Answer 2:

See attached/embedded map (**Attachment #1**):



LAAF Excess Soil
Spreading Location

Question 3 (Jonathan Mack):

There are several areas where pipe is to be enlarged under existing paving. Please provide details of paving & base thickness, and method of dowelling into the adjacent paving.

Answer 3:

The contractor should anticipate airfield pavement to be constructed per the appropriate UFC which is **UFC 3-260-02**, throughout project area.

Question 4 (Sara Forrest):

Please clarify what erosion control will be required.

Answer 4:

As we cannot require specific means and methods, the erosion control requirements cannot be specifically defined prior to the official submittal of the project. That said however, road and infrastructure maintenance is exempt from the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction general permitting if the following criteria is met and applicable:

- i. This must be strictly routine maintenance for the original purpose of the road and infrastructure that is maintained.
- ii. The original line, grade, and hydraulic capacity must remain the same as applicable.
- iii. Best Management Practices (BMPs) are to be implemented per The Manual for Erosion and Sediment Control in Georgia as practical.
- iv. Conservation and engineering practices should be considered and implemented to prevent erosion and resultant sedimentation.
- v. No mass grading shall occur.

- vi. The repair and maintenance must use the original material that was previously used in the construction or past maintenance of the road / infrastructure (i.e. dirt roads maintained with dirt: gravel roads maintained with gravel).
- vii. This maintenance shall be stabilized by the end of each day with permanent and/or temporary stabilization measures.
- viii. The maintenance activity described shall last no longer than 120 calendar days.
- ix. Final stabilization practices must be implemented and established by the end of the maintenance activity.

If any of the above criteria is not met based on the environmental submittal analysis, than a NPDES Construction permit will be required.

Any deviation from the existing footprint of the infrastructure must be noted in the Record of Environmental Consideration as land disturbances rather than a maintenance activity, if the additional disturbances equal greater than 1 acre, a NPDES permit would be required. The foot print of the project will be analyzed for contiguous disturbance greater than an acre to make that determination.

Portions of LAAF fall under both Fort Benning's MS4 NPDES Permit and Industrial NPDES Permit. Both of these storm water discharge permits may have regulations applicable regarding discharges from projects that fall within specific areas on the airfield footprint. Fort Benning currently manages these programs under the Storm Water Management Plan and the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan which outline that BMPs should be implemented in order to prevent pollutants from entering the system.

Question 5 (Andrew Wilson):

The scope of work states "A survey to confirm the results and recommendations of the attached studies will be required before any designs can be approved for this project. Designers will be required to confirm and include the recommendations outlined in the study, or provide designs of their own that meet or exceed the study's recommendations and Installation requirements." Is this survey to be completed prior to bid or after award? A pre-bid survey will require significant investment with no guarantee of recovering this cost. A survey completed after award may identify a different scope of work than what we have been given to price and require a modification.

Answer 5:

Any survey work is expected to be part of the Contractor's bid. The Government is not directing, nor expecting the Contractors to conduct a full survey of the project area prior to award of this project.

Questions from 7/7/2020:

Question 6 (Sara Forrest):

Will land disturbance for open cut/land disturbance be treated in a cumulative manner (possibly exceeding 1 acre in disturbance) or individually since disturbance will not be contiguous?

Answer 6:

Only contiguous land disturbance exceeding 1 acre requires permitting. Phasing of the project, while allowed for various reasons cannot be done to avoid permitting. If pockets or segments of disturbance are to occur, the proximity to each other, timing of construction and work plan of the contractor will be considered to determine if the areas can be considered non-contiguous. Consultation with GA EPD will occur if needed.

Question 7 (Sara Forrest):

During the initial site visit it was noted by EMD that typical NPDES requirements may not hold precedent on this project due to its location on the airfield and the potential for disturbing archaeological sites when installing silt fence, construction entrances, concrete washouts, etc. Is there a basis of bid that bidding contractors should follow with regard to erosion control measures?

Answer 7:

BMP's are still required to be installed and as per the GA Erosion Control Manual, however, consideration would be considered in order to avoid areas of un-needed disturbance. Sediment storage if required would need to be met, and calculations provided however consideration to FOD on the airfield, the avoidance of sensitive areas are all considered during the review of any required ESPCPs. Should an ESPCP not be required, the prevention of pollution from entering storm drains as per the MS4 requirements is to be implemented by utilizing appropriate BMPs and good housekeeping methods.

Please note- Fort Benning no longer requires ESPCPs for land minor land disturbance unless the disturbance is occurring within 200 feet of a state water. Portions of the drainage system on LAAF could potentially be within the 200 foot area and a plan would be needed. This does not necessarily trigger the need for permitting.

Question 8 (Ron Hobgood):

Does the archaeologist have to be present during backfill of the open cut/land disturbance items?

Answer 8:

The archaeologists need to be on site during the entirety of the project. They will need to be present during all construction activities.

Question 9 (Sara Forrest):

Can open cut and trenchless construction activities occur simultaneously since trenchless activities will not result in land disturbance?

Answer 9:

Yes, however, the size of the open cut area, proximity to the nearest open cut area and the work plan of the contractor will be considered to make that determination.

Question 10 (Ron Hobgood):

Is the archaeologist solely required to be on site during open cut / land disturbance activity or are they also required to be on site during trenchless rehab, spraycast, and heavy cleaning operations?

Answer 10:

The archaeologists need to be on site during the entirety of the project. They will need to be present during all construction activities.

Question 11 (Andrew Wilson):

365 day duration does not appear to be substantial enough to complete this sow given the requirements. Will the project duration be extended longer than 365 days?

