

Post Design-Build Evaluation Report

Project Description: FY 16 Bridges Batch – 3

P.I. Number: 0014176

County: Coweta, Harris, Pike, Meriwether and Crawford

GDOT District: District 3

Date Conducted: October 1, 2019



Coweta County



Harris County



Pike County



Meriwether County



Crawford County



Marion County

Project Description: The proposed project [P.I. No. 0014176] replaced the existing, structurally deficient bridges in following locations.

Bridge Serial Number	Feature Carried	Feature Intersected	County Name	GDOT District
077-5050-0	Bradbury Road	Yellow Jacket Creek	Coweta	3
145-5031-0	Fortune Hole Road	Little Palmetto Creek	Harris	3
231-5003-0	Williams Mill Road	Chapman Creek	Pike	3
199-5023-0	Co Line Church Road	White Sulphur Creek	Meriwether	3
079-5025-0	Avery Road	Culpepper Creek	Crawford	3
197-5001-0*	Walter Wells Road*	Shoal Creek*	Marion*	3

**Marion County Project Cancellation - The Marion County bridge replacement work was cancelled due to existing physical features that prevented the DBT from accomplishing the work as proposed in the RFP. Marion County was provided the opportunity to fund the additional scope necessary for satisfactory replacement of the existing bridge. However, Marion County rejected the opportunity to fund the scope changes proposed by the DBT and subsequently, the Marion County bridge replacement work was cancelled through a Supplemental Agreement to the Contract.*

1. **Design-Build delivery goal(s):** Expedite delivery and minimizing the project’s impact to the traveling public. The project was delivered using Design-Build.

2. **Project stakeholders:**

- GDOT – Innovative Delivery, District 3, Environmental Services, Bridge Design, State Utilities
- CW Matthews Contracting Co., Inc. – Prime Contractor
- Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc. – Prime Designer/ Engineer of Record
- Coweta County
- Harris County
- Pike County
- Meriwether County
- Crawford County
- Marion County*

3. **Project Summary:**

	Project Milestone	Date
Pre-Let	Public Notice Advertisement (PNA)	10/16/2015
	Industry Forum	11/5/2015
	Industry one-on-one meetings	11/5/2015

	Request for Qualifications (RFQ)	01/08/2016
	Notice to Finalists	02/19/2016
	Request for Proposals (RFP) to the finalists	04/22/2016
	Price Proposal / Project Letting	06/17/2016
Post-Let	Project Award	08/01/2016
	NTP1 – Preliminary Design	08/01/2016
	NTP3 – Coweta County	04/03/2017
	NTP3 – Harris County	01/30/2018
	NTP3 – Pike County	01/31/2018
	NTP3- Meriwether County	5/7/2019
	NTP3- Crawford County	11/03/2017
	Milestone Deadline –Bridge Open to Traffic-Coweta County	07/22/2017
	Milestone Deadline –Bridge Open to Traffic-Harris County	07/08/2019
	Milestone Deadline –Bridge Open to Traffic-Pike County	08/03/2018
	Milestone Deadline –Bridge Open to Traffic-Meriwether County	05/07/2019
	Milestone Deadline –Bridge Open to Traffic-Crawford County	03/09/2018
	Contract Completion Date	08/01/2019
	Substantial Completion Date	Pending
	Maintenance Acceptance Date	Pending

4. Design-Build Proposers:

	Contractor	Designer	Total Bid
1	CW Matthews Contracting Co., Inc	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	\$7,514,011.57
2	Southeastern Site Development, Inc.	Gresham Smith and Partners	\$9,444,177.00
3	E.R. Snell Contractor, Inc.	Moreland Altobelli Associates	\$9,873,200.00
4	Southern Concrete Construction Co., Inc.	Neel-Schaffer	\$10,395,000.00

5. Stipend

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

6. 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 90 days +
- c. Was a draft RFP released for this project? Yes No
 If yes # of releases: 1 draft was released
 Was a Q&A format provided? Yes No
- d. Were One-on-One meetings held with proposers? Yes No
- e. List GDOT offices involved in the RFP development: Design Policy & Support, Engineering Services, Environmental Services, Innovative Delivery, Utilities, Construction, Bridge, District 3.

