



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND MARIANAS
PSC 455, BOX 195
FPO AP 96540-2937

27 July 2016

NOTICE 2
PRE-PROPOSAL REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION AND RESPONSES
SOLICITATION N40192-16-R-1305
FY16 MILCON P-635, MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE LANDFILL CLOSURE
ANDERSEN AIR FORCE BASE, GUAM

QUESTION 8: Reference RFP Part B, Specification Section 01 11 00, Paragraph 1.2.e. Question is regarding stripping of 6" thick soil and temporary stockpiling on site. Please advise if the existing 6" thick soil to be stripped can be considered as top soil and will require no further amendment.

Answer 8: One of the Government's project objectives is to mix as much of the existing green/wood waste as possible in the top soil to promote vegetation growth. The stripped existing top soil would also be required to mix with a suitable amount of the ground up green/wood waste. Refer to Specification Section 32 92 19, Paragraph 2.5

QUESTION 9: Reference RFP Part C, Drawing C-130.

- (a) Please indicate on plans the extent and limit of the new liner system.
- (b) Please provide termination detail for the new liner system.

Answer 9:

- (a) The scale of Drawing C-130 is not suitable to provide the detailed/accurate location of the new liner system limit. The liner limit is governed by the extent of the foundation layer depicted in C-501 Detail 1 and C-502 Detail 7.
- (b) Termination of the new liner system is to join the existing secondary liner system as depicted in C-502 Detail 7.

QUESTION 10: Reference RFP Part B, Specification Section 01 11 00, Paragraph 1.2.n.

- (a) Please advise specific repair items to be done on the leachate system.
- (b) Does the leachate tank need cleaning?

Answer 10:

- (a) Specific repairs items for leachate collection system are presented in Drawing E-100 and Specifications Division 09 Finishes and Division 26 Electrical.
- (b) Yes.

QUESTION 11: Reference RFP Part C, Drawing C-501, Detail 1/15 for Final Closure Cap and Final Grading on sheet C-131. Please clarify if the final grade being referred to in the reference detail is on top of Fill Materials (protective cover) or on top of Top Soil.

Answer 11: The final grade depicted in Drawing C-131 is on top of the top soil.

QUESTION 12: Reference RFP Part C, Drawing C-503. Concrete culvert requires 15” dia. concrete pipe as shown on sheet C-503. The 15” dia. concrete pipe is not available on-island. Please confirm.

Answer 12: Design calls for 15” pipe. Contractor may propose a suitable alternative for Government approval.

QUESTION 13: Reference RFP Part C, Drawing C-121, and RFP Part D, D.1 Schedule of Government Furnished Property. Drawing C-121, General Note 1, indicates that the borrow area was previously an excavated site that has been backfilled with an unknown quantity of satisfactory and unsatisfactory materials as described in the project specifications. If the quantity of satisfactory materials required to complete the work cannot be excavated at the borrow area then additional material will be required to be imported from an alternate source approved by the contracting officer. Schedule D.1 indicates that the Government will provide 28,200CY of soil from the borrow site. Is the 28,200CY of soil indicated under the Government Furnished Property taken from the borrow site to be considered suitable materials? If the 28,200CY of Government provided materials are not suitable, and materials are required to be imported, will the contractor be compensated by the Government for the balance to complete the 28,200CY?

Answer 13: Refer to Specification Section 31 23 00, Paragraph 1.5 e.

QUESTION 14: Reference RFP Part B, Specification Section 01 57 19.01 20, and RFP Part C Drawings C-111 and C-131. Drawing C-111, Key Note 1, calls for stripping the existing vegetation and removal of 6” soil cover. Drawing C-131 indicates the final grading plan of the landfill. Specification Section 01 57 19.01 20 is the standard Supplemental Temporary Environmental Control Section (JRM ESS). This section may not be applicable to work within the landfill area due to the type of the materials being graded.

(a) Due to the nature of the materials within the landfill, it would be impossible for standard MEC Full Clearance Ahead of Construction procedures to be effective. We do not see the applicability of Magnetometer or EM type (all metal) sensors as having any productive results at all. For the existing vegetation and 6” soil cover removal, as well as the grading/excavations within the trash, will the Government consider active on-site MEC monitoring at the points of excavation in lieu of an upfront investigation? If active monitoring is implemented we would also train all on-site personnel in MEC Recognition, Retreat and Report procedures per DDESB TP-18. Active monitoring has worked effectively on recent landfill closure projects.

