

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:**

	Project Milestone	Date	Intermediate Completion Date
Pre-Let	Public Notice Advertisement (PNA)	10/24/2013	
	Industry Forum	11/15/2013	
	Request for Proposals (RFP)	1/24/2014	
	Qualifications Package due to Department	3/21/2014	
	Letting	3/21/2014	
Post-Let	Award	4/4/2014	
	NEPA Approval (PCE-III) 0010394	10/6/2015	
	NEPA Approval (PCE-III) 0010401	1/14/2014	
	NEPA Approval (PCE-III) 0010403	1/14/2015	
	NTP 1 – Preliminary Design	5/14/2014	
	NTP 2 – Final Design	5/14/2014	
	NTP 3a – PI 0010394 (Briarlake, Fairington, Hawthorne, Oak Grove Ele)	2/27/2015	5/28/2015
	NTP 3b – PI 0010394 (Evansdale Ele)	3/9/2015	7/7/2015
	NTP 3c – PI 0010401 (Kincaid Ele)	3/9/2015	7/7/2015
	NTP 3d – PI 0010403 (Bethune Ele)	5/12/2015	9/9/2015
	Suspension of Work for PI 0010394 (Evansdale Ele)	4/30/2015	
	NTP 3e – PI 0010394 (Evansdale Ele – Northbrook Dr Only) REVISED	7/13/2015	11/10/2015
	NTP 3f – PI 0010401 (Cheatham Hill Ele)	8/31/2015	12/29/2015
	Construction Complete	12/29/2015	
Contract Completion Date	12/31/2015		

5. **Design-Build Proposers:**

	Contractor	Designer	Total Bid
1	Baldwin Paving Co., Inc.	Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	\$1,428,266,57
2	Gregory Bridge Co.	Wolverton & Associates, Inc.	\$2,441,036.75

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

8. Design-Build RFP Package

- a. List items included in the RFP package:

Item	Yes	No	Notes
Costing plans		X	
Approved bridge layouts		X	
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		Survey files provided on GDOT's SharePoint site
Approved Design Exceptions/Variations	X		Special design spillway under sidewalk
Approved BFI		X	A draft BFI was performed on the North side of the Irwin Road bridge over Noses Creek and provided on GDOT's SharePoint site
Approved WFI		X	
Approved Soils Report		X	
Geotechnical borings		X	
Approved Pavement Design		X	N/A, No pavement required on the project
Pavement Design Alternative		X	
Overhead/Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE) Quality Level "B" (QL-B)	X		Provided on the GDOT's SharePoint site
Utility Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)	X		
Costing Plan Review Report		X	No costing plans were provided
Draft Transportation Management Plan (TMP)		X	N/A
Other	X		Survey Control database, Specifications review, Industry Forum, H&H study for Noses Creek bridge

- b. General observations of the RFP contents and/or procurement process:
 o 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 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.
- o 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:
- o 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 to 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):
 - o 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:
 - o 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.
 - o 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:
 - o Recommend setting a monthly reoccurring meeting until all utility relocations are completed.
- f. What was the frequency of utility coordination meetings:
 - o 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

- 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 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:

- o 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:

- o 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:

No.	VECP Description	Total Savings	Approved

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

17. Supplemental Agreement Summary

SA No.	Amount	Description
1	\$6,525.05	Removal of the raised crosswalks at Oak Grove Elementary school and replaced with RRFB and crosswalks at Crestline at Oak Grove.
2	(\$114,898.21)	Reduction in the Scope of Work to remove sidewalk along Evans Dale Drive due to public opposition.

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

If no, then describe reasons: -

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

NAME	COMPANY / OFFICE	PHONE NUMBER	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Derrick Cameron	GDOT/Engineering Services	(404) 631-1223	dcameron@dot.ga.gov (NOT PRESENT)
Lisa Myers	GDOT/Eng. Services	4 6031-1770	lmyers@dot.ga.gov
SHAWN L PRINGLE	GDOT / DOT CONSTRUCTION	7 / 986-1414	SPRINGALE@DOT.GA.GOV
Alex Stevie	WALKER	678-795-3615	astone@mulkeyinc.com
JASAL WALKER	BALDWIN TAYLOR	404-427-9947	JWALKER@BALDWIN-TAYLOR.COM
Katelyn Digirolia	GDOT / OTO	404 635 2834	k.digirolia@dot.ga.gov
Shane Swan	HNTB / GDOT OID	404-783-7437	SSwan@HNTB.com
Tim Evans	GDOT / OPD	4) 631-1555	
Xavier Jemy	GDOT / OPD	4) 621-1583	XJemy@dot.ga.gov
Carlton Fisher	GDOT - OPD	4 631-1481	cfisher@dot.ga.gov