



STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

MICHAEL F. EASLEY
GOVERNOR

LYNDO TIPPETT
SECRETARY

October 6, 2008

MEMO TO: Jay Bennett, Jonathan Bivens, Stuart Bourne, Dennis Wofford, Judith Corley-Lay, Randy, Garris, Ron Hancock, Berry Jenkins, Don Lee, Michael Manning, Gerhard Pilcher, Jim Seybert, Ed Spencer, Michael Taylor, and Brian Webb

FROM: Victor Barbour, PE
State Project Services Engineer

SUBJECT: AGC/Roadway Subcommittee Meeting Minutes
August 21, 2008

The subject committee met on August 21, 2008 at 9:30 a.m. in the Riverwood Conference Room at the Century Center with the following in attendance:

Jay Bennett	Berry Jenkins	Norma Smith
Jonathan Bivens	Don Lee	Ed Spencer
Randy Garris	Donald Pearson	Michael Taylor
Ron Hancock	Gerhard Pilcher	Dennis Wofford
Joel Howerton	Jim Seybert	

The following items were discussed:

1. STORM DRAINAGE CHANGES

Ron Hancock announced that the Drainage Committee, which is a subcommittee of the Bridge Team, has been looking at changes in Division 3 of the *Standard Specifications Book*. They are reviewing alternative pipes, methods of installation and changes in backfill material. The Industry discussed the testing procedures and lifting devices. The proposed date for having all changes completed is July 2009.

The Drainage Committee will be meeting with the Pipe Industry on September 17 in the Chief Engineer's Conference Room at 1:00 pm. [Handout No. 1](#)

2. SKAGGS METHOD FOR DETERMINING LATERAL EFFECTS OF A BORROW PIT ON ADJACENT WETLANDS

Don Pearson, representing Ted Sherrod, led the discussion and provided some general information on the US Army Corp of Engineers position on required borrow pit setbacks from wetland locations. The discussion included:

- (A) The contractor should have a level III-B Erosion and Sediment Control/Stormwater responsible party complete the hydrologic analysis (Skaggs Method).
- (B) The contractor should provide existing and proposed ground elevations of proposed sites to determine which Type Borrow Pit is present (Type 1, 2, or 3).
- (C) A note was included on the document to clarify that a 25 ft. setback would be required from wetland boundaries and a 50 ft. setback would be required from stream banks.
- (D) A comment was added to indicate daylighting may be necessary to allow surface drainage in a diffuse manner flow from pit to wetland. [Handout No. 2](#)

3. BORROW PIT DEWATERING BASIN

Don Pearson led the discussion on the following:

- (A) The formula to determine the Volume required was removed from this special provision and added to the Revised Borrow and Waste Reclamation Procedures.
- (B) The Industry raised some questions regarding maximum depth of 3 ft. for basin. The concern is that the dewatering basin will need to be very large to allow pumping and a limiting depth would impact how much area of the pit would be needed for the basin rather than the borrow material. The Industry asked if the Department could revisit the 3 ft. depth. The Department replied that baffle height is 3 ft. and allowing a deeper basin would render the baffles ineffective. The Industry suggested adding a forebay type system where the initial discharge from pit would enter, allow heavy sediment deposition and then use the formula for settlement ($Q=8.0203 *Q*t$) to determine the final phase or clarifying station for a dewatering device. Don Lee suggested Roadside Environmental review the issue and have the Industry make comments on a draft detail drawing of the proposed dewatering basin.
- (C) A comment was added to the second page of the document indicating the water pumped from borrow pit to dewatering basin shall be obtained from top of water column and discharged into dewatering basin in a diffuse manner.
- (D) A flashboard riser option was added to outlet methods from dewatering basin.
- (E) A comment was added allowing the contractor at his discretion, to add a drain device to the outlet system to aid in complete drainage of device for removal. [Handout No. 3](#)

4. BORROW AND WASTE SITE RECLAMATION PROCEDURES FOR CONTRACTED PROJECTS

Don Pearson led the discussion on the following:

- (A) Three handouts (pages 2, 7, 11) with additional revisions were distributed. The revisions are noted in blue ink.
- (B) The History language at beginning of document was removed and replaced with a short opening paragraph.
- (C) Under Plan Procedure, the number of copies to be submitted was increased from 10 to 11 to match the number of people listed in distribution list further in document.
- (D) A comment allowing the submittal of an electronic version of the reclamation plan to expedite review and approval was included as an alternative.
- (E) A comment was added to address the 100-year floodplain impacts. Waste or Borrow activities cannot occur in 100-year floodplain unless superseded by an environmental permit. Waste or Borrow activities cannot occur within High Quality Water Zones (water classifications include WS-1, WS-2, ORW, Class SA, and Primary Nursery Waters) unless superseded by an environmental permit. Don gave an update from David Chang of Hydraulics Unit regarding the 100-year floodplain. David spoke with someone from FEMA and asked about Borrow activities in this area. He was told that it is possible to obtain permission for Borrow activities in 100-year floodplain as long as appropriate management of stockpiling is observed. Some type of communication or approval would still be required. (This was not recorded on the revised document presented but given verbally by Don.)
- (F) The revised document relocated a paragraph referencing the Skaggs method from the end of one bulleted point to the beginning of the same bullet under the Environmental Evaluation section.
- (G) The words “are required” were added to the statement...”Identification of jurisdictional wetlands, surface waters, and protected riparian buffers at the site or within a 400’ perimeter of the site *are required.*”
- (H) A bullet was added that appropriate permits need to be provided when work is proposed in 100-year floodplain.
- (I) A bullet was added that State Historic Preservation Office Review should be included for Borrow and Waste Sites and the website for SHPO was included.
- (J) The comment “Refer to Procedures for Monitoring Borrow Pit Discharge Special Provision for more details” was added to bullet referencing turbidity management.
- (K) The bullet was added that a Level III-B EC/Stormwater Certified person should prepare Reclamation Plan.
- (L) A sub bullet was added to include design formula and procedure for Borrow Pit Dewatering Basins.
- (M) A sub bullet was added giving contractor guidance that perimeter erosion control design shall be sequenced to reflect rapid construction phase. The intent is to address the need for perimeter EC measures around borrow pits for the short time during and after clearing and grubbing. These devices may not be needed if the contractor pursues excavation in a timely manner.... Thus reducing need for some devices.

- (N) Some revisions were provided in a supplemental handout of page 7 where the formula for determining the weir length was rearranged to solve for “L” rather than “Q”. A minimum “L” was also given as 4 ft. minimum. This rearrangement is to simplify the formula.
- (O) Some additions were made for guidance under Map Legend to address who prepared plans and what the Level III-B EC/Stormwater certification number is.
- (P) Clarifications were made to SHPO item in checklist for Reclamation Plan to include "have conditions been addressed?" [Handout No. 4](#)

5. STAGING AREA, AN AMENDMENT TO RECLAMATION PLAN PROCEDURES

Don presented the Revised Staging Area Document and the following topics were discussed:

- (A) The statement for “staging areas that do not contain erodible material....” Was amended to include ...” or involve land disturbing activities shall ...
- (B) The statement for “staging areas that contain erodible material” was amended to include or involve land disturbing activities shall...
- (C) A new paragraph was added addressing the use of existing facilities for storage of non-erodible materials or involve land disturbing activities being exempt from an environmental evaluation or reclamation plan unless jurisdictional features are present.
- (D) A statement was added addressing mobile operations that involve parking of equipment and vehicles. No environmental evaluation or reclamation plans are necessary. [Handout No. 5](#)

6. APRONS- DRAFT SPECIAL PROVISION

The Industry stated at a previous meeting that the subcontractor that installs the drop inlet or catch basin is not the one that performs the flat concrete work around the box. Right now, the apron is incidental to the drop inlet or catch basin. Randy distributed a draft Project Special Provision for a pay item for the apron area around the drop inlets and catch basins. The Industry agreed with the draft provision. It will be effective with the January 19, 2009 letting. [Handout No. 6](#)

7. OTHER BUSINESS

(A) SUGGESTIONS FOR PAY ITEMS ON UTILITY ITEMS

At a previous meeting, the Industry had a utility contractor speak about the difficulty of being paid for items that are incidental to pipe, such as extenders, elbows, or fittings. Upon further investigation by the Department, it was found that the specific contract presented was a POC, for which this Unit has no control. The Department asked for specific examples of problems of Centrally-Let Projects.

- (B) The Industry asked when the sediment control basins could be filled in. Are there changes that can be made in the procedures? The Department said the "Rule of Thumb" is as the project progresses."

8. REMAINING MEETING DATES FOR 2008

OCTOBER 23

DECEMBER 18

CC: Ellis Powell, PE
Ted Sherrod, PE, CPESC, CPSWQ
Don Pearson, EI, CPESC
Joel Howerton, PE