



Notice of Addendum STPA Form F 60800 (2008)

Sydney Tar Ponds Agency
1 Inglis Street
PO Box 1028, Station A
Sydney, NS B1P 6J7
Telephone: (902) 567-1035

Date: August 10, 2010

To: ALL BIDDERS

Subject: Addendum 9

**ADDENDUM # 9
Tender # STPA 2008S-37
Tar Ponds Surface Cap
for the Sydney Tar Ponds Agency**

Query/Clarification: Questions submitted to the Agency on August 5, 2010

Question 1:

In the revised tender drawings provided within Addendum No. 3, most notably Drawing. TP7-DWG-N-0011, the northing UTM coordinate for point number 291 appears to be erroneous.

Response Question 1:

Please refer to Addendum #8 item 5.

Question 2:

There are a number of gates that provide access to the Tar Ponds work site, most notably the internal construction access or staging roads, can these gates be used to access the site if secured using manned security?

Response Question 2:

Access to the site is via the TP2 facility.

Question 3:

Section 3.1.1 of the TP7 EPP (Ref 97918-TP7-EPP-N-001-RF) states that the SPAR will provide the main access the aforementioned internal staging roads which are presented on TP7-DWG-N025, however this drawing is not part of the tender package. In addition the TP7 Tender drawings notes (TP7-DWG-N-001) state "Assume that all temporary existing construction roads around the perimeters of the North and South Ponds will be removed as well as supporting drainage infrastructure.



Notice of Addendum STPA Form F 60800 (2008)

Response Question 3:

The reference to DWG-25 has been removed, please refer to Addendum 8. Also please refer to Addendum 6 for updates related to road decommissioning.

Question 4:

The Ferry St. Bridge span is slated for demolition shortly and its removal will inhibit access to the west side of the cap site. What is the planned removal date of the bridge? Will an alternate crossing be provided by the Agency or others to cross the channel?

Response Question 4:

Access to the west shore will be provided by a Bailey bridge at the Narrows when access is required and when Ferry Street Bridge is not accessible.

Query/Clarification: Questions submitted to the Agency on August 6, 2010

Question 5:

The recent Addendum 6 notes that the TP7 Contractor is required to remove the existing construction access roads as shown on the TP7 Tender Drawings and the costs of which are to be included within Item 2 (Mobilization/Demobilization) of the Unit Price Bid Form. Information pertaining to the actual construction of the existing Tar Ponds Construction Access Roads was not included in the TP7 tender documents, can the "As Built Drawings" be made available for review or provided to TP7 bidders?

Response Question 5:

Roads depicted on the TP7 drawings are as-constructed. Materials consist of crushed rock and slag. Please refer to Addendum 8 for a typical design cross section of the road.

Question 6:

Alternatively can a separate item be derived where by measurement and payment is on a volumetric basis? Please confirm that the existing Construction Access Roads contained within the fence line of the Tar Ponds remediation site cannot be considered "Clean Roads"?

Response Question 6:

Measure for payment will not be revised. Please see response to Question 1 above. Related to "clean roads" please refer to Appendix B- Environmental Protection Plan, Section 3.1.8 and Addendum #1.

Question 7:

What is the maximum requirement per season for the stockpile volume?

Response Question 7:

Please refer to Addendum 4 and response to Question 8 below.

Question 8:

Is the stockpile minimum of 40,000 tonnes of protective fill materials and a minimum of 10,000 tonnes of low permeability cohesive soil materials are a one time minimum amount or is the TP7 contractor required to maintain that minimum volume at all times?

Response Question 8:

Please refer to Addendum #8 for the minimum quantities for stockpiling and the dates where these quantities are required to be maintained.

Question 9:

Please provide the current TP6B detailed schedule information.

Response Question 9:

Please refer to the Unit Price Bid form where contractual milestone dates that are pertinent to the TP7 Contractor are provided. In addition, the Unit Price Bid form contains a 'Scheduling of Work' section where additional coordination details are provided. No other information will be provided during the tender period.

Question 10:

What minimum condition constitutes a "Conditional Notice to Proceed?"

Response Question 10:

A conditional notice to proceed may be provided if the contractual requirements for the work proposed by the Contractor are met. Therefore, the minimum condition will be dependent upon the work proposed by the Contractor.

Question 11:

Where could the stockpiles be located for subsequent North Pond capping phases (North Pond-Ferry St. to the Narrows, North Pond-Narrows to Battery Point)?

Response Question 11:

These locations will be within the site limits and in an area 'released for cap construction' by the Sydney Tar Ponds Agency or the Design Engineer.

Question 12:

A minimum area depicted by the Sketch TP7-SKT-NO1 will be made available to the TP7 contractor in 2010 for cap construction and staging, what is the potential maximum area that could be released for construction in 2010?

Response Question 12:

A revised area will be provided to the Contractor after contract award. The area shown on the sketch is what can be provided today. Therefore, it is expected that a larger area will be available, however, this is not guaranteed.

