

**30f. Why has the project required so many amendments? (Garcia)**

As noted above, the original contract has been expanded to actually provide three separate construction projects involving approximately 2.5 times the original apron area, plus fifty hangars for GA aircraft. Those projects were done as extensions of the original contract because of the urgent need to provide facilities for GA aircraft as quickly as possible.

**30g. Has the work by Martinez, et al. up to this point been completed on time and on budget? (Garcia)**

Yes. The Supplemental Amendments to the contract were based on additional requests from the Department of Aviation and not as result of schedule or budgeting issues with the project.

**31a. Are there specific parks uses planned for his area, including soccer fields? (Wynn)**

After seeds have been established and the grass has reached 1½" growth (approximately one month from project completion), the area will be used for overflow parking during PARD events.

**31b. Do "permanent erosion controls" for this contract include anything other than the addition of topsoil and seeding? (Griffith)**

No, only topsoil, hydromulch and any watering necessary to establish the grass.

**31c. What measures have been taken to mitigate leeching from the landfill into Town Lake? (Garcia)**

The surface of the former landfill was reworked to reduce ponding and infiltration of stormwater that can contribute to leachate formation. A clean soil "cap" was placed over the surface of the former landfill site, to a depth of approximately 1 foot, and graded so stormwater will run off the landfill surface to drainage swales and then into existing culverts under the hike and bike trail. This project establishes grass as a permanent erosion control measure to keep the fill material in place and provide an appropriate surface that is compatible with the surrounding area.

**31d. When was the landfill in operation? (Garcia)**

The Zilker Landfill was in operation from 1944-1967.

**31e. What is in the landfill? Are there any concerns of methane leaks or abrupt settling of the landfill? (Garcia)**

The composition of the garbage placed in this landfill is expected to be typical of municipal solid waste (rubbish, paper, yard trimmings, household garbage including small quantity hazardous waste, etc.).

The consultant confirmed the presence of methane, and recommended additional monitoring of gas and groundwater to determine if the methane is impacting groundwater at the site. Methane may impact groundwater quality, but does not represent a threat to park users since there are no structures in the vicinity where methane could accumulate. Migration of contaminated groundwater or landfill leachate is expected to be mitigated by the improvements made to the cap to reduce the infiltration of water and the generation of leachate.

Abrupt settlement of the landfill is not a concern. Additional subsidence of the landfill may occur due to decomposition of the landfill materials, but this would not be abrupt, and the consultant attempted to allow for this in the design of the final grades. Periodic inspection and monitoring of this site will continue.

**31f. There is a significant difference in the bids for what appears to be a relatively straightforward project. Why is that? (Garcia)**

Staff can only assume that differences the costs of topsoil and delivery, and estimates for additional watering could have caused the variations in bids. The contractor is responsible for watering the hydromulch as needed to reach the 1-1/2" of growth. Watering could be achieved by various means (water truck, temporary irrigation system, etc.) and the amount of watering will also vary depending on the amount of rain.

**31g. Did Robert Jentsch Construction submit a cost breakdown for their work? (Garcia)**

Answer forthcoming.

**31h. Where is Jentsch getting the topsoil? (Garcia)**

Capital Aggregates.

**32a. Rainbow Materials is listed as supplying the concrete for this job. Are they still dumping excess concrete in the Colorado River? (Griffith)**

Watershed Dept staff reported that the Rainbow Materials Del Valle facility is not engaged in illegal dumping at their facility.

**Public Works (29-36)****29h. What is the status of determining the liability for the pipe problem? (Griffith)**

The repair of the pipeline will ultimately be paid for by the responsible party or parties. The issue of who is or is not a responsible party is the subject of potential litigation. All evidence indicates that the City is not at fault. Formal written notice of the City's claim has been given to the appropriate parties, and settlement negotiations have begun. Since this is the subject of potential litigation, any further discussion should be limited to private consultation with the City's attorneys.

**29i. Why are we approving another contract increase for repairs? (Griffith)**

The Ullrich TM is an essential component of the water distribution system. There is a need for this TM to be functional they summer. From the time that we identified the problem, in order to have the TM functional this summer, the City approach was to make the repairs then seek to recover the cost from the responsible party.

**29j. How much has the city approved (with this increase) for repairs thus far that we anticipate being able to re-coup from others (contractors or pipe vendor)? (Griffith)**

The City will seek to recover all of this cost from the responsible party. (Griffith)

**29k. What is the current total estimate for all repairs to get this pipe fixed? (Griffith)**

The estimated cost is \$6,376,125.60,

**29l. When are the repairs scheduled to be completed? (Griffith)**

The current schedule is to have the repairs completed and the TM functional by May 1, 2002.

**31g. Did Robert Jentsch Construction submit a cost breakdown for their work? (Garcia)**

Not yet. After contract award, the contractor will submit a schedule of values showing the breakdown of scopes of work and costs associated with each scope.

**31h. Is this related to the placement of the excavated material from the CSC and City Hall projects at Zilker park? (Griffith)**

Yes. This was arranged in advance with the Parks Department because they needed fill at Zilker Park and the City Hall site had soil which needed to be excavated and disposed of. The City Hall excavation was bid with the requirement that the contractor haul 30,000 cubic yards of clean alluvial soil to the Zilker Park site.

**31i. Was there any cost savings for either CSC or City Hall by using this area to dump the excavated material, if so how much did we save? (Griffith)**

Both the City Hall project and Parks Department benefited from this arrangement. Staff very conservatively estimates that the City saved \$435,260 on the Zilker Landfill project by using the City Hall excavation spoils. This quantity is based on the minimum thickness of the cap (1.5') recommended by the engineer. The City Hall Project also benefited from lower hauling costs for the shorter distance and no tipping fees to dispose of the soil at Zilker Park, however savings cannot be estimated at this time.

**32b. Didn't Council Member Wynn, at a recent Council meeting, request that the City pay debt owed to Rainbow Materials and discontinue contracts with the company? (Griffith)**

Council Member Wynn had initially suggested this at the meeting of January 31, 2002. Consequently, ratification for the debt owed was approved, however the new contract award was not acted on. The matter of the pending award was brought back to Council for action at the February 14, 2002 meeting. An executive session was held prior to action for award of contract. Based on the information provided to Council, a new contract was approved on consent at the February 14, 2002 meeting, with Council Member Slusher making the motion with the second by Council Member Wynn. Rainbow Materials has made every effort to cooperate with the City and the other regulatory agencies to solve problems related to the site.

**33e. Did the town Lake Park Stakeholder group or the Parks Board Land and Facilities committees review this proposal? (Griffith)**

No, neither the Parks Board nor the stakeholders reviewed the proposed extension of the existing parking garage design contract to address photovoltaics. The PV project does not affect the park funding as it is funded completely through Austin Energy, independent of the venue.

**36c. What measures will need to be taken to ensure the security of office equipment, especially computer systems in the proposed new open office environment at the new location? (Griffith)**

This item has been postponed indefinitely.