Answer 11:

Yes, Period of Performance has been extended to 540 days for this project.

Questions from 7/9/2020:

Question 12 (Andrew Wilson):

Please identify the overall footprint of the SOW. The SOW describes on Page 2 ii General Description, This project, identified as "Repair Storm Water System - LAAF Drainage Basin, Phase I" is for work to repair the storm water system south of Jecelin Road running underneath Lawson Army Airfield to the Chattahoochee River. The "Phase I" repairs to the storm water system in the Lawson Army Airfield (LAAF) Drainage Basin is outlined in the attached study reports. HOWEVER, in the original solicitation we received Phase I June 2017 and Phase II September 2018 documents. Please clarify the line of demarcation for field work and design requirements under this contract. We have included an aerial boundary in this RFI as our understanding of the work limits within this solicitation. Please provide further clarification for bidding purposes.

Answer 12:

The overview map you have provided as your understanding of the boundaries identified in the SOW appears accurate to our scoped boundaries of the projects. Please see embedded file below depicting the phase line for LAAF Drainage Basin Repair (**Attachment #2**).



Question 13 (Andrew Wilson):

Does the numbering of the nodes titled "Storage Areas" in Appendix H correspond to the locations of the "Proposed Detention Ponds" in Table 7?

Answer 13:

Yes.

Question 14 (Andrew Wilson):

Are the quantities and sizes listed in the excel file (Table of Pipes and Structures) provided by MICC the basis of bid? In other words, if there are conflicts or inaccuracies listed in these reports that are discovered post bid during the design and construction phase will this be addressed via modification? Given the amount of information provided we can only assume that the excel file is to be used as a basis of bid.

Answer 14:

The Contractors can rely on the provided bidding documents that represent a 35% Design of the project to competitively bid their proposals. As these maps, spreadsheets, and other information are representative of the 35% Design provided to the Contractors for competitive bid, the Contractors assume at their own risk that the data contained within is "accurate for the final engineered state".

Questions from 7/10/2020:

Question 15 (Andrew Wilson):

We are concerned that the time allowed for this project (365 days) is inadequate due to the extensive design requirements, forewarned delays contained in the SOW for cultural resource issues and airfield operations being more important than contractor operations. We recommend the government consider increasing the time on this project to 730 days.

Answer 15:

The Government has updated the Period of Performance to 540 days, released in Addendum #2 to the original SOW.

Question 16 (Andrew Wilson):

The work indicated within the provided maps and spreadsheets is well defined and biddable. In the SOW under paragraph 2.a.ii.3, the government states “Designers will be required to confirm and include the recommendations outlined in the study... .” This could be interpreted to mean the government wants the contractor’s DOR to re-model the entire system. Modeling stormwater systems is a phenomenally time consuming (and expensive) task that would also require the DOR to re-survey every node in the entire drainage base to confirm the study that has been conducted by Barge. Please confirm that the government does not require any modeling from the contractor on this project.

Answer 16:

The Government requires the Contractors to adhere to the guidance directed in paragraph 2.a.ii.3. For any designs to be approved by the Government following award, the Contractors must show that a complete survey was conducted to either:

- i. Confirm the results of the study provided and the study’s applicability to the design criteria of a 25 year, 24 hour return period storm event, or
- ii. Develop new designs for repairing the stormwater sewer system’s shortfalls in hydraulic capacities and efficiencies as outlined in the studies to meet or exceed the design criteria of a 25 year, 24 hour return period storm event.

Question 17 (Andrew Wilson):

This project is given to the MATOC pool as a competitive bid project. The bid documents provided by the Govt describe a scope of work with defined locations, sizes, lengths and requirements. However, the SOW page 3, Note 3 describes after award requirements that require basically a complete redesign “at risk”. The potential risk of either “confirm or redesign” of Barge’s study is excessive. For the contractor to accept the level of risk described in Note 3, would require a full design in advance of bidding; this is not be expected for a MATOC bid. In order to provide level competition, can the contractor rely on the maps, spreadsheets and other information provided by the government and bid accordingly. Also, can we trust the information given in the contract documents describes the complete and accurate scope of work and that it is, within reason, accurate for the final engineered state?

Answer 17:

The Contractors can rely on the provided bidding documents that represent a 35% Design of the project to competitively bid their proposals. As these maps, spreadsheets, and other information are representative of the 35% Design provided to the Contractors for competitive bid, the Contractors assume at their own risk that the data contained within is “accurate for the final engineered state”.

Question 18 (Andrew Wilson):

Can the contractor assume that the information given as bid documents is accurate in relation to scope, size, quantity, length and location? Can the contractor base their lump sum competitive bid on the information provided by the Govt?

Answer 18:

The information provided by the Government in relation to scope, size, quantity, length, and location is accurate to the best of the Government's knowledge. It still remains the responsibility of the Contractor to conduct field/site visits to obtain and verify measurements, existing site conditions, dimensions, and any other requirements from the information provided. The Government has provided all documents necessary to constitute a 35% Design for competitive bid by the Contractors.

Question 19 (Sara Forrest):

NPDES Permitting. Will the contractor be required to obtain NPDES permits on any of the work included in this contract?

Answer 19:

This will be determined based on submittals from the contractor during the NEPA process. There are various contributing factors dependent on the means and methods the contractor determines.

Question 20 (Sara Forrest):

NPDES Permitting. If the contractor is required to obtain NPDES permitting, will Fort Benning support the contractor in agreeing that this is not an earthwork project, but instead is a linear/pipeline/utility type project that would fall under the auspices of an Infrastructure Construction Permit - GAR100002.

