

Pre-bid Meeting – DN00338 – Wednesday, October 15, 2014
NC 281 Slide Repair Project

The following items were noted and/or discussed:

General Contract Requirements – Jeffrey Alspaugh

- Bid opening date and time: October 28, 2014 @ 2:00pm
- Contract Time:
 - Availability date: March 2, 2015
 - Completion date: June 30, 2015
 - Contractor asked why availability date was so far out.
 - DOT's response was that the acquisition of right of way took longer than anticipated, pushing a 2014 Availability Date late enough into the Fall season that cold weather would set in and the asphalt plants would shut down before the project could be completed.
 - Contractor asked if work could non-paving portions of the work start before the Contract Availability Date.
 - DOT's response was that it would consider such a request, but with several caveats:
 - the contractor's scope of work, for this early start, would need to be reviewed and approved
 - the associated traffic control, would need to be reviewed and approved
 - no contractor initiated claims for delays could be made prior to the contract availability date
 - the official contract time would not be altered
 - Day and Time Restrictions were noted.
- WBE and MBE goals were noted.
- Performance bonding requirements were noted.
- Geotech special provisions were noted. Jody Kuhne, of the DOT Geotech Unit, gave a brief overview of the existing conditions, the anticipated methodology of the pre-split, blasting, and stabilization, which includes a test segment that is to be observed by DOT staff prior to production blasting; he strongly encouraged the contractors to start their drilling and blasting operations at the east end of the project. Shane Clark, of the DOT Geotech Unit, advised that there was a special provision that did not make it into the proposal, and that he would be forwarding this along. He was advised to send this special provision to Wanda Austin so that she may publish an addendum to all bidders.
- Pay items were noted.

General Scope of Work – Jeffrey Alspaugh

- Project's general scope was covered during review of the plans

- On plan sheet 1-A of the plans, under Additional Notes, contractors were directed to pay close attention to the notes about:
 - Traffic control – particularly about restoring at least one lane of traffic within 20 minutes of a closure (per Note #3 of Index 1101.06, Sheet 1 of 1, of the NCDOT 2012 Roadway Standard Drawings). A contractor asked if that 20-minute time limit was exceeded, was that part of the intermediate liquidated damages.
 - DOT’s response was that it acknowledged that post-blasting debris removal operations may exceed this time. While exceeding that 20-minute time limit was not a part of the intermediate liquidated damages in this contract proposal, that time limit is listed in the NCDOT 2012 Roadway Standard Drawings, which are a part of the contract, so the contractor was encouraged to minimize delays and inconvenience to the motoring public.
 - Erosion Control – acknowledged that maintaining the erosion control measures along the cut-side of the project would be a challenge, due to blasting operations.
 - Temporary Road Maintenance:
 - During part of the construction operations, traffic would be placed on the travel lane, where subsidence has occurred. A contractor was concerned that a catastrophic slide would occur.
 - Jody Kuhne, of the DOT Geotech Unit, responded that the failing condition of this type, would not result in catastrophic failure, but would indeed experience additional subsidence that would have to be repaired by bringing additional stone or base material, in order to keep the lane passable during construction operations.
 - It was noted that the contractor would be responsible for the maintenance of this segment of the road, NOT NCDOT Forces.

- On plan sheet 1-A of the plans, under General Notes, contractors were directed to pay close attention to the notes about:
 - Guardrail
 - Subsurface Plans (none)
 - Utilities – some relocations have occurred. Abandon lines are within the limits of construction. Utilities in the area are Haywood EMC and Frontier.

- On plan sheet 2 of the plans, typical section – noted that general scope has center line shifting 17 feet into the cut.

- A contractor asked if the addendum that reported that 40, 000 cubic yards of cut material included the swell factor.
 - DOT’s response: the 40,000 cubic yards did NOT include shrinkage or swell factors; it is just the raw quantity, but it was noted that shrinkage and swell factors are provided in the proposal (page 2 of the Geotechnical Report – Design and Construction Recommendations).

- On plan sheet 4 of the plans, contractors were directed to pay close attention to the notes about the woven wire fence that is to be erected one foot inside the proposed right of way line. This will be a protective measure for the nearby home owners.

- A contractor asked to whom the cleared trees would belong.
 - DOT's answer: the contractor would take possession of the trees.
- A contractor asked if the cleared trees could be burned at the project site, if the proper permit was obtained.
 - DOT's answer was yes, but noted that homes were within 500 feet of the burn location, so property owners would have to sign-off in agreement.
- A contractor asked how close the cut slope was to the right of way line.
 - DOT's response was about 10 feet. (After checking, the distance varies, with the average indeed being about 10 feet, with the closest distance being seven feet, and the furthest distance being about 25 feet).
- A contractor asked how close the new right of way line was to the nearest house.
 - DOT's response was about 30 feet (after checking, the closest distance is confirmed to be a little over 34 feet).
- A contractor asked if the red flagging in the woods delineated the proposed right of way.
 - DOT's response was that it could not be confirmed at this time. (After checking with DOT's Locations and Survey Unit, the red tape does NOT delineate the right of way. White survey tape would have been used to mark the R/W between monuments. The monuments are DOT's standard Iron Pin and Cap, with a yellow carsonite marker with the station and offset).
- On plan sheet 4-B of the plans, contractors were directed to pay close attention to the notes about:
 - The Little Canada Maintenance Yard – it is a stockpile location for selected shot rock.
 - Its location and distance from the project site were noted and the offer was extended to escort contractors to the location, but none of them opted for the escort.
 - The stockpile storage capacity was noted.
 - The criteria for the rock were noted.
 - The criteria for the stockpile were noted including safety concerns.
 - It was acknowledged that this was not a waste site for this project, but that proper measures are to be taken to ensure that erosion does not become an issue.
 - A contractor asked if the site had to be used.
 - DOT's response was yes, it has to be used.
- Starting on plan sheet TCP-1, contractors were advised that these are the beginning of the traffic control plans. It was noted that there is flexibility in the phasing – if the contractor wants to modify the phasing, then he would need to submit an applicable traffic control plan for review and approval to DOT.
- On plan sheet EC-4, the contractor was directed to pay close attention to the notes on this sheet.

- Starting on plan sheet X-1 begins the cross-sections.
- The last sheet is a detail for Slope Stability for Soil and Weathered Rock Slopes, as provided by the DOT Geotechnical Unit.
- Contractors were advised that all questions and concerns, regarding the proposal or plans, that arise after this meeting adjourns, are to be directed to Wanda Austin at the Division office. She will push the question or concern out to the proper party to get an answer. That party will push that answer back through Wanda, after which both the question and answer will be published for all bidders to review.