Post Design-Build Evaluation Report

Project Description: I-285 Variable Speed Limits
P.I. Number: 0010782
County: Cobb, Fulton, DeKalb
GDOT District: District 7

Date Conducted: January 11th, 2017

(I-285 Westbound east of SR 400, DeKalb County)
1. **Project Description:** The purpose of this project is to optimize traffic flow, increase the operational efficiency and reduce congestion, traffic delays, crashes, and vehicle emissions on the freeway corridor by installing Variable Speed Limit Signs (VSLs) on the northern section of I-285 from I-20 to I-20 throughout Cobb, DeKalb and Fulton Counties. Static speed limit signs will be added on the southern section of I-285 from I-20 to I-20 through Clayton, DeKalb and Fulton Counties.

2. **Design-Build delivery goal(s):** Expedite delivery and to make use of available funds.

3. **Project stakeholders:**
   - GDOT – Innovative Delivery, Traffic Operations, District 7
   - Brooks Berry Haynie & Associates – Prime Contractor
   - Atkins – Prime Designer

4. **Project Summary:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Milestone</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Let</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Notice Advertisement (PNA)</td>
<td>05/11/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for Qualifications (RFQ)</td>
<td>06/08/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter of Interest (LOI)/Statement of Qualifications (SOQ)</td>
<td>07/06/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice to Finalists</td>
<td>08/27/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for Proposals (RFP)</td>
<td>09/21/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Proposal / Project Letting</td>
<td>10/19/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Let</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Award</td>
<td>11/02/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTP 1 – Preliminary Design</td>
<td>12/04/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTP 2 – Final Design</td>
<td>04/30/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA (CE) Re-Evaluation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional NTP 3a – Construction Phase</td>
<td>10/18/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full NTP 3 – Construction Phase</td>
<td>05/27/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Completion Date (original)</td>
<td>09/30/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to traffic</td>
<td>10/05/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial Project Completion</td>
<td>08/11/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Design-Build Proposers:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Designer</th>
<th>Total Bid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Brooks Berry Haynie &amp; Assoc., Inc.</td>
<td>Atkins</td>
<td>$4,921,604.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Midasco, LLC.</td>
<td>Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>$5,720,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 RJ Haynie &amp; Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>URS Corporation</td>
<td>$7,449,985.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 The L.C. Whitford Co., Inc.</td>
<td>GCA Engineering</td>
<td>$9,998,887.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **Stipend**
   
a. Was a stipend (stipulated fee) offered to proposing Design-Build Teams?  
   - Yes  
   - No  
   
   If yes, how much per firm: - N/A

7. **Design-Build Request for Proposals (RFP)**
   
a. Type of procurement:
   - One Phase/Low Bid  
   - Two Phase/Low Bid  
   - Best Value  

b. Advertisement duration:
   - 30 days  
   - 60 days  
   - 90 days  

7. **Design-Build Request for Proposals (RFP)**
   
a. Type of procurement:
   - One Phase/Low Bid  
   - Two Phase/Low Bid  
   - Best Value  

b. Advertisement duration:
   - 30 days  
   - 60 days  
   - 90 days  


b. General observations of the RFP contents and/or procurement process:
   Overall the process was good. GDOT provided redlined and clean versions, for addendums, of the proposal. There were a lot of questions from the DB Teams. The group felt that a best value procurement method should have been used because it would’ve allowed contractor innovation through the ATC process. There were several projects in the vicinity that were not listed in the proposal.

8. **Design-Build RFP Package**
   
a. List items included in the RFP package:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costing plans</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge layouts</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved concept report/concept revision</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provided on the GDOT’s SharePoint site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Environmental Document</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provided on the GDOT’s SharePoint site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAiCE files</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microstation files</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Design Exceptions/Variances</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Design Exceptions/Variances required for the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnical Reports</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Pavement Design</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Design Alternative</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead/Subsurface Utility Engineering</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>SUE waiver obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Level “B” (QL-B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costing Plan Review Report</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provided on the GDOT’s SharePoint site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Transportation Management Plan (TMP)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provided on the GDOT’s SharePoint site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Special Provisions &amp; additional I-285 sign project details</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. Were conflicts in project scope identified: Yes  No
   If yes, what sections should be revised for future RFPs: It was very difficult to integrate with existing GDOT software (Navigator). The group felt that in the future maybe consider requiring standalone software development from the DB Team and let GDOT be responsible for software integration to ensure better maintenance transition from DB Team to GDOT. It was also suggested to consider liquidated damages on the Toll System Integrator contract, which is managed by TMC.