Question 13:

Please clarify the conflict between the definition of regular working days and hours noted in Section 01 14 00, Section 1.2 Special Requirements and the definition of a Working Day in GC1.13.4 "Working Day" in Section 00 72 43 of the General Conditions of the Contract. Which will apply to the TP7 project, considering the requirements to stock pile protective fill and cohesive materials for use as frost protection? Should the former definition apply are there any implications to the contractor?

Response Question 13:

For this contract, Contractor can work within the times identified by Section 01 14 00.

Query/Clarification: Questions submitted to the Agency on August 9, 2010

Question 14:

Will insitu testing of the s/s material be performed prior to placement of bedding/lining? Will this be used as a criteria for releasing sections of the s/s'd material?

Response Question 14:

In-situ testing is not performed as part of the TP6B contract. Rather samples are collected during mixing and laboratory testing.

Question 15:

With regards to frost protection material and its potential reuse in the capping process, how will cross contamination of the s/s material and frost protection material during removal be accommodated? Will the s/s mass be damaged if surface is breached and removed during frost protection removal? If so, what is the criteria for said damage and anticipated monetary impact should this occur?

Response Question 15:

It is expected that reworking the frost protection material to meet specifications for the grading/bedding material will not require contact or impact to the S/S material by the TP7 Contractor. This includes construction equipment and truck traffic.

Any part of the S/S'd material that is damaged will require relocation of that material and compaction as directed by the Design Engineer.

Question 16:

Please specify the material type and required characteristics to be used for the frost protection layer. Does this material have to be clay, or are alternative materials acceptable?

Response Question 16:

It is anticipated that the TP7 contractor will re-use the frost protection material in cap construction. In that case, the frost protection material will be required to meet the specification for the cap material. If an alternative material is used then the removal and disposal of this material will be at the contractor's cost. This alternative material will also be required to provide frost protection and be approved by the Design Engineer.

Question 17:

If the TP6B contractor utilizes the grading/bedding material (with the DE's approval) from the stockpile placed by the TP7 contractor for frost protection on S/S material that is not released to the TP7 contractor by the November 1st deadlines, what placing parameters must the TP6B contractor follow? If proper compaction methods are not utilized during placement, how will the moisture content of the material be controlled to ensure suitability for re-use by the TP7 contractor the following construction season?

Response Question 17:

There are no compaction requirements for the frost protection layer within the TP6B contract. The TP6B contractor will be required to shape and grade the material to promote positive drainage.

Question 18:

Are the existing construction access roads that provide access around the Tar Pond's Site considered to be clean or impacted and will vehicles require decontamination if only the access roads were traveled upon?

Response Question 18:

Please refer to the EPP for decontamination requirements and Addendum 1 for special case for imported fill transportation vehicles only.

Question 19:

Can the contractor provide an acceptable alternate decon facility to TP2?

Response Question 19:

No.

Question 20:

Please clarify if the top of the SS monolith requires scarification to a depth of 150 mm prior to placing either the grading/bedding layer or the suitable low permeability backfill material, as noted in Section 31 22 13 Rough Grading, Part 3.2 Grading, Item 0.4.

Response Question 20:

No scarification of S/S material will be required. Please refer to Addendum #8.

Question 21:

Addendum No. 4 identifies a change to Bid Item 9.0 Grading/Bedding, can an additional item be provided for an all inclusive rate (supply and install) with a quantity to reflect the likely scenario that some materials will be directly placed as opposed to stockpiling.

Response Question 21:

Please refer to Addendum #8 for an update to this bid item.

Query/Clarification: Questions submitted to the Agency on August 10, 2010

Question 22:

We are looking for additional information regarding the specification for the Geo-composite drainage layer Section 33 46 16. Does the minimum value for the transmissivity reflect a double-sided composite or the geonet alone?

Response Question 22:

Yes the transmissivity reflects a double sided geocomposite.

Question 23:

If you are seeking this minimum value for the geocomposite (5.3×10^{-3}) can you provide some guidance as to the product you had in mind?

Response Question 23:

Any product that meets the specification will be reviewed by the Design Engineer via the Contractor submittal process.

Question 24:

Section 3.2.1.2 of TP7 EPP document provided in Appendix B of the Tender Documents, states that silt fence barriers are to be installed as shown on drawings referenced TP7-DWG-N-023 and TP7-DWG-N-024. Unfortunately the referenced drawings were not included in the Tender Package. Can you please provide such or alternatively, a bid quantity at your earliest convenience.

Response Question 24:

The requirements of the silt barriers for the TP7 project are shown in Drawings TP7-DWG-N-016 and TP7-DWG-N-017.

These changes will not require a revision to the Closing Date and Time given in Addendum #6.



Notice of Addendum STPA Form F 60800 (2008)

In your bid, please indicate that you have noted this change by including the words “Includes Addendum # 009” on your *Bid Form*. If there is more than one (1) Addendum issued for this tender, please acknowledge each separately on your *Bid Form*.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dawn MacNeil", with a large, stylized flourish at the end.

Dawn MacNeil
Contract Manager
Phone: (902) 567-6746
Fax: (902) 567-1037
Email: dawn@tarpondscleanup.ca