APPENDIX A

CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTATION REPORT
FOR
FINAL COVER SYSTEM FOR CELLS A AND B
(main text only)

89-73643 Claim #

FEB 1998
Received
Loss Prevention
Unit

PAGE-TROWBRIDGE RANCH LANDFILL CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTATION REPORT FOR FINAL COVER SYSTEM FOR CELLS A AND B

Prepared for:

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Department of Risk Management
1610 North Vine
Tucson, Arizona 85719

Prepared by:

SCS ENGINEERS
2702 North 44th Street
Suite 105B
Phoenix, Arizona 85008

February 5, 1998
File No. 10.95034.02

CONTENTS

Section		Page
	CERTIFICATION STATEMENT	i
1	INTRODUCTION	
	Purpose	1-1
	Background	1-1
	Record Storage	1-3
2	PROJECT ORGANIZATION AND RESPONSIBILITY	
	Purpose	2-1
	Permitting Agency	2-1
	Facility Owner/Operator	2-1
	Design Engineer	2-2
	Construction Quality Assurance	2-2
	Construction Contractor	2-4
3	SURVEY CONTROL	3-1
4	EXCAVATION	4-1
	Overview	4-1
	Clearing and Grubbing	4-1
	Excavation of Borrow Area Soils	4-1
	Soil Processing	4-2
5	EARTHWORK FOR FINAL COVER SYSTEM	
	Overview	5-1
	Subgrade Preparation	5-1
	Final Cover System	5-2
	Soil Testing	5-2
6	GEOGRID	
	Overview	6-1
	Nonconforming Geogrid	6-1
	Geogrid Storage	6-1
	Manufacturer's Quality Control Documentation	6-1
	Conformance Testing	6-2
	Geogrid Placement	6-2
	Geogrid Subgrade	6-2
	Geogrid Warranties	6-3

CONTENTS - *continued*

Section **Page**

7 GEONET

Overview 7-1
Geonet Storage 7-1
Manufacturer's Quality Control Documentation 7-1
Conformance Testing 7-1
Geonet Placement 7-2

8 SITE FENCES

Overview 8-1
Chainlink Fence 8-1
Barbed Wire Fence 8-1
Signs 8-2

9 STORMWATER DRAINAGE SYSTEM AND ACCESS ROADWAY

Stormwater Drainage System 9-1
Access Roadway 9-2

10 SITE RESEEDING

Overview 10-1
Manufacturer's Quality Control Documentation 10-1
Performance of Site Reseeding 10-1

11 SITE WASTE MATERIALS

Overview 11-1
Receiving Landfill Documentation 11-1

APPENDICES

A PERMITS, AMENDMENTS, AND MISCELLANEOUS
B SOIL SUBGRADE AND ENGINEERED FILL
C HDPE GEOGRID

C-1 Nonconforming Geogrid
C-2 Contractor's Work Plan and Change Order
C-3 Manufacturer's Quality Control Documentation
C-4 Geogrid Conformance Test Results
C-5 Geogrid Panel Installer Deployment and Repair Logs
C-6 Subgrade Drawings
C-7 Certificates of Subgrade Acceptance
C-8 Manufacturer's and Installer's Warranties

CONTENTS - *continued*

D GEONET

D-1 Manufacturer's Quality Control Documentation
D-2 Geonet Quality Assurance Conformance Test Results and Panel Deployment

E CONFORMANCE WITH SITE RESEEDING

F SITE WASTE DISPOSAL DOCUMENTATION

G WEEKLY SUMMARY REPORTS OF CONSTRUCTION

G-1 Manufacturer's Quality Control Documents
G-2 Methods of Application Documents

H PHOTO DOCUMENTATION LOG OF CONSTRUCTION OF CELLS A AND B, STORMWATER DITCH COLLECTION SYSTEM, SITE ACCESS ROAD, FENCES, AND RESEEDING

CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

SCS Engineers' personnel provided Construction Quality Assurance services during the construction of the Final Cover System at the Page-Trowbridge Ranch Landfill located near Oracle Junction, Arizona. Based on the results of the quality assurance program and our observations, SCS certifies that, with the exception of the sprig count conformance for Site B, the Construction Quality Assurance Plan has been successfully implemented and the construction of the Final Cover System is in general accordance with the design criteria and Specifications in the Construction Documents.

