Post Design-Build Evaluation Report

Project Description: Safe Routes to Schools at Various Locations
P.I. Number: 0010394, 0010401, 0010403
County: DeKalb, Cobb, Fulton
GDOT District: District 7

Date Conducted: January 4, 2016

Irwin Rd Bridge over Noses Creek (PI 0010401, Cheatham Hill Elementary, Cobb County)
1. **Project Description:** Project 0010394, 0010401, 0010403 utilizes the one-phase low bid letting. This project includes the construction of 4” thick sidewalks, 8” thick sidewalks for wheelchair ramps, pedestrian bridge, crosswalks, pavement markings, solar powered rectangular rapid flashing beacon signs, solar powered radar speed signs, bike paths, and various improvements for safe routes to schools. Each school site was constructed within the existing right-of-way.

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

3. **Project stakeholders:**
   - GDOT – Innovative Delivery, Program Delivery, Traffic Operations, Construction Inspection
   - Baldwin Paving Co., Inc. – Prime Contractor
   - Mulkey Engineers & Consultants – Prime Designer
   - City of Atlanta
   - Cobb County DOT and Cobb County School System
   - DeKalb County DOT

4. **Project Summary:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Milestone</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Intermediate Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Let</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Notice Advertisement (PNA)</td>
<td>10/24/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Forum</td>
<td>11/15/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for Proposals (RFP)</td>
<td>1/24/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications Package due to Department</td>
<td>3/21/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letting</td>
<td>3/21/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Let</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award</td>
<td>4/4/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA Approval (PCE-III) 0010394</td>
<td>10/6/2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA Approval (PCE-III) 0010401</td>
<td>1/14/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA Approval (PCE-III) 0010403</td>
<td>1/14/2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTP 1 – Preliminary Design</td>
<td>5/14/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTP 2 – Final Design</td>
<td>5/14/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTP 3a – PI 0010394 (Briarlake, Fairington, Hawthorne, Oak Grove Ele)</td>
<td>2/27/2015</td>
<td>5/28/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTP 3b – PI 0010394 (Evansdale Ele)</td>
<td>3/9/2015</td>
<td>7/7/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTP 3c – PI 0010401 (Kincaid Ele)</td>
<td>3/9/2015</td>
<td>7/7/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTP 3d – PI 0010403 (Bethune Ele)</td>
<td>5/12/2015</td>
<td>9/9/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension of Work for PI 0010394 (Evansdale Ele) REVISI</td>
<td>4/30/2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTP 3e – PI 0010394 (Evansdale Ele – Northbrook Dr Only)</td>
<td>7/13/2015</td>
<td>11/10/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTP 3f – PI 0010401 (Cheatham Hill Ele) REVISI</td>
<td>8/31/2015</td>
<td>12/29/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Complete</td>
<td>12/29/2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Completion Date</td>
<td>12/31/2015</td>
<td></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>Mulkey Engineers &amp; Consultants</td>
<td>$1,428,266.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Gregory Bridge Co.</td>
<td>Wolverton &amp; Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>$2,441,036.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **Stipend**
   
a. Was a stipend (stipulated fee) offered to proposing Design-Build Teams?  
   - Yes [ ] No [x]
   If yes, how much per firm: - N/A

7. **Design-Build Request for Proposals (RFP)**
   
a. Type of procurement:  
   - [x] One Phase/Low Bid
   - [ ] 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?  
   - Yes [x] 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

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>Approved bridge layouts</td>
<td>X</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>Survey files provided on GDOT’s SharePoint site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Design Exceptions/Variances</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Special design spillway under sidewalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved BFI</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>A draft BFI was performed on the North side of the Irwin Road bridge over Noses Creek and provided on GDOT’s SharePoint site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved WFI</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Soils Report</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnical borings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Pavement Design</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A, No pavement required on the project</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 the GDOT’s SharePoint site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Level “B” (QL-B)</td>
<td>X</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>No costing plans were provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Transportation Management Plan (TMP)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey Control database, Specifications review, Industry Forum, H&amp;H study for Noses Creek bridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. General observations of the RFP contents and/or procurement process:
   - None