9. Environmental
   a. Type of document: NEPA: Level: PCE  CE  EA/FONSI  EIS/ROD
      GEPA: Level: Type A  Type B  EER/NOD
      b. Was the environmental document approved prior to the RFP advertisement? Yes  No
      If no, when was the NEPA/GEPA document approved? N/A
      c. Was a re-evaluation performed post-let? Yes  No
      If yes, describe scenario why a re-evaluation was required: N/A
      If yes, did the Design-Build Team perform the re-evaluation? N/A
      Did the Design-Build Team provide supporting documentation? N/A
      d. General observations of the pre-let or post-let environmental process:
         o None

10. Environmental Permitting
    a. Type of 404 permit required: NWP  IP  Other  None
    b. Was mitigation required as part of the permit? Yes  No
       If yes, did the Design-Build Team perform mitigation and/or acquire credits? Yes  No
    c. Was a Stream Buffer Variance (SBV) required? Yes  No
    d. List any other permits required by the project (not counting NPDES Permit):
       o None
    e. General observations of the environmental permitting process:
       o None

11. NPDES Permit
    a. Did the Design-Build Team prepare the Notice of Intent (NOI)? Yes  No  NA
    b. Did the Design-Build Team pay the NPDES permitting fee? Yes  No  NA
    c. Were the ESPCP regularly redlined? Yes  No  NA
    d. Did any self-report actions occur? Yes  No
       If yes, describe the reason(s) and outcome(s): N/A
    e. Was a consent order filed? Yes  No
       If yes, describe the reason(s) and outcome(s): N/A
    i. Additional comments: Less than one acre disturbed per site

12. Right of Way (R/W)
    a. Was R/W required? Yes  No
       If yes, who was responsible for R/W? N/A
       If yes, was it acquired prior to award of the Design-Build contract? N/A
If yes, how did R/W acquisition activities impact the project schedule? N/A
b. How were R/W commitments or cost-to-cure elements handled on this project: N/A
c. List any special circumstances, conditions, or property owner commitments of R/W acquisition: N/A
d. General observations of the R/W acquisition process: N/A

13. Utilities
a. Was SUE performed pre-let and included in the RFP package? □ Yes ☒ No
   If yes, what level? N/A
   If No, was a ‘SUE waiver’ approved by the State Utilities Office? ☒ Yes ☐ No
   If No, what was the mitigating activity (e.g. white lining specification, “no-conflict” letters, first submission plans)?
   o White-lining
b. Were Design-Build Utility MOU’s executed? □ Yes ☒ No
c. List the utility owners, if any, which were included in the Design-Build contract: None
d. Generally describe observations with respect to Design-Build utility coordination:
   o Solar panels were used, but there were issues with trees off the ROW blocking sun light.
e. Generally describe any areas of improvement with respect to Design-Build utility coordination:
   o None
f. What was the frequency of utility coordination meetings?
   o None

14. Geotechnical
a. Was an approved Soils Report included in the RFP package? □ Yes ☒ No
   If no, was a Soils Report required for the project? □ Yes ☒ No
b. Was an approved Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) included in the RFP package? □ Yes ☒ No
   If no, was a BFI required for this project? □ Yes ☒ No
c. Was an approved WFI included in the RFP package? □ Yes ☒ No
   If no, was a Wall Foundation Investigation (WFI) required for this project? □ Yes ☒ No
d. Was an approved High Mast Foundation Investigation (HMFI) report included in the RFP package?
   □ Yes ☒ No
   If no, was a HMFI required for this project? □ Yes ☒ No
e. Were there any geotechnical issues encountered on construction? □ Yes ☒ No
   If yes, describe issues and outcome: N/A

15. Design and Construction Phases
a. Did the Design-Build Team advance portions of the project to the construction phase while other portions of the project continued to be designed and/or permits obtained? ☒ Yes □ No
   If yes, describe: Conditional NTP 3 was issued for the static sign placement south of I-20. This allowed the Department an early win on the project. Additionally, NTP 3b was issued for those items not affected by Supplemental Agreement.
   Describe the typical frequency for progress meetings? Monthly
b. Were the Design-Build Team plans/submittals of acceptable quality? ☒ Yes □ No
If no, describe issue and any corrective actions taken: N/A

c. Were GDOT’s review times adequate?  ☒ Yes  ☐ No
   General observations of review times:
      ☐ None

d. Was the Asphalt Index specification included in this project?  ☐ Yes  ☒ No

e. Was the Fuel Index specification included in this project?  ☐ Yes  ☒ No

f. Was construction the Maintenance of Traffic (MOT) acceptable?  ☒ Yes  ☐ No
   If no, describe: N/A

g. Was the Schedule of Values adequate?  ☒ Yes  ☐ No
   If no, describe: N/A

h. Was the pay voucher and overall payment process acceptable?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No
   If no, describe: N/A

i. Was the Critical Path Method (CPM) schedule specification used on this project?  ☒ Yes  ☐ No
   If yes, describe general experiences (pro or con) using the CPM specification:
      ☐ CPM worked well, but was overkill for this project.
   If yes, any suggested improvements to the use of CPM schedule:
      ☐ None

j. Were there any unique issues (to Design-Build) that occurred?  ☒ Yes  ☐ No
   If yes, describe:
      ☐ Software Integration, see earlier discussion
      ☐ Solar panels, see earlier discussion

k. Were sound barriers required on this project?  ☐ Yes  ☒ No
   If yes, describe the material/color: N/A
   If yes, was the sound barrier material/color specified in the contract?  ☐ Yes  ☒ No
   If yes, was the sound barrier height/location specified in the contract?  ☒ Yes  ☐ No

l. Were there lane closure restrictions on this project?  ☒ Yes  ☐ No
   If yes, were they adequate or could they have been modified for efficiency:
      ☐ No daytime lane closures would have been preferred

m. Were there ITS outage restrictions on this project?  ☒ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ NA
   If yes, were they adequate or could they have been modified for efficiency: Adequate

n. Were there new or existing Traffic Signal modifications required?  ☐ Yes  ☒ No
   If yes, were the traffic signal permits obtained by GDOT:  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

o. Were As-built plans prepared by the Design-Build Team?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☒ Pending

