Post Design-Build Evaluation Report

Project Description: Riverside Drive Roundabouts @ I-285
P.I. Number: 0010925
County: Fulton
GDOT District: District 7

Date Conducted: November 16, 2016
1. The Riverside roundabouts project is located on Riverside Drive at the interchange with I-285 in Fulton County Georgia and is within the city limits of Sandy Springs. The Design-Build project converted the signalized intersections at the ramp termini to single lane roundabouts, one at each intersection. Each approach to the roundabout was widened to two lanes from the ramps with one lane entering the roundabout and the other serving as a right turn lane. Sidewalks were added to both sides of the roadway along Riverside Drive within the limits of the project. The existing bridge required maintenance items to be performed and a bridge barrier replacement was completed over a weekend. In addition the City of Sandy Springs contributed funds to the project to include landscaping and lighting within the project limits.

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 Construction
   - Baldwin Paving Co., Inc. – Prime Contractor
   - Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC – Prime Designer
   - City of Sandy Springs

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>09/19/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Forum</td>
<td>10/21/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Request for Qualifications (RFQ)</td>
<td>10/24/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive Statement of Qualifications (SOQ)</td>
<td>11/26/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for Proposals (RFP)</td>
<td>12/19/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA Approval (CE) 0010925</td>
<td>02/03/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letting</td>
<td>03/20/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Let</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award</td>
<td>04/03/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTP 1 – Preliminary Design</td>
<td>05/11/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTP 2 – Final Design</td>
<td>07/23/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA Re-Eval Approval (CE) 0010925</td>
<td>12/08/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTP 3a – PI 0010925 Conditional</td>
<td>01/13/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTP 3b – PI 0010925</td>
<td>03/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Roundabouts to Traffic</td>
<td>08/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Complete</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Completion Date</td>
<td>11/06/2016</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 Baldwin Paving Co., Inc.</td>
<td>Infrastructure Consulting &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>$5,604,139.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 G.P.’s Enterprises, Inc.</td>
<td>Wolverton &amp; Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>$6,469,946.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 E.R. Snell Contractor, Inc.</td>
<td>Moreland Allobelli Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>$6,961,714.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Stipend**

   a. Was a stipend (stipulated fee) offered to proposing Design-Build Teams?  
      | Yes  | No | N/A

   If yes, how much per firm:  - N/A
7. **Design-Build Request for Proposals (RFP)**
   a. Type of procurement: [ ] One Phase/Low Bid  [x] Two Phase/Low Bid  [ ] Best Value
   b. Advertisement duration: [ ] 30 days  [x] 60 days  [ ] 90 days
   c. Was a draft RFP released for this project?  [ ] Yes  [x] No

   If yes # of releases: - N/A
   d. Was a Q&A format provided?  [x] Yes  [ ] No
   e. Were One-on-One meetings held with proposers?  [ ] Yes  [x] No
   f. List GDOT offices involved in the RFP development: Design Policy & Support, Engineering Services, Environmental Services, Innovative Delivery, Utilities, Construction, Bridge, District 7, Traffic Operations, GO Right of Way

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>Provided on GDOT’s SharePoint site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Condition Survey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provided on GDOT’s SharePoint site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved concept report</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provided on GDOT’s SharePoint site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Environmental Document</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provided on GDOT’s SharePoint site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InRoads files</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provided on GDOT’s SharePoint site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MicroStation files</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provided on GDOT’s SharePoint site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Design Exceptions/Variances</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provided on GDOT’s SharePoint site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved BFI</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved WFI</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Soils Report</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnical borings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Pavement Design</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provided on GDOT’s SharePoint site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Design Alternative</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead/Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provided on GDOT’s SharePoint site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Level “B” (QL-B)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provided as an attachment to Volume 2 of the Design-Build Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provided as an attachment to Volume 2 of the Design-Build Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costing Plan Review Report</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provided on GDOT’s SharePoint site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Transportation Management Plan (TMP)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved Proprietary Items for Lighting, Landscaping Conceptual Layout, MOU’s and Agreements between GDOT and COSS, Draft MS4 Infeasibility Report, Right of Way Plans, Schedule Template, Shelf Specifications and Shelf Special Provisions, Stormwater Manuals, Survey Database, Traffic Study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   b. General observations of the RFP contents and/or procurement process: None
   c. Were conflicts in project scope identified:  [ ] Yes  [x] No
If yes, what sections should be revised for future RFPs:

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
   c. Was a re-evaluation performed post-let? ☒ Yes ☐ No
      If yes, describe scenario why a re-evaluation was required:
      o Driveway reconstruction and sidewalk extension occurred impacting a historic property. The sidewalk extension was requested by the property owner during right of way negotiations.
      If yes, did the Design-Build team perform the re-evaluation? ☐ Yes ☒ No
      Did the Design-Build team provide supporting documentation? ☒ Yes ☐ No
   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
    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
       No redline changes were required to be made to the ESPCP plans.
    d. Did any self-report actions occur? ☐ Yes ☒ No
       If yes, describe the reason(s) and outcome(s):
    e. Was a consent order filed? ☐ Yes ☒ No
    i. Additional comments: None

12. Right of Way (R/W)
    a. Was R/W required? ☒ Yes ☐ No
       If yes, who was responsible for R/W? ☐ GDOT ☐ Locals ☒ Design-Build team
       If yes, was it acquired prior to award of the Design-Build contract? ☐ Yes ☒ No
       If yes, did R/W acquisition activities impact the project schedule? ☐ Yes ☒ No
    b. How were R/W commitments or cost-to-cure elements handled on this project:
       o Supplemental Agreements
    c. List any special circumstances, conditions, or property owner commitments of R/W acquisition:
       o Sidewalk was extended onto parcel 1 as requested by the property owner
       o A retaining wall was constructed to avoid the need for right of way from parcel 6
d. General observations of the R/W acquisition process:
   o With the Design-Build Team being involved with the process it helped with communication with property owners. The right of way was also fitted to design, which reduced the purchasing of excess right of way or multiple agreements. The entire process took 6-7 months from the Design-Build Team’s NTP to access of all properties.

13. Utilities
   a. Was SUE performed pre-let and included in the RFP package? ☒ Yes ☐ No
      If yes, what level? ☐ QL-D ☐ QL-C ☒ QL-B ☐ QL-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):
   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: AGL, Georgia Power Company (Distribution), Georgia Power Company (Transmission), City of Atlanta Water, Fulton County Sewer, AT&T, Level 3 Communications, Verizon/MCI, X.O. Communications, Zayo Fiber Solutions, and Comcast
   d. Generally describe observations with respect to Design-Build utility coordination:
      o Successful, there was good communication and proactive outreach to utility owners.
   e. Generally describe any areas of improvement with respect to Design-Build utility coordination:
      o The 90 day review times seem excessive if DB team designs and pays the utility owner for review of the design and to construct.
   f. What was the frequency of utility coordination meetings:
      o Monthly

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 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 WFI required for this project? ☐ Yes ☒ No
   d. Was an approved High Mast Found Investigation 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:

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: The first construction notice to proceed allowed the DB Team to perform utility relocation work while the remaining Design-Build submittals (per article 3.3.1.3) were being completed. Also, NTP was provided for roadway and drainage construction while landscaping and lighting were still being designed.
b. Describe the typical frequency for progress meetings? Monthly meetings were held at the District 7, Area 2 office.

c. Were the Design-Build team plans/submittals of acceptable quality? Yes ☒ No
   If no, describe issue and any corrective actions taken: -

d. Were GDOT’s review times adequate? Yes ☒ No
   If no, describe:
   General observations of review times:
   o A damaged bridge barrier was discovered on the project after letting and GDOT wanted this replaced as it posed a safety concern. The Design-Build Team assembled a repair plan and supplemental agreement that was favorable to replace during construction. From the time the Design-Build Team submitted the repair plans to GDOT acceptance was within 24 hours.

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

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

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

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

i. Was the pay voucher and overall payment process acceptable? Yes ☒ No
   If no, describe:

j. 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: The monthly updates allowed GDOT and COSS to identify the upcoming bridge closures early-on, prepare for and coordinate public outreach.
   If yes, any suggested improvements to the use of CPM schedule: Flexibility on the software, Primavera is too restrictive for this type of project.

k. Were there any unique issues (to Design-Build) that occurred? Yes ☒ No
   If yes, describe:
   o The budget for design and construction of landscaping was set prior to letting. The Design-Build Team was responsible for coordinating with COSS on a landscaping design. It was a challenge to balance the budget of design and construction in compliance with COSS landscaping vision for the project.

l. Were sound barriers required on this project? Yes ☒ No
   If yes, describe the material/color: Match existing, Metal/Tan.
   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

m. Were there lane closure restrictions on this project? Yes ☒ No
   If yes, were they adequate or could they have been modified for efficiency:
   o Allow more daytime closures due to low volume during that time. It was difficult to meet the 72 hour advance notice requirement for weekend lane closures.

n. 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 Street Print typically used for crosswalks will be used on the red asphalt truck aprons.

b. Were any Value Engineering Proposals (VEP) submitted?  ☐ Yes ☑ No
   If yes, fill out the below information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>VECP Description</th>
<th>Total Savings</th>
<th>Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

e. List other benefits that are not reflected in the cost savings:  None

17. Supplemental Agreement (SA) Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA No.</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   | 1      | $79,839.20 | Repaired the existing damaged bridge barrier with the addition of one 56-hour weekend bridge closure to perform the work, wall construction adjacent to Parcel 6, and additional sidewalk adjacent to Parcel 1. The SA also included 5 days added to the overall project completion.