7. Design-Build RFP Package

a. List items included in the RFP package:

Item	Yes	No	Notes
Approved Traffic Study		X	
Bridge layouts	X		
Approved Survey Files	X		Survey provided as RID
Approved Concept Report		X	
Microstation Design files	X		
Approved Design Exceptions/Variations	X		Provided in RFP
Original Bridge Foundation Investigation		X	
Approved Pavement Design		X	
Approved Overhead/Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE) Quality Level "B"		X	Level D provided
Utility Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)	X		
NEPA Categorical Exclusion		X	GEPA Special Studies

b. General observations of the RFP contents and/or procurement process: Many of the Utility MOU's were sole source contractors and making contact was difficult for the DBT, as they were reluctant to communicate with the DBT; without some intervention by GDOT, this could be a risk moving forward on future projects. Once contacted the utility owners felt little obligation to communicate with the DBT; utility subs were responsive but not the utility owner.

c. Were conflicts in project scope identified: Yes No

If yes, what sections should be revised for future RFPs:

8. Environmental

a. Type of document: NEPA: Level: PCE CE EA/FONSI EIS/ROD
 GEPA: Level: Type A Type B EER/NOD

N/A, no environmental document provided, AOE's were provided

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: The re-evaluations were necessary due to the change in Ecology impacts during the project design and PCN development.

d. General observations of the pre-let or post-let environmental process: The DBT expressed concern that the timeframe necessary for GDOT to complete the review process was excessive. Once the DBT received comments and responded the review cycle would begin again and the timeframes were excessive. The comments from GDOT seemed to be "preferences" from the reviewer instead of comments. However, the process seemed to get better as the Contract progressed. This portion of the Contract seemed more like a "pilot project" since the USACE was the lead federal agency. DBT also noticed inconsistencies in the review process at each location. GDOT had many layers in the review process, i.e. Arcadis and Atkins (GDOT OES) and this appeared excessive; suggest that GDOT continue working toward beneficial permitting strategies moving forward.

9. 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: Similar observations as mentioned in Section 8 Environmental.

10. NPDES Permit

- a. Did the Design-Build Team prepare the Notice of Intent (NOI)? Yes No NA
The Pike County and Harris County projects required an application for NOI.
- 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
- e. Was a consent order filed? Yes No
- i. Additional comments: None

11. 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: County government handled the R/W commitments as necessary pre-let.
- c. List any special circumstances, conditions, or property owner commitments of R/W acquisition: None
- d. General observations of the R/W acquisition process:

12. 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, what was the mitigating activity (e.g. white lining specification, "no-conflict" letters, first submission plans): N/A
- 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: Coweta-Fayette EMC, Public Service Telephone Company, AT&T/DBA BellSouth, Flint EMC, Diverse Power Electric, Marion County Rural Water, Windstream Communications, Crawford County Water, Southern Rivers Energy,
- d. Generally describe observations with respect to Design-Build utility coordination: The DBT had difficulty in establishing communication with the utility owners.

- e. Generally describe any areas of improvement with respect to Design-Build utility coordination: The DBT suggested that GDOT provide better communication with the utility owners pre-let concerning the upcoming project and how the utility work would be coordinated by the DBT and also post-let during the Utility Kick-Off meeting.
- f. What was the frequency of utility coordination meetings? Kick-Off meeting was the only one held.

13. 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 Foundation 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: The DBT found rock elevations that were unexpected and not provided in the RID's.

14. 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
 - o The advanced work was of minimal significance, i.e. utility relocation, clearing, erosion control installation; The DBT's baseline schedule advanced work to construction earlier, but the environmental permitting process consumed most of the time; The overall Contract duration was acceptable.
- b. Describe the typical frequency for progress meetings? Monthly
- c. Were the Design-Build Team plans/submittals of acceptable quality? Yes No
- d. Were GDOT's review times adequate? Yes No
- e. Was the Asphalt Index specification included in this project? Yes No
However, it should be noted that a Special Provision should have been included since the Contract Time exceeded 365 days.
- f. Was the Fuel Index specification included in this project? Yes No
- g. Was construction of the Maintenance of Traffic (MOT) acceptable? Yes No
- h. Was the Schedule of Values adequate? Yes No
If no, describe:
- 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 DBT stated they did not spend much time updating the CPM. The DBT suggests that GDOT consider scaling back this requirement on future projects of this size/ complexity. The DBT stated that the CPM does not add value to this type of project.