(b) The documents do not incorporate the recent CNO Waiver to MEC Guidance that would allow the use of 60mm procedures and 18” lifts. Will the Government consider incorporating the most recent CNO Waiver?

(c) Section 01 57 19.01 20 Paragraph 3.8 Imported Soils requires that all imported soils be obtained from a Government approved borrow pits or must be screened using a 0.75” screen prior to entering the project site or Government property. Is the on-site borrow area considered an approved borrow pit or must the 28,200CY of Government Furnished Soil be screened with a 0.75” screen?

Answer 14:

(a) ESS MEC only applies at on-site borrow area.

(b) ESS MEC Specification is amended to incorporate the recent CNO Waiver. Refer to RFP Amendment 0002.

(c) On-site borrow area is also subjects to the same requirement.

QUESTION 15: Reference RFP Part C, Drawings C-121 and C-301. Drawing C-121, General Note 1, indicates that the borrow area was previously an excavated site that has been backfilled with an unknown quantity of satisfactory and unsatisfactory materials as described in the project specifications. If the quantity of satisfactory materials required to complete the work cannot be excavated at the borrow area then additional material will be required to be imported from an alternate source approved by the contracting officer.

- (a) Is the contractor compelled to use the suitable borrow material following MEC clearance together with crushing and/or screening to meet gradation in the event that material from off-site sources proves less expensive both in terms of time & cost.
- (b) Is the contractor required to achieve the borrow pit grading profiles as indicated on drawing C-301, or can surplus & unsuitable material be left in place?
- (c) In the event that the contractor is required to achieve the borrow pit grading profiles is the unsatisfactory materials required to be disposed of off-base? And if so, is the material required to be screened for MEC to ¾”?
- (d) If surplus & unsuitable material is to be left in place, will the contractor be required to grade the borrow area and deliver an as-left topographic survey?
- (e) In the event that the materials taken from the designated borrow are insufficient to meet the Government’s volume quota, does the Government intend to nominate another borrow location inside the base?

Answer 15:

- (a) Refer to Specification Section 31 23 00, Paragraph 1.5 e.
- (b) Surplus material can be left in place with proper grading for drainage and erosion control.
- (c) Off-base disposal is not required unless hazardous materials are encountered during excavation.
- (d) Yes.
- (e) Not planned at this time. See response to 15(a) above.

QUESTION 16: Reference RFP Part C, Drawing C-501 Detail 1, Drawing C-502 Detail 7, and Drawing C-121.

- (a) During the site visit, it was evident that Cells 1&2 were heavily vegetated. During the removal of the heavy vegetation, there is a possibility that the root system of the existing vegetation may damage the existing secondary liner (Detail 7 on Drawing C-502). Is that a concern, and if so, does the secondary liner need to be repaired if damaged? If repair is necessary, will this be treated as a changed condition?
- (b) During the site visit, we were able to observe the various liners. These appear to have been exposed to the elements for some time. Has the Government determined that the various liners are still suitable for use without the need for additional testing and/or scrutiny?
- (c) Drawing C-501, Detail 1 indicates the 12” existing cover and 6” foundation layer. After the vegetation and 6” of the 12” cover is removed, does this 12” thickness of cover need to be reestablished before installing the foundation layer? What are the gradation requirements for the 12” cover, the 6” foundation layer, and the 18” of fill materials?

Answer 16:

- (a) Damaged liner needs to be properly repaired. Determination of a changed condition will be at the Contracting Officer’s discretion.
- (b) The contractor is required to sample the Government-provided liner materials for testing as specified in Specification Section 02 56 13, Paragraph 1.2 (c); Specification Section 02 56 15, Paragraph 1.2 (d); and Specification Section 1 05 20, Paragraph 1.2.

(c) Drawing C-501 Detail 1 depicts the to-be constructed final cover and not the current Cell 1 and 2 surface condition. Site clearing grubbing and fill requirement are specified in Specification Sections 31 11 00 and 31 23 00.

QUESTION 17: Reference RFP Part B, Specification Sections 01 11 00, 09 96 72, and 09 96 74.

(a) Section 01 11 00 paragraph 1.2 – General description of the project does not indicate work on the existing leachate tank. Please provide specific scope of work together with specification for the existing leachate tank upgrades.