16. Design-Build Innovations

a. Were there innovative designs, solutions or materials used on this project?  ☒ Yes  ☐ No
   If yes, describe:
      ☐ Flexibility in placement of signs, in terms of exact location and power supply.

b. Were any Value Engineering Proposals (VEP) submitted?  ☐ Yes  ☒ No
   If yes, fill out the below information:
c. List other benefits that are not reflected in the cost savings:
   o Contractor was able to use prior knowledge of site conditions from previous experience in the corridor to save the Department substantial money by utilizing existing, unused foundations and not installing median foundations for some of the signs.

17. **Supplemental Agreement Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA No.</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Sitemanager default</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Sitemanager default</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$-163,068.59</td>
<td>Delete duct bank and fiber optic cable on outer loop of I-285. Add two additional Changeable Message Signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Increase contractual substantial completion by 111 days &amp; eliminate future liquidated damages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$216,836.18</td>
<td>Firmware updates to VSL system &amp; monthly maintenance of signs for 6 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. **DBE**

   a. What was the project’s DBE goal?  9.0%
   b. Was it or will it be met?  ☑ Yes  ☐ No
      If yes, generally describe utilization:
         o Fiber optic/materials/software
      If no, then describe reasons:
         o N/A

19. **Summary of observations from Office of Innovative Delivery**

   a. The challenge for this project existed in the software roll-out and the maintenance acceptance turnover. These timeframes and demarcation points could have been spelled out better in the DB contract.

20. **Summary of observations from Office of Traffic**

   a. Agreed with OID, nothing additional

21. **Summary of observations from Design-Build Team**

   a. Agreed with OID, nothing additional

22. **Recommendations**

   a. Consider different methods for software integration.
   b. Consider full maintenance on projects with standalone software

23. **Notable achievements by early interaction of design and contractor**

   a. Design consultant was working on a major project in the area (I-285 and Atlanta Rd) so it was beneficial to have that coordination within the DB Team.
### Post Design-Build Evaluation participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Office/Company</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walt Taylor</td>
<td>Asst. Office Head</td>
<td>Eng. Services/GDOT</td>
<td>404.631.1922</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wtaylor@dot.ga.gov">wtaylor@dot.ga.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dustin O’Quinn</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>HNTB/OID</td>
<td>404.960.9323</td>
<td><a href="mailto:doquinn@HNTB.com">doquinn@HNTB.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Gunter</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>BBH</td>
<td>678.410.7999</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Bill@bbhelectric.com">Bill@bbhelectric.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashlyn Morgan</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Atkins</td>
<td>678.247.2414</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Ashlyn.morgan@atkinsglobal.com">Ashlyn.morgan@atkinsglobal.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Harry</td>
<td>Const. Liaison</td>
<td>Atkins</td>
<td>678.247.2414</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Collin@atkinsglobal.com">Collin@atkinsglobal.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shun Pringle</td>
<td>D7 – DCM</td>
<td>GDOT</td>
<td>404.362.6235</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhay@atkinsglobal.com">jhay@atkinsglobal.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Brad Humphrey</td>
<td>D7 – Area 1 Manager</td>
<td>GDOT</td>
<td>404.362.6235</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jbrad@atkinsglobal.com">jbrad@atkinsglobal.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Hoenig</td>
<td>Sr. Project Manager</td>
<td>GDOT/OID</td>
<td>404.362.6235</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhoenig@atkinsglobal.com">jhoenig@atkinsglobal.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Rohde</td>
<td>Asst. Office Head</td>
<td>Eng. Services/GDOT</td>
<td>404.362.6235</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jrohde@atkinsglobal.com">jrohde@atkinsglobal.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Office/Company</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Demidovich</td>
<td>Asst. Office Head</td>
<td>Traffic Ops/GDOT</td>
<td>404.362.6235</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mdemidovich@atkinsglobal.com">mdemidovich@atkinsglobal.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Murphy</td>
<td>State ITS Engineer</td>
<td>Traffic Ops</td>
<td>404.362.6235</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kmurphy@atkinsglobal.com">kmurphy@atkinsglobal.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Glasser</td>
<td>Asst. State ITS Engineer</td>
<td>Traffic Ops</td>
<td>404.362.6235</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mglasser@atkinsglobal.com">mglasser@atkinsglobal.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Welch</td>
<td>D7 – ADCE</td>
<td>GDOT</td>
<td>404.362.6235</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dwelch@atkinsglobal.com">dwelch@atkinsglobal.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>