c. Were conflicts in project scope identified?  
   - Yes [ ] No [x]
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:
   - PI 0010394, by mutual agreement between GDOT, the DB Team, and Oak Grove Elementary School removed the raised crosswalk within the student loading/unloading area and placed rectangular rapid flashing beacons signs near Crestline at Oak Grove. An additional change to the original NEPA document was the removal of sidewalk along Evans Dale Drive after a neighborhood outcry and concern over the project.
   - PI 0010403, during the procurement phase of the project the GDOT project manager determined that some walls may be required to install sidewalk along the roadway crossing over streams. The DB Team was able to reduce the width of the utility strip and sidewalk width (within ADA and GDOT guidelines) to eliminate all stream and buffer impacts to the project.

   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:
      - During the pre-let phase of the environmental process to allow the DB Team more flexibility to avoid impacts (such as bridges, walls, reduction in sidewalk width) without having to perform a re-evaluation of the environmental document. When the environmental document has to be re-evaluated sometimes it could affect the overall project completion date.

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): -
    e. Was a consent order filed? □ Yes □ No

    i. Additional comments: This is one of the first projects where the DB Team was responsible for preparing the NOI, submitting to EPD, and paying the fee. The Office of Innovative Delivery intentionally removed GDOT from the process and in turn the associated responsibilities/risks were transferred to the DB Team.
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: -  
   c. List any special circumstances, conditions, or property owner commitments of R/W acquisition: -  
   d. General observations of the R/W acquisition process: None

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):  
         - The white lining specification was used by the Design-Build Team for the school sites with no grading required and only signs were installed.  
   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: AT&T, AGL, City of Atlanta of Watershed Management, Cobb County, Cobb County EMC, Comcast, Fulton County Sewer, Georgia Power Company, Sunesys, Zayo Fiber Solutions.  
   d. Generally describe observations with respect to Design-Build utility coordination:  
      - The DB Team was late conducting the utility coordination kick-off meeting, but after the meeting most “no conflict” letters were acquired, and minimal coordination was required for all other utility owners.  
      - The District Utility Office believe the Design-Build process for SRTS projects is a step in the best direction for delivery.  
   e. Generally describe any areas of improvement with respect to Design-Build utility coordination:  
      - Recommend setting a monthly reoccurring meeting until all utility relocations are completed.  
   f. What was the frequency of utility coordination meetings:  
      - The DB Team had one utility coordination meeting which was the kick-off meeting.

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
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 design-build team identified critical path issues for each PI and school location. On the more complicated projects, survey and design were started first. Irwin Road involved a pedestrian bridge, and the Bethune site involved additional coordination with the City of Atlanta utilities and an NOI. The sites in Dekalb County and Kincaid Road in Cobb County were very straightforward and could progress to construction much more quickly without as much design effort. NTP3 was issued on these sites first (2/27/15 and 3/9/15, respectively). The remaining projects were given NTP3 in the summer of 2015. This allowed the contractor to stage labor and materials over most of the 2015 calendar year.

b. Describe the typical frequency for progress meetings? Monthly

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:

   - The DB Team was in a bind where they needed to add a splice to the pedestrian bridge (PI 0010401) and have approved the same day in order to not affect the overall project completion date. This change was not part of their design and was requested to be added, GDOT Bridge Design was able to review and approve the revised bridge shop drawings within the matter of hours after receipt.

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: N/A

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:

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

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

   If yes, describe:

   - GDOT received all necessary plans, permits, etc. to grant the DB Team NTP 3 for Evansdale Elementary School which was provided on March 9, 2015. During the month of May the Contractor began mobilizing near Evans Dale Drive, and the neighborhood strongly disapproved the project. In reaction, GDOT postponed the Construction by providing a letter to the DB Team to halt work until the issues with the neighborhood could be
mitigated. The DB Team helped provide responses and plan alternatives to the residents to gain support for the sidewalk adjacent to the properties. After two months, and no positive traction with the neighborhood, GDOT ultimately elected to remove a portion of the sidewalk to allow the project to continue without threatening the overall completion date.