(for) Brad Smith

Henry O'Bryan
CQA Monitor
SCS ENGINEERS

Registered Professional Engineer (Civil)
CERTIFICATE NO.
23413
STEPHEN B.
SMITH
Date Signed 2-3-96
ARIZONA, U.S.A.

Stephen B. Smith, P.E.
Project Director
SCS ENGINEERS

SECTION 1
INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE

This report describes activities and provides documentation related to the Final Cover Installation at the Page-Trowbridge Ranch Landfill (PTRL) located near Oracle Junction, Arizona. The construction was completed in accordance with an Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) closure plan letter of approval dated September 13, 1996. The project consisted of the construction of the Final Cover System for the disposal cells in Sites A and B within the landfill, a Stormwater Drainage System to divert stormwater around the landfill, and a site fencing system to control public access to the facility. Through submittal of this Construction Documentation Report, the University of Arizona, Risk Management Department is requesting that ADEQ issue an approval of the final closure of the PTRL in accordance with the modified closure plan.

This report describes construction activities and the construction quality assurance/quality control (CQA/CQC) program results. Report appendices include copies of test results, manufacturers' certifications, photo documentation, and summaries of field forms used to document the quality of construction. Record Drawings and construction documents are bound separately. The Record Drawings were provided exclusively by Granite Construction Company.

BACKGROUND

The PTRL is located in the Oracle Junction area of Pinal County, Arizona, north of State Highway 77. The land where the landfill is located is owned by the University of Arizona (UA). The land owned by UA is known as the Page-Trowbridge Ranch Research Center and is located within Township 9 South, Range 14 East, Gila and Salt River Base and Meridian, and includes approximately the south half of Section 27 and the northern half of Section 34. The PTRL is located in the southwest corner of the Page-Trowbridge

Ranch Research Center. The PTRL contains mainly laboratory wastes and some radioactive wastes which were generated by the UA. The landfilling operations at the PTRL stopped in February 1986.

The PTRL was developed through construction of individual 10-foot by 10-foot by 10-foot-deep disposal cells, separated by native soils, thereby creating a "waffle-like" configuration. These cells were used for disposal of small quantities of hazardous waste. In general, the cells were developed in a layered manner by placing a level of containerized waste, capping the waste with a layer of plywood or cardboard sheets and/or 2 feet of soil, then repeating this process until the cell was filled approximately 6 feet. The remaining 3 to 4 feet was then backfilled with soil to the current landfill grades.

The PTRL facility includes two areas: an approximate 0.9-acre area designated as Site A, and a separate, approximately 2.3-acre area designated as Site B. Site A received hazardous materials in sealed 55-gallon drums (DOT 17C) which it is reported, were never opened at the site. Site B was used as an open neutralization pit and a burn pit prior to being used for direct burial of 1- and 5-gallon containers, and 55-gallon drums. Site B also received radioactive waste.

Construction activities performed as part of the installation of the Final Cover System included the following:

- Clearing and Grubbing
- Excavation of the Borrow Area Soils
- Soil Processing
- Placement of the Soil Components of the Final Cover System
- Installation of the Geogrid and Geonet in the Final Cover System
- Construction of Drainage Channels
- Installation of the Facility Fence
- Site Reseeding

Construction of the Final Cover System was initiated on December 4, 1996 and was substantially complete on August 6, 1997.

RECORD STORAGE

One complete set of Construction Document Records will be maintained at each of the following locations:

- University of Arizona, Risk Management in Tucson, Arizona; and
- SCS Engineers, Phoenix, Arizona.

Construction Document Records will include the Construction Plans and Specifications, Final Cover System Construction CQA/CQC Plan, and this Construction Documentation Report.

SECTION 2
PROJECT ORGANIZATION AND RESPONSIBILITY

PURPOSE

The purpose of this Section is to set forth the responsibility of the organizations involved in the Final Cover System Installation at the PTRL.