(b) Section 09 96 72 Paragraph 1.01, Description, calls for application of protective coating on the interior and exterior of the tank. Section 09 96 74 Paragraph 1.01, Description, only calls for application of protective coating on exterior tank surfaces. Please confirm if both exterior and interior of the tank will receive new coating. If the interior of the tank will receive new coating, who will be responsible for draining the tank of its content?

Answer 17:

(a) See response to Question 10.

(b) The interior and exterior of the tank shall be coated and the Contractor will be responsible for draining the tank contents. Provide temporary storage tank or sewage pump truck to intercept the leachate flow redirection during the repair and coating of the interior of the leachate tank.

QUESTION 18: Reference RFP Part B, Specification Section 31 00 00, Paragraph 1.1. The Earthwork Section part 1 describes the measurement procedures to be applied in the computation of quantities whereas the various CLIN's provided in the body of the Solicitation Contract Form describes the work in terms of total sums. Please clarify the Government's intention.

Answer 18: Offerors shall complete the Schedule of Prices for all Contract Line Item Numbers (CLINs) in Section 00010 of the SF1442 as required in the solicitation.

QUESTION 19: Reference RFP Part A, Section 00210, Factor 1 Experience. Would NAVFAC consider reducing the required magnitude for past project experience? Given that projects similar to the scope of work have been completed on the mainland at a lower threshold we feel that by lowering the \$5M requirement to \$3M the offerors will successfully be able to submit extremely relevant past experience according to the scope of work required for this particular project.

Answer 19: Minimum dollar value for projects submitted in Factor 1 Experience remains unchanged at \$5 million.

QUESTION 20: Reference RFP Part A, Exhibit A Construction Experience Project Data Sheet. Would the Government consider releasing the word version of Exhibit A? In order to allow offerors to expand the cells the Government issued word document would be extremely helpful.

Answer 20: To minimize corruption of data, Microsoft Word files of the exhibits will not be provided.

QUESTION 21: Reference RFP Part A, Section 00210, Factor 3 Past Performance. Is a Government completed Performance Evaluation (Construction) – DD Form 2626, JUN 94 (EG) acceptable in lieu of a CPAR or CCASS if that's what was completed for evaluation of a contract we are referencing?

Answer 21: Yes. DD Form 2626, Performance Evaluation (Construction), is acceptable.

QUESTION 22: Reference RFP Part B, Specification Section 09 96 72, Paragraph 3.07. This specification is totally unacceptable based on two factors: the current condition of the tank and products to be applied after surface preparation. Basically, the existing coatings system has reached its life's end. There is nothing here to build on. The products called out for application, particularly the zinc, require a surface much cleaner than what you will get using this specification for washing. The exterior of the tank should be a minimum abrasive blast as SSPC-SP 6. SP 10 would be better. If we try to apply the current paint specification, I believe it will fail in less than one year. At about 6-7 months, we will need to go back and do touch up and every month thereafter until the one year warranty is up. Also if this specification is imposed, there would be no warranty on the exterior surfaces. Please clarify the Government's intention and advise how to proceed.

Answer 22: Government concurs to use SSPC SP-10. Refer to RFP Amendment 0002 for word changes to Specification Section 09 96 72, Paragraph 3.07.

QUESTION 23: Reference RFP C, Drawing C-112, Soil investigation report at Borrow Pit. Please provide boring logs for holes #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, and #6.

Answer 23: Refer to RFP Amendment 0002 for inclusion of boring logs B1 through B6 in RFP Part D.

QUESTION 24: Can the Government revise the requirements for the projects submitted under 'Factor 1-Experience' to large earthwork, utilities, and road/paving projects valued at \$2.0M or more and allow firms to include a special consultant and/or subcontractor with landfill capping and venting experience on the Offeror's team? The required size of the mandatory project (minimum of \$5M in value) is not a typical size for landfill capping projects, and landfill capping projects are not common at military installations. These requirements may limit competition and exclude firms that have demonstrated capability on similarly complex projects and who work successfully at military installations.

Answer 24: No. Definition of a relevant construction project remains unchanged. Also see response to Question 19.

QUESTION 25: We respectfully request a 3-week time extension to the current submission date of August 09, 2016. The current submission date is insufficient time for us or our subcontractors/vendors to put together a comprehensive and best value proposal for the Government.

Answer 25: The date for receipt of proposals is extended from August 9, 2016 to August 16, 2016 at 4:30pm local time. Refer to RFP Amendment 0002.