l. Were sound barriers required on this project? ☐ Yes ☑ No
   If yes, describe the material/color:
   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 The DB Team said that they were adequate.

n. Were there ITS outage restrictions on this project? ☐ Yes ☑ No ☐ NA
   If yes, were they adequate or could they have been modified for efficiency: None

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

p. 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 Design/Constructed a pedestrian bridge instead of widening the existing box girder bridge
      o Design/Constructed special design sidewalk spillways
   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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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>$6,525.05</td>
<td>Removal of the raised crosswalks at Oak Grove Elementary school and replaced with RRFB and crosswalks at Crestline at Oak Grove.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>($114,898.21)</td>
<td>Reduction in the Scope of Work to remove sidewalk along Evans Dale Drive due to public opposition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. DBE
   a. What was the project’s DBE goal? 13%
   b. Was it or will it be met? ☑ Yes ☐ No
      If yes, generally describe utilization:
      o D.E.T., Inc. was used for Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon and the Radar Speed Sign Installations
      o Clean Water Consultants, Inc. was used for miscellaneous erosion control items
      o Highway Services, Inc. was used for striping
19. **Summary of observations from Office of Innovative Delivery (OID)**
   
a. This was the first time using the One Phase Low Bid RFP package.

20. **Summary of observations from Office of Construction**
   
a. None

21. **Summary of observations from Design-Build Team**
   
a. Cobb County DOT provided a no rise certification on the project pre-let and was updated post-let after receiving the DB Teams final plan design. The scour requirements for a standalone pedestrian bridge appeared excessive by the DB Team, however was still followed in accordance with the Bridge Office requirements. This resulted in pile lengths that were much longer than were initially designed.

22. **Recommendations**
   
a. None

23. **Notable achievements by early interaction of design and contractor**
   
a. Phasing of construction activities

24. **Post Design-Build Evaluation participants:** See the Attached Sign-In Sheet
# Post Design Build Evaluation Sign-in Sheet

**PI No.: 0010349/0010401/0010403**  
**County: Cobb Dekalb Fulton**

**Date: 4 January 2016**

**NON DOT EMPLOYEES PLEASE PROVIDE BUSINESS CARD OR PRINT E-MAIL ADDRESS LEGIBLY.**

**DOT EMPLOYEES PLEASE SIGN IN WITH NAME AS SHOWN ON DOT E-MAIL ADDRESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>COMPANY / OFFICE</th>
<th>PHONE NUMBER</th>
<th>E-MAIL ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derrick Cameron</td>
<td>GDOT/Engineering</td>
<td>(404) 631-1223</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dcameron@dot.ga.gov">dcameron@dot.ga.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Myers</td>
<td>GDOT/Eng. Services</td>
<td>41631-1770</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lmyers@dot.ga.gov">lmyers@dot.ga.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuan L Pringle</td>
<td>GDOT/OT Construction</td>
<td>7986-1414</td>
<td><a href="mailto:springle@dot.ga.gov">springle@dot.ga.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Steve</td>
<td>Mulkey</td>
<td>678-795-3615</td>
<td><a href="mailto:astone@mulkeyinc.com">astone@mulkeyinc.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Walker</td>
<td>Baldwin Paving</td>
<td>404-427-9947</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jwalker@baldwin-paving.com">jwalker@baldwin-paving.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katelyn Diniqia</td>
<td>GDOT/ITO</td>
<td>404-635-2834</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kdiniqia@dot.ga.gov">kdiniqia@dot.ga.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane Swan</td>
<td>HNT13 / GDOT oip</td>
<td>404-783-7957</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sswan@hnt13.com">sswan@hnt13.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Evans</td>
<td>GDOT/OPD</td>
<td>41631-1555</td>
<td><a href="mailto:oxevans@dot.ga.gov">oxevans@dot.ga.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javier Jancy</td>
<td>GDOT/DEP</td>
<td>41621-1583</td>
<td><a href="mailto:xjimenez@dot.ga.gov">xjimenez@dot.ga.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton Fisher</td>
<td>GDOT/OPD</td>
<td>41621-1951</td>
<td><a href="mailto:afisher@dot.ga.gov">afisher@dot.ga.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>