

Post Design-Build Evaluation Report

Project Description: FY-16 Bridge Replacement Project Batch – 4

P.I. Number: 0014177

County: Atkinson, Ben Hill, Grady, Tift, and Ware Counties

GDOT District: Districts 4 & 5

Date Conducted: October 1, 2019



Tift County



Atkinson County



Ben Hill County



Grady County



Ware County

Project Description: The proposed project replaced the existing, structurally deficient bridges at the following Locations.

Bridge Serial Number	Feature Carried	Feature Intersected	County Name	GDOT District
003-5026-0	Cogdell Road	Red Bluff Creek	Atkinson	4
131-0052-0	Old Thomasville Road	Barnetts Creek	Grady	4
277-5043-0	Lower Brookfield Road	New River	Tift	4
017-0020-0	Perry House Road	Willacooche Creek	Ben Hill	4
299-0032-0	Old Nicholls Hwy	Hog Creek Tributary	Ware	5

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, Districts 4 & 5, Environmental Services, Bridge Design, State Utilities
- Southern Concrete Construction Company, Inc. – Prime Contractor
- Neel-Schaffer, Inc. – Prime Designer/ Engineer of Record
- Atkinson County
- Tift County
- Grady County
- Ben Hill County
- Ware County

3. **Project Summary:**

	Project Milestone	Date
Pre-Let	GDOT issues Public Notice Advertisement (PNA)	10/16/2015
	Industry Forum	11/05/2015
	Industry one-on-one meeting	11/05/2015
	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	06/17/2016
	NTP1 – Preliminary Design	08/03/2016
	NTP 3 - Atkinson County	12/22/2017
	NTP 3 - Grady County	11/13/2018
	NTP 3 - Tift County	01/13/2019
	NTP 3 - Ben Hill County	03/15/2018
	NTP 3 - Ware County	08/28/2018
	Milestone Deadline – New Bridge Open to Traffic	05/16/2017
	Milestone Deadline –Bridge Open to Traffic Atkinson County	05/03/2018
	Milestone Deadline –Bridge Open to Traffic Grady County	05/24/2019
	Milestone Deadline –Bridge Open to Traffic Tift County	06/03/2019
	Milestone Deadline –Bridge Open to Traffic Ben Hill County	07/05/2018
	Milestone Deadline –Bridge Open to Traffic Ware County	11/15/2018
	Contract Completion Date	08/03/2019
	Substantial Project Completion	08/03/2019
	Maintenance Acceptance	08/03/2019

4. Design-Build Proposers:

	Contractor	Total Bid
1	Southern Concrete Construction Co, Inc.	\$9,345,000.00
2	Southeastern Site Development	\$10,498,997.00

5. Stipend

- a. Was a stipend (stipulated fee) offered to proposing Design-Build Teams? Yes No
 If yes, how much per firm: N/A

6. Design-Build Request for Proposals (RFP)

- a. Type of procurement: One Phase/Low Bid Two Phase/Low Bid Best Value

Note:

- b. Advertisement duration: 30 days 60 days 90 days 90 days +

Note:

- 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, Traffic Operations

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/Variances	X		Provided in RFP
Original Bridge Foundation Investigation		X	
Approved Pavement Design		X	Minor Pavement Designs
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: None

c. Were conflicts in project scope identified: Yes No

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

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 that lockdown plans were required to move forward. However, the process has changed since early in this Contract as evidenced on the FY18 Contracts; The DBT expressed that collaboration has been improved since the beginning of the FY16 Contracts.

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

The Tift County project was found to need mitigation credits by USACE during the PCN review; GDOT purchased the credits.

- 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: The DBT expressed that the review process has improved. The 140 day review duration in the contract includes all reviews from GDOT to USACE approval, which was not clear initially. The actual USACE review time once the permit was received is closer to 45 days.

10. NPDES Permit

- a. Did the Design-Build Team prepare the Notice of Intent (NOI)? Yes No NA
The Grady County 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: None

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: Georgia Power, AT&T/DBA BellSouth, City of Tifton – Water, Plant Telephone Company, Irwin EMC, Windstream, City of Thomasville – Electrical, City of Fitzgerald – Water/Sewer, Mediacom, Colquitt EMC, Satilla Rural EMC – Electric Distribution
- d. Generally describe observations with respect to Design-Build utility coordination: None
- e. Generally describe any areas of improvement with respect to Design-Build utility coordination: None
- 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 expressed issues meeting minimum pile tip elevation at several locations. The DBT mentioned that borings were provided upfront and the DBT decided to not do additional borings. OMAT's change to Statement of Concerns was an improvement. The DBT expressed that the longest duration for review was with OMAT.

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
If yes, describe: The DBT expressed that sequential construction phases were utilized. The DBT expressed benefits to the staggered/conditional NTP process for construction.
- b. Describe the typical frequency for progress meetings? Monthly
- c. Were the Design-Build Team plans/submittals of acceptable quality? Yes No
Plans were acceptable; however, the following issues were documented:
- d. Were GDOT's review times adequate? Yes No
If no, describe: The DBT made comments regarding GDOT review times:
General observations of review times: Geotechnical took longer; Environmental took longer; **NCR response for approved method of correction and providing timely responses could be improved;** DBT was working at risk during the NCR review timeframe.
- 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 of the Maintenance of Traffic (MOT) acceptable? Yes No
MOT was acceptable; however, the following observations were provided:
- 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 that the CPM of scheduling is not necessary and GDOT should could be simplify the schedule requirements. The CPM created more unnecessary work for the DBT because it is not essential for construction.
If yes, any suggested improvements to the use of CPM schedule: See above comments.

- k. Were there any unique issues (to Design-Build) that occurred? Yes No
If yes, describe: N/A
- 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: N/A
- 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

- Each successive review of the As-Built Plans seemed to increase requirements not mentioned in the Contract, and insufficient justification was provided for each request. GDOT should consider experienced reviewers concerning As-Built Plans, as bad direction and extra expectations became a problem. GDOT needs better explanation of As-Built expectations at the outset, and consistent reviewers throughout the entire process from plan design through as-built plans.

15. Design-Build Innovations

- a. Were there innovative designs, solutions or materials used on this project? Yes No
If yes, describe: Precast caps (Ben Hill, Tift, Ware)
- b. Were any Value Engineering Proposals (VEP) submitted? Yes No
If yes, fill out the below information:

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

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

16. Supplemental Agreement Summary

SA No.	Amount	Description
N/A	N/A	N/A

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:

- GDOT should consider longer closure durations for each location, including; considering the complexity of the bridge when determining the duration.
- The DBT expressed the need to revisit the NCR process as previously discussed and also the As-Built plan expectations should be clearly defined in the RPF.

19. Recommendations:

- The DBT expressed that this is a good program, and the issues experienced early in the Contract have seen improvements.
- DBT recommends earlier working responses regarding NCR process maybe on a case by case basis for reduced response timeframe. For example, the Bridge Manual allows pile min tip elevation to be raised 3 feet with no problem, so the review process on this item took longer than anticipated.
- Recommend GDOT review the CPM requirements for smaller projects where a very detailed schedule may not be necessary.

20. Notable achievements by early interaction of design and contractor:

- Collaboration between the builder and designer occurred from pre-let and throughout project completion.