Answer 20:

If permitting is required this would fall under an infrastructure permit unless additional non-contiguous area is utilized for spreading of spoils.

Question 21 (Andrew Wilson):

Design Deliverables. Much of this work would only require confirmation of the existing structure conditions and sizes for preparation of a comprehensive map, plan sheets and specifications outlining the finalized scope of work (prepared and stamped by a professional engineer). Included in this list is all the work included in the spreadsheet under the OPEN TRENCH STRUCTURES and TRENCHLESS REHAB tabs as well as most of the work under the OPEN TRENCH STORMDRAINS tab (with the exception of replacing whole segments of pipe). Will the government agree with this approach on these items of work?

Answer 21:

Yes, if you are outlining the approach of accepting the recommendations provided in the 35% Design documents and study provided, AND plan on conducting your own complete survey to confirm the results of the study according to the design criteria set for a 25 year, 24 hour return period storm event. This will satisfy the Government's request for a survey and design that meet or exceed the requirements and design criteria set forth in the drainage basin study provided.

Question 22 (Andrew Wilson):

Design Deliverables. Assuming the government agrees with the recommendation above, will the government allow the contractor to submit these items on a "Fast-Track" basis so we can get working ASAP after award?

Answer 22:

The Government will be open to "Fast-Tracking" after award.

Question 23 (Andrew Wilson):

If the designer of record finds that pipes requiring lining based on the RFP documentation are smaller than indicated in the RFP, are we to stop work and notify the government to allow them to evaluate the sizing?

Answer 23:

The expectation of the Government is that the awarded Contractor will identify this issue during their survey/design phase of their project as a check on the study's recommendations and accuracy according to the design criteria of a 25 year, 24 hour return period storm event. In any case, the Government would expect to be notified of the discrepancy and look for the Contractor DOR's recommendation to repair the pipe given the above design criteria.

Question 24 (Andrew Wilson):

If the designer of record believes that the government would be better served by the replacement of a structure (manhole, headwall or inlet) as opposed to rehabilitation, will the government negotiate a change order to compensate the contractor assuming they agree with the designer's recommendation?

Answer 24:

The Government is not dictating the "means and methods" of construction and repairs. The provided documentation is a 35% Design package made up primarily of a study conducted on the conditions of the infrastructure and recommended repairs. The Contractor and their DOR can choose to follow the recommendations that are based on a 25 year, 24 hour return period storm event and simply confirm those results through an independent survey of their own, or they can choose to design a separate

approach that meets or exceeds the recommendations provided with the given design criteria. In either case, the Government will approve the designs provided by the Contractor and any later deviations from the designs provided by the Contractor will be addressed through the Fort Benning Contracting Office.

Question 25 (Andrew Wilson):

If the contractor prefers to replace a section of pipe instead of lining it, will the government accept that or are we bound to the actions outlined in the RFP?

Answer 25:

The Government is not dictating the “means and methods” of construction and repairs. The provided documentation is a 35% Design package made up primarily of a study conducted on the conditions of the infrastructure and recommended repairs. The Contractor and their DOR can choose to follow the recommendations that are based on a 25 year, 24 hour return period storm event and simply confirm those results through an independent survey of their own, or they can choose to design a separate approach that meets or exceeds the recommendations provided with the given design criteria. In either case, the Government will approve the designs provided by the Contractor and any later deviations from the designs provided by the Contractor will be addressed through the Fort Benning Contracting Office.

Question 26 (Andrew Wilson):

Is the designer of record responsible for modeling the as-built system following construction? If so, will the government provide the designer with the model used to prepare this RFP?

Answer 26:

The Government will not provide the company utilized in the development of the provided study and recommendations. The Government will require as-builts following construction.

Question 27 (Andrew Wilson):

What information is required at as-built for the government’s GIS system?

Answer 27:

The Government will require “As-Builts” as described on page 6 of the SOW.

Question 28 (Sara Forrest):

What is the contractor to do with the material that is removed from the system under the heavy cleaning effort? Can it be used on site as part of the sinkhole filling work?

Answer 28:

This will probably be dependent on the type of material removed and if it is considered suitable fill.

Question 29 (Andrew Wilson):

On all notations for required “heavy cleaning” of underground storm lines; after cleaning, is any modification or work required on these listed lines? If damage is found and repairs are required, will this work be performed under a modification to the contract? Given the limited information, we would be unable to provide competitive pricing on an undefined yet to be determined scope.

Answer 29:

Yes, repair items limited by “unforeseen conditions” would be later addressed as modifications to the contract.

Question 30 (Jonathan Mack):

CIPP Work. The term CIPP is fairly stringent and is interpreted to mean pulling a resin impregnated felt liner between structures and then applying heat and a curing compound to create a structurally sound liner within the existing pipe. However, there are alternative means and methods that may be more advantageous from a cost perspective. Are other technologies acceptable to the government or is CIPP literally intended to mean the felt liner method mentioned above? Please provide specification on CIPP.

Answer 30:

Other technologies will be acceptable as long they meet or exceed the life expectancy of the resin impregnated felt liner method. What is provided as a solution from the Government in the 35% design documents is a suggestion, the contractor can provide an alternate solution. Attached is the design basis for the 35% design documents (**Attachment #3**).



CIPP
FerraTex_Applied Fe

Question 31 (Jonathan Mack):

CIPP Work. It is assumed that all pipes indicated for CIPP work are concrete pipe. Please confirm or provide a list of materials for all pipes listed in the government provided spreadsheets.

Answer 31:

The list of materials for all the pipes known is provided in the amended “Table of Pipes and Structures” (**Attachment #9**). There are other pipes other than concrete that have been suggested to have CIPP.