18. DBE

   a. What was the project’s DBE goal?  14%
   b. Was it or will it be met?  ☑ Yes ☐ No
      If yes, generally describe utilization:
      o DET Inc. – Signal / Lighting
      o Highway Services – Striping
      o M.A.R. Trucking – Haul
      o Clean Water Consulting – Erosion/Grassing
      o Edward Scott Trucking – Haul
      o Long Engineering
      o Southeastern Engineering
      If no, then describe reasons:

19. Summary of observations from Office of Innovative Delivery (OID)

   a. Overall this was a good project for the Design-Build method and finished within the contract timeframe. The initiative of allowing the Design-Build Team to complete right of way plans and negotiations with property owners was a success; this office will pursue further opportunities to include the right of way in the Design-Build contract.

20. Summary of observations from Office of Traffic Operations

   a. Design-Build method provided an expedited delivery that provided a safety benefit. This project can be used as an example for other locations. Should require peer review for roundabouts.
   b. TMC assumed the third bridge closure would have been the opening of the roundabouts with minor construction to remain. Instead when the roundabouts were open there was still substantial paving and construction to be completed. On future roundabout and diverging diamond interchange projects, OID and TMC will hold a meeting to discuss risks and opportunities in relation to the timing of substantial completion while allowing Design-Build Team innovation.

21. Summary of observations from District 7
a. Overall, this project was smooth. Early communication and coordination between GDOT, COSS, and the Design-Build Team minimized public inquiries.

22. **Summary of observations from Design-Build Team**
   a. ICE – Great project overall. While it was a smaller project, it included many moving parts such as utility relocations, right-of-way acquisition, and extensive landscaping. All parties worked together to solve issues as they arose in order to open the project on time.
   b. Baldwin Paving – Positive learning experience. Baldwin has understands the dynamic to constructing roundabouts and maintenance of traffic combined with the flexibility within the Design-Build contract allowed for a better/lower bid price.

23. **Recommendations**
   a.

24. **Notable achievements by early interaction of design and contractor**
   a. The Design-Build Team interacted with property owners and acted with sensibility within and outside of the project limits during construction. Combined with proactive repairs to property that may or may not have been caused by their construction, developed a positive image/public perception during construction.

25. **Post Design-Build Evaluation participants:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>OFFICE</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walt Taylor</td>
<td>Engineering Services</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wtaylor@dot.ga.gov">wtaylor@dot.ga.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Zehngraff</td>
<td>Traffic Operations</td>
<td><a href="mailto:szehngraff@dot.ga.gov">szehngraff@dot.ga.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane Swan</td>
<td>HNTB/OIB</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sswan@hntb.com">sswan@hntb.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Zahul</td>
<td>District 7</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kzahul@dot.ga.gov">kzahul@dot.ga.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Adams</td>
<td>Traffic Operations</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eadams@dot.ga.gov">eadams@dot.ga.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Barry</td>
<td>Traffic Operations</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cbarry@dot.ga.gov">cbarry@dot.ga.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Raymond</td>
<td>Traffic Operations</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cdraymond@dot.ga.gov">cdraymond@dot.ga.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Graves</td>
<td>Arcadis</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ryan.graves@arcadis.com">ryan.graves@arcadis.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler McIntosh</td>
<td>ICE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tyler.mcintosh@ICE-ENG.com">tyler.mcintosh@ICE-ENG.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Walker</td>
<td>Baldwin Paving</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jwalker@baldwin-paving.com">jwalker@baldwin-paving.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Mayo</td>
<td>Baldwin Paving</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmayo@baldwin-paving.com">jmayo@baldwin-paving.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rusty Ledbetter</td>
<td>Baldwin Paving</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rledbetter@baldwin-paving.com">rledbetter@baldwin-paving.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Rohde</td>
<td>Engineering Services</td>
<td><a href="mailto:erohde@dot.ga.gov">erohde@dot.ga.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Myers</td>
<td>Engineering Services</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lmyers@dot.ga.gov">lmyers@dot.ga.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlo Clowers</td>
<td>OID</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mclowers@dot.ga.gov">mclowers@dot.ga.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>