PERMITTING AGENCY

The Permitting Agency for the PTRL is the ADEQ. ADEQ is authorized to issue an approval for construction based on review and acceptance of the Closure Plan documents and any modifications. ADEQ approval to construct was obtained prior to the commencement of construction (see letter dated September 13, 1996, included in Appendix A). As construction progressed, ADEQ held the responsibility and authority to review and accept design revisions or requests for variance submitted by the Owner or its designated representative. ADEQ is responsible for review of the site Final Cover System installation and ensures compliance with applicable regulations. In addition, ADEQ has the responsibility and authority to review all CQA documentation to confirm that the PTRL Final Cover System has been constructed in accordance with the approved and/or amended construction documents.

FACILITY OWNER/OPERATOR

The Owner/Operator of the PTRL is the State of Arizona. The State of Arizona is responsible for all facility operations, including coordinating the design and construction of the PTRL's environmental controls. This responsibility includes compliance with the Closure Plan and the submission of CQA documentation, which demonstrates that the facility was closed in accordance with the Closure Plan documents and the design Plans and Specifications. The Owner has the authority to contract and manage the parties charged with design, CQA, and construction activities. The Owner also has the

authority to accept or reject design Plans and Specifications, CQA Plans, reports, and recommendations of the CQA Consultant, and the materials and workmanship of Contractors.

DESIGN ENGINEER

The Engineer is SCS Engineers (SCS). The Engineer is responsible for the preparation of the design, including Drawings, Plans, and Project Specifications for construction, and the CQA/CQC Plan.

The Engineer is responsible for performing the engineering design and preparing the associated Drawings and Specifications, reviewing and/or approving all design and Specification changes, and making design clarifications necessitated during construction. The Engineer is a licensed professional, skilled in the appropriate design disciplines. The Engineer is familiar with the construction details of the PTRL and applicable regulatory requirements.

CONSTRUCTION QUALITY ASSURANCE

The CQA Consultant is SCS Engineers (SCS). The CQA Consultant is a party independent of the Contractor and is responsible for verification and evaluation of field testing, observing, and documenting activities related to the construction and/or permit documents and the CQA/CQC Plan. The CQA Consultant is represented on-site by CQA monitoring personnel. In general, the responsibilities and authorities of the CQA Consultant include:

- Understanding the permit documents, design Plans, and Specifications in relation to all aspects of the CQA/CQC Plan;

- Scheduling, coordinating, and performing CQA/CQC activities;

- Performing independent on-site observation of the Work in progress to assess compliance with the CQA/CQC Plan, permit documents, design Plans and Specifications;

- Reporting deviations from [illegible] CQC Plan, permit documents, design Plans and/or Specifications to the Ow[illegible] representative. Secure documents from the Owner which [illegible]

- Recording and mai[illegible] r;

- Verifying that c[illegible]

- Documentin[illegible] ting the data needed for record doc[illegible]

- Maintaining open lines of [illegible] er parties involved in the construction; and

- Preparing the Construction Documentation Report, complete with certification statements.

Representative(s) of the CQA Consultant (SCS Engineers), referred to as CQA Monitor(s), verify and evaluate all tests necessary to ascertain the physical/mechanical characteristics of earthwork, and geosynthetic components of the Final Cover System, the Drainage Channels, the Facility Fence, and Site Reseeding. The CQA Monitor prepares daily reports containing field observations, such as:

- Visual observations;

- CQA/CQC test results;

- Problems or deficiencies encountered and notifications to the Contractor. Documentation of Contractor's actions for resolution or retesting of remediation;
- Summary details of significant events;
- Weather conditions; and
- Other field observations, as deemed necessary.

CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTOR

The Owner retained Granite Construction Company (Granite) from Tucson, Arizona as the Construction Contractor. Granite was responsible for the following:

- Installation of the Facility Fence, as shown on the Plans and in conformance with the Contract Documents;
- Preparation of staging area;
- Setting up the Contractor's Area;
- All survey activities required to perform the Work and verify that the project was completed in accordance with the Plans and Contract Documents;
- Clearing and grubbing;
- Excavating the borrow area;
- Processing the borrow area soils with the onsite stockpiled clay;
- Preparation of Subgrade;

- Placement and compaction of the soil components of the Final Cover System (Foundation Layer, Soil Infiltration Barrier Layer, Geonet, and Vegetative Layer);

- Placement of the geogrid beneath and in the Foundation Layer to the lines and grades as shown on the Plans and in conformance with the Contract Documents;

- Excavating and backfilling as necessary, including the Drainage Channels and installation of Corrugated Metal Arch Pipe Culverts to the lines and grades as shown on the Plans and in conformance with the Contract Documents;

- Site Reseeding, as shown on the Plans and in conformance with the Contract Documents; and

- Other site-specific responsibilities as required by the Contract Documents.