Question 32 (Jonathan Mack):

CIPP Work. Is CIPP allowed on pipe materials other than concrete?

Answer 32:

Yes.

Question 33 (Andrew Wilson):

Headwalls. When the term “Rebuild Headwall” is used, does that mean remove and replace the headwall with a new headwall in the same configuration?

Answer 33:

When the term “Rebuild Headwall” is used, it indicates that the headwall structure is beyond salvaging and must be repaired by replacement. Final sizing and configuration will be dependent on the DOR’s recommendations and design sheets.

Question 34 (Andrew Wilson):

Point Repair (general). There is no definition of the level of effort required for a pipeline point repair. Are we to assume the repair include removing and replacing a whole stick of pipe in that location? This will be difficult to bid without additional information.

Answer 34:

When the term “Point Repair” is used, it indicates a small section of pipe/structure that is in poor condition while the rest of the surrounding pipe/structures may be in good condition. Most often in the bid documents provided, these “point repair” areas are directly associated with a depressed area indicating a cracked or broken pipe segment or joint that must be repaired.

Question 35 (Andrew Wilson):

Heavy Clean and CCTV. We understand the intent of heavy clean to mean flushing all dirt and other obstructions out of the pipe. What is the intent for the CCTV? Are we simply required to film the pipeline and provide the video to the government or are we to make a recommendation for future repairs/repairs by mod.

Answer 35:

The CCTV was put in as a recommended method of visual inspection following the heavy cleaning. The intent is to identify the cause of the issue and conduct a repair by modification.

Question 36 (Jonathan Mack):

Spraycast. The term spraycast is used in a somewhat generic manner in the engineering community to mean spray lining the interior of a structure for elimination of leaks. There are many materials used in these processes. Obviously these materials vary greatly in price. Please provide a specification for the spray cast material the government wants installed (epoxy, cementitious, polyurethane, etc.).

Answer 36:

Attached is the design basis for the 35% design documents (**Attachment #4**). The contractor can provide another solution that meets or exceeds the life expectancy.



GeoKrete Technical
Data Sheet-20 Spray

Question 37 (Jonathan Mack):

Spraycast. Since this is a storm sewer system, we would not expect to encounter any hydrogen sulfide gas like in a sanitary system. Is a cementitious material acceptable for the spraycast work on structures? This is a very affordable way to line structures when compared to epoxy or other materials.

Answer 37:

Attached is the design basis for the 35% design documents (**Attachment #4**). The contractor can provide another solution that meets or exceeds the life expectancy.



GeoKrete Technical
Data Sheet-20 Spray

Question 38 (Andrew Wilson):

Locate and Raise Structure. Please confirm the intent for the items noted as “locate and raise” and “locate and raise structure” is actually just raising the lid/top of the structure to or above grade and that there is no requirement to raise the entire structure.

Answer 38:

Yes, the intent stated above is corrected. “Locate and Raise Structure” identifies structures that have soil and grass overtop that must be removed and the structure’s lid/top raised to grade. There is no requirement to raise the entire structure.

Question 39 (Andrew Wilson):

Many lines and location are indicated for point repair and depressed area repair. What is the method of point repair? Is this repair external to the pipe or internal? Some of these sinkholes seem to occur at every joint in a pipe line. Please provide specification on point and joint repair.

Answer 39:

When the term "Point Repair" is used, it indicates a small section of pipe/structure that is in poor condition while the rest of the surrounding pipe/structures may be in good condition. Most often in the bid documents provided, these "point repair" areas are most directly associated with a depressed area indicating a cracked or broken pipe segment or joint that must be repaired. The Government is not dictating "means and methods" of repairing indicated "point repair" locations, nor able to provide exact requirements of the "point repair" in the 35% design bid package.

Question 40 (Andrew Wilson):

Abandon Structures. Does this literally mean no work, or are we required to fill them or in some other way remove them from service. Please clarify.

Answer 40:

The Government will require either filling or removing any structure/pipe labeled as "abandon". In no case will "abandon structure" mean no work is associated for that section.

Question 41 (Andrew Wilson):

Asphalt Removal. Will the government accept replacing asphalt that is removed during construction with the same thickness of asphalt?

Answer 41:

Yes, as per the SOW, the Government expects replacement of any asphalt, heavy duty asphalt, or concrete pavement to be to the same thickness and grade.

Question 41 (Andrew Wilson):

Asphalt Repairs. Is the intent of the asphalt area repairs to match the existing lines and grades of the asphalt surfaces? Is the contractor required to provide a topographic survey of these areas to prove this was done?

Answer 41:

Yes, as per the SOW, the Government expects replacement of any asphalt, heavy duty asphalt, or concrete pavement to be to the same thickness and grade. A topographic survey will not be required to

prove this was done; Government Inspectors will verify the completion of work as per this SOW and finalized construction drawings submitted and approved.

Question 42 (Andrew Wilson):

Asphalt removal. What mix design/strength of asphalt is required for patched areas?

Answer 42:

Pavement design, thickness, and strength vary throughout the project area. Contractors are to match the existing pavement for any patched areas. The Contractor should anticipate airfield pavement to be constructed per the appropriate UFC which is **UFC 3-260-02**, throughout project area.

Question 43 (Andrew Wilson):

Concrete repairs. Will the government accept replacing concrete that is removed during construction with the same thickness of concrete or does the designer of record have to present a design to the government?

Answer 43:

Yes, as per the SOW, the Government expects replacement of any asphalt, heavy duty asphalt, or concrete pavement to be to the same thickness and grade.

Question 44 (Andrew Wilson):

What concrete compressive strength is required for concrete in various areas that is being removed during construction?