If yes, any suggested improvements to the use of CPM schedule: The DBT suggested moving forward, GDOT develop a scheduling method to best fit this type of project.

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

If yes, describe:

- l. 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

- m. Were there lane closure restrictions on this project? Yes No

If yes, were they adequate or could they have been modified for efficiency:

- 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:

- 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

15. Design-Build Innovations

- a. Were there innovative designs, solutions or materials used on this project? Yes No

If yes, describe: N/A

- b. Were any Value Engineering Proposals (VEP) submitted? Yes No

If yes, fill out the below information:

No.	VECP Description	Total Savings	Approved
1	N/A	\$	N/A

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

16. Supplemental Agreement Summary- Pending liquidated damages final determination.

SA No.	Amount	Description
01	-\$ 936,111.26	Marion County Project Cancellation - The Marion County bridge replacement work was cancelled due to existing physical features that prevented the DBT from accomplishing the work as proposed in the RFP. Marion County was provided the opportunity to fund the additional scope necessary for satisfactory replacement of the existing bridge. However, Marion County rejected the opportunity to fund the scope changes proposed by the DBT and subsequently, the Marion County bridge replacement work was cancelled through a Supplemental Agreement to the Contract.
02	\$ 18,784.56	Pike County- Differing Substructure Conditions: The Pike County project suffered due to poor geotechnical information provided in the RID's. The pre-let information provided in the RID's did not support field conditions encountered during

		construction. Shallow rock was anticipated as provided in the RID's, however deeper conditions were encountered in the field. This led to the DBT having to alter the substructure design from a spread footing a piles. The redesign, additional materials, and labor were considered for this compensation event.
03	\$0	Crawford County – Calendar Day Time Extension to increase the closure duration from 120 Calendar Days to 123 Calendar Days

17. DBE

- a. What was the project's DBE goal? 0%
- b. Was it or will it be met? Yes No
 If yes, generally describe utilization: N/A

18. Summary of observations from Office of Innovative Delivery (OID), Construction, DB Team:

- OID observed that at the outset of the two FY16 Contracts, the quality results regarding the bridge deck steel rebar cover, achieved 90% satisfactory results at Coweta and Morgan, while Walton and Greene were only able to achieve 70% satisfactory results. The DBT stated that the dry checks and wet checks resulted in similar results, however the pachometer checks did not reflect the same results; DBT and GDOT stressed a need for better quality checks on both sides. As previously stated, the environmental review periods should be revisited and revised in order to provide more reliability during the design process.

19. Recommendations:

- The DBT acknowledged that the OMAT BFI "Statement of Concern" response, that developed during the course of this Contract, was beneficial.
- The DBT mentioned that the use of LIBP Guidance and other beneficial design guidelines should be available to proposers and provided in future RFP's during the procurement phase.
- The usual materials and precast issues were mentioned as an ongoing problem that needs to be monitored for similar project in the future.
- Recommendation made by the DB Team that GDOT provide better coordination during pre-let and post-let with the utility owners; suggest that GDOT point out the information in MOU to all utility owners pre-let and post-let in the MOU meeting and Utility Kick-Off meeting.
- The DBT mentioned that their administrative work during the bridge design phase was excessive as a result of GDOT bridge reviews. GDOT bridge reviews appeared to be excessive, preferential, and/or inconsistent depending on the GDOT reviewer. GDOT mentioned that the FPR comments should have more consistency. The DBT mentioned that they were eventually able to work through the bridge reviewer's comment by directly contacting the GDOT Bridge Office and having conversations regarding minor irregularities such as drafting line weights; The DBT recommended that GDOT work toward maintaining the same POC in the review process to provide consistency with comments.
- The DBT suggests that GDOT provide more boring information pre-let for consideration by the proposers.
- Engineering Services mentioned that OID should consider and coordinate with other GDOT internal office to avoid conflicts with other projects, i.e. the Harris County project detour presented a conflict with another off system Low Impact Bridge Project.