Granite retained the following subcontractors to complete the Final Cover System construction:

- Field Lining Systems, Inc. (FSLI) assisted and/or supervised the installation of all geosynthetic products, including the geogrid and geonet geosynthetic materials. FSLI also supplied the geonet manufactured by Fluid Systems, Inc. of Aurora, Illinois, and also supplied some certifications on testing of materials.

- Smith-Rollins, Inc., a Registered Land Surveyor in the State of Arizona, provided all survey control on the project.

- Tensar Corporation, a geosynthetic material manufacturer and testing laboratory from Morrow, Georgia, provided the geogrid materials and performed the manufacturer's quality control testing for these materials.

- Brown and White, Inc., a fence construction Contractor, performed installation of the chainlink security fence and barbed-wire boundary fences.

- Western Sod, Inc. performed seeding of devegetated areas and the Final Cover System.

- CET Environmental Services, Inc., an environmental services firm, wrote the Site Health and Safety Plan and Site Contingency and Emergency Plan, performed on-site employee training and employee exposure monitoring, and provided hazardous material spill response during subgrade preparation and installation of the Final Cover System.

SECTION 3
SURVEY CONTROL

Smith-Rollins, Inc. performed all surveying for the Final Cover System Installation. Smith-Rollins, Inc. prepared the earthwork and survey portions of Record Drawings as part of the CQA/CQC survey. The Record Drawings consist of a set of full-size "D" drawings, which are bound separately. The Record Drawings include the following information:

- Final Cover System and Final Elevation Grade Plan with Survey Stations, Fences, and Stormwater Drainage System;
- Field Soil and Geosynthetics Testing Location Map, with associated Survey Control Stations, and field notes for the field elevation of samples (also see Appendix B);
- Access Roadway Grade, existing topography at the site prior to construction;
- Additional drawings received in accordance with the Project Manual are listed below:
  - Record Survey for the mid-section corner and its relocation (see Appendix A).
  - Subgrade map for Site A (see Appendix C).
  - Subgrade map for Site B (see Appendix C).

SECTION 4
EXCAVATION

OVERVIEW

For the purposes of this report, excavation activities discussed in this section include:

- Clearing and grubbing,
- Excavation of borrow area soils, and
- Soil processing.

CLEARING AND GRUBBING

These activities consisted of the removal of objectionable material from Site A and B areas, soil borrow area, staging area, topsoil stockpile area, and Contractor's area as required by the Specifications. Site clearing also included demolition and salvage of existing chain link and barbed wire fence on Site A; demolition and removal of existing chain link fence on Site B; and the demolition and removal of barbed wire, and any PVC, metal pipe, or concrete monuments within the limits of the disposal areas (Sites A and B). The Contractor installed a new brass cap monument outside the construction area to replace the mid-section corner of Section 33 and 34. The new brass cap monument was installed, surveyed, and recorded in accordance with all applicable laws (see Appendix A).

A Bentonite concrete cement slurry was used to plug old site test points after the 2-inch steel and 3-inch PVC pipes were removed prior to the preparation of the subgrade. Field verification and observance of construction activities indicated that this activity was performed in accordance with the Specifications and Drawings.

EXCAVATION OF BORROW AREA SOILS

The Contractor excavated the Borrow Area in general accordance with the Specifications and Drawings. The top 6 inches of soil in the borrow area were removed and stockpiled

in the Topsoil Stockpile Area to be used in vegetation of disturbed areas near the completion of the project. All other excavation material was used in the construction of the project. For the convenience of the Contractor and with the approval of the land owner, the Borrow Area was expanded to the east beyond the limits shown on the drawings.

