

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

4. **Project Summary:**

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

5. **Design-Build Proposers:**

	Contractor	Designer	Total Bid
1	Brooks Berry Haynie & Assoc., Inc.	Atkins	\$4,921,604.00
2	Midasco, LLC.	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	\$5,720,000.00
3	RJ Haynie & Associates, Inc.	URS Corporation	\$7,449,985.00
4	The L.C. Whitford Co., Inc.	GCA Engineering	\$9,998,887.00

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
 c. Was a draft RFP released for this project? Yes No
 If yes # of releases: - N/A
 d. Was a Q&A format provided? Yes No
 e. Were One-on-One meetings held with proposers? Yes No
 f. List GDOT offices involved in the RFP development: Traffic Operations, Design Policy & Support, Engineering Services, Environmental Services, Innovative Delivery, Construction,

8. Design-Build RFP Package

- a. List items included in the RFP package:

Item	Yes	No	Notes
Costing plans		X	
Bridge layouts		N/A	
Approved concept report/concept revision	X		Provided on the GDOT's SharePoint site
Approved Environmental Document	X		Provided on the GDOT's SharePoint site
CAiCE files		X	
Microstation files		X	
Approved Design Exceptions/Variances		X	No Design Exceptions/Variances required for the project
Geotechnical Reports		X	
Approved Pavement Design		N/A	
Pavement Design Alternative		N/A	
Overhead/Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE) Quality Level "B" (QL-B)		X	SUE waiver obtained
Utility Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)		X	
Costing Plan Review Report	X		Provided on the GDOT's SharePoint site
Draft Transportation Management Plan (TMP)	X		Provided on the GDOT's SharePoint site
Other	X		Additional Special Provisions & additional I-285 sign project details

- 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.

- 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:
 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):
 None
- e. General observations of the environmental permitting process:
 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

If no, describe: N/A

General observations of review times:

- o 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:

- o CPM worked well, but was overkill for this project.

If yes, any suggested improvements to the use of CPM schedule:

- o None

- j. Were there any unique issues (to Design-Build) that occurred? Yes No

If yes, describe:

- o Software Integration, see earlier discussion
- o 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:

- o 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:

- o 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:

No.	VECP Description	Total Savings	Approved
-	-	-	-

- 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

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

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.

24. Post Design-Build Evaluation participants:

Name	Title	Office/Company	Phone	Email
Walt Taylor	Asst. Office Head	Eng. Services/GDOT	404.631.1922	wtaylor@dot.ga.gov
Dustin O'Quinn	Project Manager	HNTB/OID	404.960.9323	doquinn@HNTB.com
Bill Gunter	Project Manager	BBH	678.410.7999	Billg@bbhelectric.com
Ashlyn Morgan	Project Manager	Atkins	678.247.2414	Ashlyn.morgan@atkinsglobal.com
James Harry	Const. Liaison	GDOT	404.362.6235	jharry@dot.ga.gov
Shun Pringle	D7 – DCM	GDOT	770.216.3860	springle@dot.ga.gov
J. Brad Humphrey	D7 – Area 1 Manager	GDOT	770.216.3921	jhumphrey@dot.ga.gov
Andrew Hoenig	Sr. Project Manager	GDOT/OID	404.631.1757	ahoenig@dot.ga.gov
Erik Rohde	Asst. Office Head	Eng. Services/GDOT	404.631.1677	erohde@dot.ga.gov
Conference				
Mark Demidovich	Asst. Office Head	Traffic Ops/GDOT		mdemidovich@dot.ga.gov
Keith Murphy	State ITS Engineer	Traffic Ops		kmurphy@dot.ga.gov
Matt Glasser	Asst. State ITS Engineer	Traffic Ops		mglasser@dot.ga.gov
Donna Welch	D7 – ADCE	GDOT		dwelch@dot.ga.gov