Answer 44:

Pavement design, thickness, and strength vary throughout the project area. Contractors are to match the existing pavement for any patched areas. The Contractor should anticipate airfield pavement to be constructed per the appropriate UFC which is **UFC 3-260-02**, throughout project area.

Question 45 (Andrew Wilson):

Is the intent of the concrete area repairs to match the existing lines and grades of the concrete surfaces?
Is the contractor required to provide a topographic survey of these areas to prove this was done?

Answer 45:

Yes, as per the SOW, the Government expects replacement of any asphalt, heavy duty asphalt, or concrete pavement to be to the same thickness and grade. A topographic survey will not be required to

prove this was done; Government Inspectors will verify the completion of work as per this SOW and finalized construction drawings submitted and approved.

Question 46 (Gary Hollon):

Are there any wetlands in any of the work areas for this project? If so, is wetlands permitting required or is it waived due to this being considered maintenance work?

Answer 46:

Yes, there are wetlands indicated in the data maintained at Fort Benning, but has not been verified by the Corps of Engineers Regulatory Division (see attachment/embedded file below, **Attachment #5**). As part of the NEPA/144-R process that the awarded Contractor will be required to submit their plans for Environmental Review, the Government will identify specific wetland requirements per specific locations and means and methods of construction identified by the DOR.



LAAF Potential
Wetland Areas.jpg

Question 47 (Andrew Wilson):

After installation of either CIPP or Spraycast, is additional CCTV required for verification or close out documentation?

Answer 47:

No, the Government expects professional workmanship of any installed products or services as part of this contract. Manufacturer warranties, as applicable, will be required as part of the installation of these products as well as standard Contractor workmanship warranties for services provided to the Government.

Question 48 (Jonathan Mack):

In several location in the bid documents, the requirement is for “lining of structures”. What is the requirements and specification for the lining system?

Answer 48:

Attached is the design basis for the 35% design documents (**Attachment #6**). The contractor can provide another solution that meets or exceeds the life expectancy.



GeoKrete Technical
Data Sheet-20 Liner.

Question 49 (Jonathan Mack):

Is there an available borrow pit for this site for the required backfill material.

Answer 49:

Yes a borrow site on Ft. Benning will be available if needed.

Question 50 (Jonathan Mack):

How is new pipe to be “bed” can we utilize existing excavated material or do we need to import a spec material such as sand?

Answer 50:

Yes the in-situ material can be used as long as it meets the pipe manufacture’s requirements. The method to how it is installed may dictate the material as well. For example if a trench box is used 57 stone may need to be used.

Question 51 (Sara Forrest):

During heavy cleaning of the pipe, there will be a significant amount of water and sediment that will need to be spoiled. Can this be spoiled on site at the airfield?

Answer 51:

To answer this question would require further information and a descriptive approach on the characteristics of the spoils and how they would be contained and addressed in the long term.

Question 52 (Ron Hobgood):

The archeological requirements, Note 8, require a sediment bag to be used for water located in the pipe. Are we required to bag all material “heavy cleaned” from the pipes and structures?

Answer 52:

Note 8 was included in case the pipes were left open during replacement/repairs. The tribes were concerned about archaeological materials being washed into the pipes. However, this has not been an issue on the previous projects because the pipes were never left open. If pipes are left open there would need to be some way of shoring up the area about the excavation (e.g. sandbags, silt fencing, etc.), and/or some way of filtering the material that goes into open pipes to prevent any archaeological material from being washed away.

Regarding the heavy cleaning, it is my understanding that the material will be staying on the airfield, so it will not be necessary to bag and screen since it could be used as backfill or placed in Location #1.

However, depending on the means and methods used, setting up a screen may be required at the outflow if it is determined there is a potential for some sediment making its way through the pipes after heavy cleaning. Fort Benning Cultural Resources team members would be able to set up and monitor the screen.

Question 53 (Andrew Wilson):

Detention Pond Work. All of the detention pond work is shown on Map 1 on page 11 of 31 of the "LAAF Drainage Basin, Phase 1 (2 of 2).pdf document. Please confirm that the SOW as written is directing the designer to survey each of the 18 locations and design a stormwater detention pond of the depth and area indicated in those areas. This work is associated with Appendix J under the OTHER tab in the government provided spreadsheet.

Answer 53:

The SOW as written is directing a complete survey to confirm the results of the bid documents in the event the Contractor chooses to go with the study's recommended repairs according to the design criteria of a 25 year, 24 hour return period storm event, OR conduct a complete survey to confirm the existing conditions for the Contractor DOR's own design of the storm water system that meets or exceeds the recommendations provided and the design criteria of a 25 year, 24 hour return period storm event. In either case, a complete survey must be conducted to confirm existing conditions as presented in the bid documents, but the SOW of work does not expressly dictate the Contractor must survey those locations (unless the Contractor chooses to follow the study's recommendations provided in the bid documents).

Question 54 (Ron Hobgood):

Per the requirements of the Amended Statement of Work, in relation to the archaeological significance of the soil disturbance, if detentions ponds are required, there will be a significant amount of spoil that will need to be taken off site or spoiled near location. What are we to do with the spoil from the detention ponds and open channels?

Answer 54:

Any excess/removed soil that is not going back into place is to be delivered to "Location 1" for archeological requirements. See embedded map for position of "Location 1" (**Attachment #1**):



LAAF Excess Soil
Spreading Location

Question 55 (Andrew Wilson):

Detention Pond Work. Related to the RFI above, where is detention pond #18 located? We cannot find it on any of the maps contained in the RFP.