SOIL PROCESSING

Soil processing included the following:

- Removal of oversized particles from soils excavated from the Borrow Area;
- Reduction or pulverization of clay clods;
- Mixing of Borrow Area soils with the on-site stockpiled clay; and
- Soil moisture and conditioning.

Field verification and observance of construction activities indicated that soil processing was performed in general accordance with the Specifications except that the clay stockpile materials were not evenly distributed throughout all the processed soil. However, the performance standards required in the placement of processed soil on the Final Cover System appear to be unaffected.

SECTION 5
EARTHWORK FOR FINAL COVER SYSTEM

OVERVIEW

The Final Cover System for the PTRL has the following configuration (from top to bottom):

- Vegetative Soil Layer (VSL) - 24-inch-thick compacted soil layer;
- Geonet - 200-mil HDPE material;
- Soil Infiltration Barrier (SIB) - 24-inch-thick compacted soil layer;
- Foundation Soil Layer (FSL) - 12-inch-thick compacted soil layer;
- Geogrid;
- Foundation Soil Layer (FSL) - 12-inch-thick compacted soil layer;
- Geogrid; and
- Prepared Subgrade.

Placement of the soil components of the Final Cover System began with preparation of the subgrade, followed by placement (from the bottom upwards) of the 2-foot-thick Foundation Layer (with Geogrid material below and in the middle of this layer), the 2-foot thick Soil Infiltration Barrier Layer, and 2-foot Vegetative Soil Layer (placed on top of Geonet material). Soils from the borrow pit excavation, mixed with clay from the stockpile, were used for all soil components of the Final Cover System.

SUBGRADE PREPARATION

The subgrade was prepared by clearing and grubbing as described in the previous section, followed by excavation/backfill to meet subgrade elevations and then rolling and compaction of the subgrade in accordance with the Specifications. Results of the required field testing of the subgrade are presented in Appendix B.

Prior to placing the first level of geogrid, the underlying soil was moisture-conditioned and wheel-rolled to provide a smooth and stable base. After the subgrade was prepared, Smith-Rollins, Inc. surveyed the subgrade to document final subgrade elevations. The subgrade drawings are presented in Appendix C.

FINAL COVER SYSTEM

The processed soil was delivered to the site from the staging area and spread in 6 to 8-inch loose lifts. Motor graders were used to scarify and to spread the processed soil on the required lift thicknesses, break any clods, and maintain uniform thickness. Compaction equipment compacted each lift to the required density within the moisture range. Wheel-rolling was provided on soil layers immediately underneath geosynthetic layers, whereas, sheep foot rollers were used after one foot of soil had been placed over the geosynthetic layer. The processed soil material was compacted to a minimum of 95 percent of the maximum dry density of the Standard Proctor at plus or minimum two percent of optimum moisture.

SOIL TESTING

Soil testing was performed by Maxim Technologies, Inc., a subcontractor to the CQA Consultant. Moisture/density tests were performed with a Troxler Nuclear Density Gauge in accordance with ASTM standards. Specified calibration tests (sand cones and percent moisture by over drying) were performed in accordance with the Specifications. Field moisture/density tests were performed for each approximate 6-inch lift of engineered fill, at an approximate rate of one (1) per 8,000 square feet of compacted subgrade. Areas in which moisture/density tests revealed failing results were reworked or removed between known adjacent locations that had previously passed the test. The test locations were identified by the approximate station from the plans, as shown on the Record Drawings.

Laboratory permeability tests were performed in accordance with ASTM standards and in accordance with the frequencies required on the Specifications. Test results are provided in Appendix B.

SECTION 6
GEOGRID

OVERVIEW

Geogrid was placed at the elevation as required within the Final Cover System. The geogrid (UX 160040) was manufactured by Tensar, Inc. Field Lining Systems, Inc. was a subcontractor to Granite Construction Company during the installation of the goegrid materials.

NONCONFORMING GEOGRID

The Contractor originally proposed by using a geogrid material identified as UX 1500HS on the project. The Contractor had the geogrid delivered to the site without providing any required documentation. The CQA Consultant obtained samples of this material and the material was found to be in nonconformance with project requirements (see Appendix C). In accordance with the Specifications, the Contractor prepared a written work plan prior to implementing corrective action. This work plan was reviewed by the Engineer and ADEQ. Implementation of the work plan necessitated the changing of the Specifications. The Change Order was prepared by the Engineer and approved as a minor permit modification by the ADEQ (see Appendix C).

