

# 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**



November 7, 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:**
  - o GDOT – Innovative Delivery, Traffic Operations, District 7 Construction
  - o Baldwin Paving Co., Inc. – Prime Contractor
  - o Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC – Prime Designer
  - o City of Sandy Springs

4. **Project Summary:**

	Project Milestone	Date
Pre-Let	Public Notice Advertisement (PNA)	09/19/2014
	Industry Forum	10/21/2014
	Issue Request for Qualifications (RFQ)	10/24/2014
	Receive Statement of Qualifications (SOQ)	11/26/2014
	Request for Proposals (RFP)	12/19/2014
	NEPA Approval (CE) 0010925	02/03/2015
	Letting	03/20/2015
Post-Let	Award	04/03/2015
	NTP 1 – Preliminary Design	05/11/2015
	NTP 2 – Final Design	07/23/2015
	NEPA Re-Eval Approval (CE) 0010925	12/08/2015
	NTP 3a – PI 0010925 Conditional	01/13/2016
	NTP 3b – PI 0010925	03/30/2016
	Open Roundabouts to Traffic	08/28/2016
	Construction Complete	TBD
	Contract Completion Date	11/06/2016

5. **Design-Build Proposers:**

	Contractor	Designer	Total Bid
1	Baldwin Paving Co., Inc.	Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering	\$5,604,139.00
2	G.P.'s Enterprises, Inc.	Wolverton & Associates, Inc.	\$6,469,946.70
3	E.R. Snell Contractor, Inc.	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	\$6,961,714.00

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: 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:

Item	Yes	No	Notes
Costing plans	X		Provided on GDOT's SharePoint site
Bridge Condition Survey	X		Provided on GDOT's SharePoint site
Approved concept report	X		Provided on GDOT's SharePoint site
Approved Environmental Document	X		Provided on GDOT's SharePoint site
InRoads files	X		Provided on GDOT's SharePoint site
MicroStation files	X		Provided on GDOT's SharePoint site
Approved Design Exceptions/Variances	X		Provided on GDOT's SharePoint site
Approved BFI		X	N/A
Approved WFI		X	N/A
Approved Soils Report		X	N/A
Geotechnical borings		X	N/A
Approved Pavement Design	X		Provided on GDOT's SharePoint site
Pavement Design Alternative		X	
Overhead/Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE) Quality Level "B" (QL-B)	X		Provided on GDOT's SharePoint site
Utility Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)	X		Provided as an attachment to Volume 2 of the Design-Build Contract
Costing Plan Review Report	X		Provided on GDOT's SharePoint site
Draft Transportation Management Plan (TMP)		X	
Other	X		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

- b. General observations of the RFP contents and/or procurement process: None
- c. Were conflicts in project scope identified:  Yes  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

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

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:

No.	VECP Description	Total Savings	Approved

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

**17. Supplemental Agreement (SA) Summary**

SA No.	Amount	Description
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:**

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