Answer 55:

Detention Pond #18 is an error on the final draft of the study released. It was included in the original modeling, but not in the final submitted to the Government. It is now deleted on the amended **Attachment #9** and no longer applies to the 35% design package as part of the recommended repairs.

Question 56 (Andrew Wilson):

Detention Pond Work. Related to the RFI above, the square nodes in Map 1 are noted as storage areas. Please confirm that the government is directing the designer to remove an existing junction in that location and place a detention pond there to provide temporary storage of water flowing through this system.

Answer 56:

The Government is not directing “means and methods” through the provided bid documents. The Contractor DOR’s decision to use the recommended repairs shown in the bid documents or conduct a design of their own is entirely up to them. The Government is only dictating that a complete survey is conducted to confirm the existing conditions and full designs meet or exceed the design criteria of a 25 year, 24 hour return period storm event before they will be approved.

Question 57 (Andrew Wilson):

DETENTION PONDS – Under the OTHER tab in the spreadsheet, there is a detention pond #18. We are unable to locate this anywhere in the maps. Please advise if this is part of the work.

Answer 57:

Detention Pond #18 is an error on the final draft of the study released. It was included in the original modeling, but not in the final submitted to the Government. It is now deleted on the amended **Attachment #9** and no longer applies to the 35% design package as part of the recommended repairs.

Question 58 (Andrew Wilson):

Detention Ponds. In the event there are utility conflicts encountered with the design of the ponds, will the government treat those as changed field conditions since no utility data has been provided as part of the SOW?

Answer 58:

As this is a 35% Design package, the discovery of said utility conflicts will occur during the initial complete survey of the project area, and further identified in full scope with regards to impacts during the DOR's design phase. Any alterations to existing utilities as part of the DOR's design will be coordinated through the Government and handled through the existing Utilities Contract. As such, these will not be treated as changed field conditions.

Question 59 (Andrew Wilson):

Detention Ponds. In respect to the "maximum area" quoted in the spreadsheets, is that the area for the top surface of the pond or is it the bottom area? Some of these ponds are 7' deep (for instance ASSET ID 14) and with a mowable side slope of 4:1, the top of the pond will be 56' wider/longer than the bottom.

Answer 59:

That is the area of the top surface of the detention pond.

Question 60 (Andrew Wilson):

Detention Ponds. Would the government provide a MAXIMUM VOLUME for the ponds instead of the MAXIMUM AREA number to allow us some flexibility in designing the ponds? We understand the model performed by BARGE likely included the depths in order to tie to the adjacent structures.

Answer 60:

Modeling calculations and dimensions were not a requirement for the submission of the studies to the Government. As such, the Government does not have these to provide to the Contractors.

Question 61 (Andrew Wilson):

Detention Ponds. Is the construction of the detention ponds considered "maintenance" or is this new construction? Ponds 1, 3, and 6 are over 1 acre and would require an NPDES permit if they are "new".

Answer 61:

This will be determined based on submittals from the contractor during the NEPA process. There are various contributing factors dependent on the means and methods the contractor determines. Again, the provided 35% Design package includes the recommendation of the studies that may be utilized, confirmed, and fully designed, or may be altered by the Contractor's DOR. As long as the design criteria is met for the system as a whole to support a 25 year, 24 hour return period storm event, the final sizing, orientation, placement, and other means and methods of construction are up to the Contractor and their DOR.

Question 62 (Andrew Wilson):

Detention Ponds. To be considered a complete design for the Detention Ponds, does the government require anything other than a survey to include utilities (marked by the government via work order) and the grading design of the ponds that shows we meet the depth and footprint area of the ponds?

Answer 62:

Yes, the Contractor will need to demonstrate through their modeling or calculations the storage of the sized Detention Pond in relation to the surrounding structures capacities to carry the design criteria storm event (25 year, 24 hour return period storm event).

Question 63 (Andrew Wilson):

It is expected that there is buried utilities along roadways, ditched and crossing future location of detention ponds. Will all unforeseen buried utilities be priced as a modification after award?

Answer 63:

As this is a 35% Design package, the discovery of said utility conflicts will occur during the initial complete survey of the project area, and further identified in full scope with regards to impacts during the DOR's design phase. Any alterations to existing utilities as part of the DOR's design will be coordinated through the Government and handled through the existing Utilities Contract. As such, these will not be treated as changed field conditions.

Question 64 (Andrew Wilson):

It is expected that there is buried utilities along roadways, ditched and crossing future location of detention ponds. Will all unforeseen buried utilities be priced as a modification after award?

Answer 64:

As this is a 35% Design package, the discovery of said utility conflicts will occur during the initial complete survey of the project area, and further identified in full scope with regards to impacts during the DOR's design phase. Any alterations to existing utilities as part of the DOR's design will be coordinated through the Government and handled through the existing Utilities Contract. As such, these will not be treated as changed field conditions.

Question 65 (Andrew Wilson):

Plan B: SDGM-52 is shown to increase from 10" to 30". There is no existing structure on either end of this pipe that is visible in the field. Are we to install a new inlet on either end of SDGM -52?

Answer 65:

The structures (SDMH-82 & SDMH-396) are indicated on Map B (Adobe Page 12 of 32) and further on Map C (Adobe Page 19 of 32). If the structures were not readily identifiable through visual inspection during site visit, more detailed inspection may be needed to confirm their location. If the structures are not present, new inlets will be needed at these locations during the upsizing of the 10" pipe to a 30" pipe, if this is the design submitted by the Contractor's DOR.

Question 66 (Andrew Wilson):

Plan D- Depressed "Bowl" location. Please provide as-build drawings of this area of concrete/asphalt.