GEOGRID STORAGE

Unloading and on-site storage of the geogrid was observed by the CQA Monitor. Operations were performed in a satisfactory manner to protect the geogrid. The roll and lot numbers were verified to insure compliance with the Specifications.

MANUFACTURER'S QUALITY CONTROL DOCUMENTATION

The geogrid Manufacturer and Installer provided quality control documentation for the geogrid used in the project (UX 160040). The documentation included Certificates of

Compliance, Certificates for Product Description, and quality control test results. This documentation was submitted to the Engineer and then to ADEQ for review. The quality control documentation is included in Appendix C.

CONFORMANCE TESTING

The UX 160040 geogrid was sampled off-site by a subcontractor (Golder Construction Services, Inc.) to the CQA Consultant. Fifteen samples of geogrid were collected by Golder Construction Services, Inc. The frequency of sampling corresponds to one (1) sample per lot and then one (1) sample per 100,000 square feet as required. Conformance samples were tested by Golder Construction Services, Inc., in accordance with the Specifications and CQA Plan, as amended. The QA conformance test results indicated compliance with the Specifications (see Appendix C).

GEOGRID PLACEMENT

The geogrid was placed in general conformance with the Specifications and Drawings. Upon deployment of geogrid by the Installer, the CQA Monitor performed field observations to provide verification of compliance with the Specifications and Drawings.

Damaged geogrid was either discarded or repaired. The CQA Monitor observed all geogrid repair activities. Locations and details of the geogrid panel placement were recorded by the Installer on the Panel Deployment and Repair Logs provided in Appendix C.

GEOGRID SUBGRADE

The subgrade was prepared and set to the elevations specified in the Contract Documents and Drawings, as revised. The revision to the subgrade was required due to the exposure of some waste materials during construction of Site B. This is

documented in Appendix A. The as-built elevations of the subgrade at each site are documented in Appendix C.

The Installer certified that the subgrade had been inspected and met the Specifications and Installer's requirements. The Installer's certificates of subgrade acceptance are contained in Appendix C.

GEOGRID WARRANTIES

The Manufacturer's and Installer's warranties are provided in Appendix C.

SECTION 7
GEONET

OVERVIEW

Geonet was placed at the elevation as required within the Final Cover System. The geonet Poly-Net (PN 3000CN) was manufactured by Fluid Systems, Inc (FSI). Field Lining Systems, Inc. was a subcontractor to Granite Construction Company during the installation of the geonet materials.

GEONET STORAGE

Unloading and storage of the geonet materials on-site was reviewed by the CQA Monitor for protection from ultraviolet light, precipitation, dirt, or other conditions which could damage the materials. The CQA Monitor observed that the protective wrappings were maintained on the geonet rolls until deployment.

MANUFACTURER'S QUALITY CONTROL DOCUMENTATION

The geonet Manufacturer and Installer provided quality control documentation for the rolls of geonet delivered to the site. The documentation included Certificates of Compliance, Certificates for Product Description, and quality control test results. This documentation was submitted to the Engineer. The quality control documentation is included in Appendix D.

CONFORMANCE TESTING

The CQA Consultant collected two conformance samples of the geonet. The frequency of sampling corresponds to one (1) sample for every 100,000 square feet of geonet installed as all the supplied geonet was from the same manufacturer's lot.

Conformance samples were sent to Golder Construction Services, Inc. for testing in accordance with the Specifications. The QA conformance test results were indicated in compliance with the Specifications (see Appendix D).

GEONET PLACEMENT

The geonet was placed in general conformance with the Specifications and Drawings. Upon deployment of geonet by the Installer, the CQA Monitor performed field observations to provide verification of compliance with the Specifications and Drawings.

SECTION 8
SITE FENCES

OVERVIEW

Brown and White, Inc. installed site fencing as subcontractor to Granite Construction Company.

Due to the presence of a wash along the south property boundary, the chainlink security fence and the barbed wire protective/boundary fence were both moved 100 feet north of the position shown on the original Drawings. The change occurred on the south boundary only and is shown on the Record Drawings.

Additionally, along the south and west fence lines, there was one point on each fence line where a small wash crossed the fence line. To insure security at the facility, an 18-inch corrugated metal pipe and rip rap were installed where the fence crossed each wash.

CHAINLINK FENCE

A 6-foot chainlink security fence, with three strands of barbed wire placed at the top and angled outward at 45 degrees, was installed around the perimeter of the site in accordance with the Specifications. Shop drawing submittals and field verification during construction activities indicated compliance with the Specifications and Drawings as noted.

BARBED WIRE FENCE

The Specifications required a four-strand barbed wire fence. However, the subcontractor installed a five-strand barbed wire fence as requested for a protective boundary. Shop drawing submittals and field verification during construction activities indicated compliance with the Specifications and Drawings as noted.

SIGNS

Signs were installed in accordance with the Specifications and Drawings. Signs were provided in both English and Spanish languages.

SECTION 9
STORM WATER DRAINAGE SYSTEM AND ACCESS ROADWAY

STORMWATER DRAINAGE SYSTEM

Ditch Construction

Two stormwater ditches were constructed as shown on the Drawings. Backfill was used as required to construct areas above existing grade. Field verification and observance of construction activities indicated that the stormwater ditches were constructed in general accordance with the Specifications and Drawings.

Corrugated Steel Arch Pipe Culverts

The piping used for the construction of the stormwater drainage was galvanized corrugated metal pipe. One size of pipe was utilized for site construction activities. The pipe measured 35 inches by 24 inches by approximately 40 feet. Shop drawing submittals and field verification during construction activities indicated compliance with the Specifications.

Rip Rap Drainage Material

Rip rap drainage material was placed within the areas as required by the Drawings. Upon delivery to the facility, it was discovered by the CQA Monitor that the proposed rip rap drainage material was off-specification because of a portion of larger rock (greater than 12-inch in size). The Contractor employed labor to hand-sort the rip rap material to comply with the Specification. Larger rock was either used in other areas of the site as directed by the Owner, crushed by the Contractor to meet Specifications, or removed from the site.

ACCESS ROADWAY

The access roadway was constructed as shown on the drawings. Field verification and observance of construction activities indicated that the access roadway was constructed in general accordance with the Specifications and Drawings.

SECTION 10
SITE RESEEDING

OVERVIEW

Western Sod Company performed the site reseeding as a subcontractor to Granite Construction Company.

The areas encompassed by the Final Cover System on Sites A and B were reseeded after completion of the Final Cover by a hydroseeding method as specified in the Specifications. Other areas, including the staging area, Contractor's area, topsoil stockpile area, borrow soil, and other areas at the site disturbed by the Contractor, were to be reseeded in accordance with the Specifications by the hay mulch seeding method. However, Western Sod Company proposed a minor change providing that all reseeding be performed by the hydroseed method and they also proposed a change in the hydroseed mix design. ADEQ approved both of these proposed changes as a minor permit modification (see Appendix A).

MANUFACTURER'S QUALITY CONTROL DOCUMENTATION

The Contractor submitted documentation on the seed mixes, slurry mixes, fertilizers, etc. as required in the Specifications. Shop drawing submittals and field verification during construction activities indicated compliance with the Specifications, as amended.

PERFORMANCE OF SITE RESEEDING

The Engineer performed a sprig count in accordance with the Specifications on November 5, 1997. Methods used to obtain the sprig count and results are presented in Appendix E. The sprig count on Site A was in conformance with the requirements of the Specifications. Site B was in nonconformance with the requirements.

SECTION 11
SITE WASTE MATERIALS

OVERVIEW

Wastes generated during the project included some fencing materials, 3-inch PVC and 2-inch steel pipes, and miscellaneous construction debris such as green waste and concrete. The materials were removed from the site per the Contract Specifications on July 30 and August 1, 1997.

RECEIVING LANDFILL DOCUMENTATION

The Contractor disposed all site materials in accordance with Contract Specifications. These documents are contained in Appendix F of this Report.

The receiving waste facility was the Tangerine Road Landfill, owned and operated by Pima County, Arizona. Copies of submittals, weight bills, etc. are contained in the Appendix F.