Answer 66:

See embedded below (**Attachments #7 and #8**):



Hazardous Cargo
Loading Apron, LAA



Hazardous Cargo
Loading Apron, LAA

Question 67 (Andrew Wilson):

Plan D- Please provide a specification and design for all concrete and asphalt to be re-poured in the location of the depressed area shown. We think this paving is "heavy". Please provide design requirements.

Answer 67:

The contractor should anticipate airfield pavement to be constructed per the appropriate UFC which is **UFC 3-260-02**, throughout project area.

Question 68 (Andrew Wilson):

Plan D- Pipe Replacement. Appendix I shows us to replace two inlets for SDGM 503 but no additional inlets for any other pipe. Can we assume that the existing structures on SCGM-469, 470, and 446 are of sufficient size to accommodate the pipe increase and that no additional structures require replacement?

Answer 68:

Yes, if the Contractor is choosing to go with the recommendations provided in the studies and 35% design package for their bid, the above is a fair assumption for pricing proposals. However, these assumptions will still need to be confirmed following award with a complete survey and design.

Question 69 (Andrew Wilson):

Plan D: the manhole structure between SDGM 470 and 446 is a large/deep structure with a system of electric winches and an “outflow gate/isolation shutoff flap” located down inside the structure. To increase SCGM 446 will require this isolation gate system to be increased accordingly. Are we to change the outflow gate to the new pipe size?

Answer 69:

Yes, if the Contractor chooses to go with the recommendations provided in the studies and 35% design package for their bid and cost out upsizing the pipe, then the outflow gate will need to be sized to the new pipe size.

Question 70 (Andrew Wilson):

Plan D- Some pipes indicated for replacement are shown as double blue lines. What does the double blue line indicate? Does it indicate two buried pipes.

Answer 70:

Yes.

Question 71 (Andrew Wilson):

Plan E- Is any work required for SDGM-513? The pipe is labeled but no notes given for its repair/replacement

Answer 71:

From the recommendations provided in the 35% design package, the pipe is identified further in Appendix H outlining depressed areas for repair and a callout to “Remove, Replace, and Compact Soil”. Whether the Contractor determines to go this route with the repair or chooses another “means and method” of repairing the area is up to them.

Question 72 (Andrew Wilson):

Plan A- SDGM 500 & 137 are shown to spraycast. These pipes look like they were recently modified. Are to spraycast these pipes?

Answer 72:

These sections of pipe were overlooked and should be removed from the SOW. These pipes have been replaced within the last year and a half, and are no longer in need of repair. These amendments are reflected in **Attachment #9 and #10**.

Question 73 (Andrew Wilson):

Plan A- SDMH 148 and 149 indicate to rebuild headwalls. Are we required to perform this work? It appears already completed

Answer 73:

These headwalls were overlooked and should be removed from the SOW. These pipes have been replaced within the last year and a half, and are no longer in need of repair. These amendments are reflected in **Attachment #9 and #10**.

Question 74 (Andrew Wilson):

Plan A- SDGM-287 & 289 are shown as recommended for upsizing and depressed area repair. Appendix E-Plan C, does not show any work associated with SDGM 287 and 289 upsizing. Are we to upsize SCGM 287 & 289? If so, give requirements.

Answer 74:

Recommended repairs according to the studies and 35% design package describe the requirements. See **Attachment #9** under Tab OPEN TRENCH STORMDRAINS, left most table. This describes further both the upsizing and depressed area repair. SDGM 289 was removed from **Attachment #9** and is no longer consider under this SOW.

Question 75 (Andrew Wilson):

Plan B- SDMH 750 & 571; one of these man holes is shown located in the middle of a paved taxiway alongside the active runway. By the notations given, the MH is either buried below the taxiway and is hidden or is below paving grade. What work is required to “raise” the MH at this location? Are we required to demolish paving to access and raise a MH buried below the taxiway?

Answer 75:

“Raise” refers to bringing the top lid to existing grade. To bring this MH to grade, demolishing taxiway pavement would be required and matching existing pavement once repairs to MH are complete. The Taxiway identified to have the buried manhole is currently shutdown and not anticipated to be opened back up.

Question 76 (Andrew Wilson):

Plan E- SDGM 487 and 490 are shown to remove replace and compact soil. In relation to archeological requirements, what are we to do with the soil we remove from these and other pipes shown?

Answer 76:

Any excess/removed soil that is not going back into place is to be delivered to “Location 1” for archeological requirements. See attached/embedded map for position of “Location 1” (**Attachment #1**):



LAAF Excess Soil
Spreading Location

Question 77 (Andrew Wilson):

Headwalls. STRC-1215 states we are to rebuild the headwall and install outfall protection. Is outfall protection actually outlet protection (rip-rap or some other sort of stilling basin to dissipate energy).

Answer 77:

This headwall was overlooked and should be removed from the SOW. The headwall has been replaced within the last year, and are no longer in need of repair. **Attachment #9 and #11** are amended to have this removed.

Question 78 (Andrew Wilson):

Point Repair. LAAF-5 states we are to provide a point repair. Is this a 24” pipe?

Answer 78:

This pipe was overlooked and should be removed from the SOW. It has been replaced within the last year, and is no longer in need of repair. **Attachment #9 and #11** are amended to have this removed.

Question 79 (Andrew Wilson):

Structures LAAF 358, 359, 361, 362, 376, 380 and 381 all require CCTV but have not been viewed previously. Please clarify if contractor is required to heavy clean these structures prior to CCTV. It would seem prudent to plan on cleaning these as well prior to CCTV.

Answer 79:

The decision on the “prudence of planning” an item in the SOW affecting the Contractors price will be left to the Contractor. These structures were labeled as “CCTV AFTER GAINING ACCESS” rather than “HEAVY CLEANING”. Similar to the “Heavy Cleaning” discussions in previous RFI’s, additional repair items or scope identified following “Gaining Access” will be addressed as modifications to the contract.

Question 80 (Andrew Wilson):

STRC-5289. States to clean structure to determine functionality. What is considered functional? If contractor merely required to provide a report of the structure's condition to the government?

Answer 80:

The intent in determining "functionality" following cleaning is to identify the condition of the structure itself for life expectancy and ability to meet design criteria storm event, and if in need of repairs, identify those repairs to be addressed as a modification to the contract.

Question 81 (Andrew Wilson):

LAAF-265. Spreadsheet says "Replace Pipe" and Map says "Spray Cast". Please clarify which is required.

Answer 81:

Given that Map X shows the adjacent pipe "LAAF-214" as Spraycast, the Contractors are to assume the error is on the spreadsheet. Therefore, if following the recommendations of the studies and pricing accordingly, consider "LAAF-265" as Spraycast.

Question 82 (Andrew Wilson):

SDMH-197. This structure is listed on Map B but we cannot locate it on any of the Map B's in the RFP. Please advise where this structure is.

Answer 82:

There is reference to "SDGM-197" shown on Map B, but no SDMH-197. This section of pipe was repaired under a contract within the last year and does not need to be considered for repairs. This section of pipe is identified under a "blackened out" box indicating it is not part of this contract.

Question 83 (Andrew Wilson):

SDGM-33 – shown on Map A in the Capital Improvement Plan but listed as Map D in the spreadsheet. Please confirm that these are the same structures.

Answer 83:

Yes, these are the same structures. This pipe is shown on both Maps A and D in separate appendices and is the same section of pipe referenced in the "Table of Pipes and Structures" under Map D.

Question 84 (Andrew Wilson):

SDGM-52 – This is shown on Map B of the Capital Improvement Plan but listed as Map C in the spreadsheet. Please confirm that these are the same structures.

Answer 84:

Yes, these are the same structures. This pipe is shown on both Maps B and C in separate appendices and is the same section of pipe referenced in the “Table of Pipes and Structures” under Map C.

Question 85 (Andrew Wilson):

SDGM 287, 289 and 290 – These are shown on Map C in the Capital Improvement Plan but listed as Map A in the spreadsheet. Are these the same structures? Is any work being done to SDGM-289?

Answer 85:

Yes, these are the same structures. Recommended repairs/work identified for SDGM-289 is listed in “Table of Pipes and Structures”.

Question 86 (Andrew Wilson):

SDGM 446, 469, 470 and 503 – these are shown on Map D in the Capital Improvements Plan but listed as Map F in the spreadsheet. Please confirm these are the same structures.

Answer 86:

Yes, these are the same structures.

Question 87 (Andrew Wilson):

SDGM 512 and 513 – these are shown on Map E in the Capital Improvements Plan but listed as Map G in the spreadsheet. Please confirm these are the same structures.

Answer 87:

Yes, these are the same structures.

Question 88 (Andrew Wilson):

SDGM-198 – the work required states “Internal Joint Seals”. Does the government mean the contractor is required to inject expandable grout material into the voids from inside the pipe (basically like pumping flowable fill in an attempt to seal the joint) or will installing a short section of CIPP be allowed to seal the joint?

Answer 88:

Means and methods are for the Contractors to decide, but both methods may be acceptable dependent of the extent of repairs needed at the specified joint.

Question 89 (Andrew Wilson):

TRENCHLESS REHAB – Under the Trenchless Rehab tab in the spreadsheet, work is outlined for SDGM 147, 148, 149, 192, 201, 502c, 532, and 540 but we are unable to find these in the maps. Please advise if these are part of the work for this project.

Answer 89:

These are part of this SOW. Maps are incorrect with relation to these specific pipes. See **Attachment #9 and Attachment #10.**

Question 90 (Andrew Wilson):

OPEN TRENCH STRUCTURES – Under the OPEN TRENCH STRUCTURES tab in the spreadsheet, we are unable to locate items SDMH 153, 577, 710 528 and 532 on any of the provided maps. Please advise if this is part of the work for this project.

Answer 90:

These are part of this SOW. Maps are incorrect with relation to these specific pipes. See **Attachment #9 and Attachment #10.**

Question 91 (Andrew Wilson):

Appendix H, Page 1 and 3, LAAF 304 & LAAF 369. It appears that there are two separate channels that require widening. Is this correct? If so, the roadway separating these two channels will limit the width that the channel can be expanded, please advise on specific location and requires for LAAF 304 & 369.

Answer 91:

Recommendation provided in the 35% design package is to widen both channels. Specific limitations and their effects to the finished design will be uncovered following award.

Question 92 (Andrew Wilson):

LAAF 304 & LAAF 369, the requirements are to widen the channel from 8' wide to 20' wide. Is this dimension at the top of channel at the widest point at the top of the slope or at the bottom of the channel?

Answer 92:

It is the dimension of the top of the channel.

Question 93 (Andrew Wilson):

LAUF 304, there appears to be a buried fire main with fire hydrants located in the slope of the channel along with buried electrical. To widen the ditch, will require a relocation of these utilities. What is required for buried utilities?

Answer 93:

Buried utilities will be identified prior to construction and coordinated with the Government for relocation under the Utilities Contract maintained by the Government.

Question 93 (Andrew Wilson):

All new channels and retention ponds, what is the required slope on banks?

Answer 93:

3:1 slopes are a typical minimum with soil types present.