# Post Design-Build Evaluation Report

**Project Description: I-20 @ SR 28 - Lighting**
**P.I. Number: 0010210**
**Project Number:**
**County: Richmond**
**GDOT District: District 2**

**Date Conducted: February 7, 2013**

1. **Project Description:** *I-20 @ SR 28/Washington Road High Mast Lighting installation.*
2. **Design-Build delivery goal(s):** *Expedited delivery, and to make use of available funds.*
3. **Project stakeholders:**
   - *GDOT - Project Delivery and Inspection*
   - *Brooks Berry Haynie – Prime Contractor*
   - *Gresham Smith & Partners – Prime Designer*
   - *City of Augusta – Lighting Agreement*
4. **Project Summary:**

| Project Milestone | Date | Procurement Summary | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Public Notice Advertisement (PNA) | 2/18/2011 | No. of SOQ's received | 3 |
| Request for Qualifications (RFQ) | 4/27/2011 | No. of teams shortlisted/prequalified | 3 |
| Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) | 5/13/2011 | No. of price/technical proposals received | 2 |
| Request for Proposals (RFP) | 5/20/2011 | Amount of lowest responsive bid | $1,113,176 |
| Letting | 6/17/2011 | | |
| NEPA Approval | 4/29/2011 | | |
| Award | 7/8/2011 | | |
| NTP 1 | 8/9/2011 | | |
| NTP 2 Partial | 2/1/2012 | | |
| NTP 2 Complete | 3/9/2012 | | |
| Contract Completion Date | 6/30/2012 | | |
| Open to Traffic | N/A | | |
| Construction Complete | 8/1/2012 | | |

5. **Design-Build Proposers:**

| | Contractor | Designer | Shortlisted or Prequalified (Y/N) | Total Bid |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Brooks-Berry-Haynie | Gresham, Smith and Partners | Y | $ 1,113,176 |
| 2 | R.J. Haynie & Assoc | Atlanta Consulting Engineers | Y | $ 1,208,890.00 |
| 3 | MetroPower, Inc | Atlanta Consulting Engineers | Y | Technical Proposal not provided, deemed unresponsive |

6. **Stipend**
   a. Was a stipend (stipulated fee) offered to proposing Design-Build teams? ☐ Yes ☒ No
      If yes, how much per firm: -
7. **Design-Build Request for Qualifications (RFQ)**
   a. Did GDOT employ a shortlist of between 3 and 5 Design-Build teams? ☐ Yes ☒ No
      If yes, list reasons why a shortlist was utilized for this project: -
   b. General observations of the RFQ process:
      - *The RFQ was advertised twice because Georgia Code Section 32-2-81 requires receipt of three responsive SOQ's. For this project only two responsive SOQ's were received after the initial RFQ*

*advertisement. GDOT quickly re-advertised the RFQ and then received three responsive SOQ's. GDOT was able to keep the project on schedule despite the re-advertisement of the RFQ.*

8. **Design-Build Request for Proposals (RFP)**
   a. Type of procurement: ☒ Two Phase/Low Bid
   b. Advertisement duration: ☒ 30 days ☐ 60 days ☐ 90 days
   c. Was a draft RFP released for this project? ☐ Yes ☒ No
      If yes # of releases: -
   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, Environmental Services, Innovative Program Delivery, Utilities*

9. **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 | |
| Approved IJR/IMR | | X | |
| Approved Environmental Document | X | | |
| CAiCE or InRoads files | | X | |
| Microstation files | X | | |
| Approved Design Exceptions/Variances | | X | |
| Approved BFI | | X | |
| Approved WFI | | X | |
| Approved Soils Report | | X | |
| Geotechnical borings | | X | |
| Approved Pavement Design | | X | |
| Pavement Design Alternative | | X | |
| Overhead/Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE) Quality Level "B" (QL-B) | X | | |
| Utility Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) | X | | |
| Costing Plan Review Report | | X | |
| Draft Transportation Management Plan (TMP) | | X | |
| Special Provision 999 | X | | |
| Other | X | | Lighting warrants |

   b. General observations of the RFP contents and/or procurement process:
      - *Design-Build team suggested that streamlining the utility coordination process in SP 999 for this type of project, or obtaining "No-Conflict" letters from as many utility owners pre-let could have helped improve the project's schedule.*
      - *By all accounts the RFP package contents appeared to be adequate.*
   c. Were conflicts in project scope identified: ☒ Yes ☐ No
      If yes, what sections should be revised for future RFPs:

- *Alternative underbridge/tunnel lighting for the SR 28/Washington Road Bridge should have been better clarified in the scope or in GDOT design manual; rather than a blanket scope item which required the use of tunnel lighting design standards.*
- *A Design Variance was executed to allow the appropriate level of lighting for the given condition. The Design-Build team did an excellent job developing a design to meet an adequate level of lighting.*

10. **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: -
        If yes, did the Design-Build team perform the re-evaluation? ☐ Yes ☐ No
        If yes, did the Design-Build team provide supporting documentation? ☐ Yes ☐ No
    d. General observations of the pre-let or post-let environmental process: *None*

11. **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: *As part of the RFP, GDOT designated buffers (ESAs) on all potential streams/wetlands with a scope requirement to avoid streams/wetlands and their respective buffers.*

12. **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
    f. If yes, describe the reason(s) and outcome(s): -
    i. Additional comments: *The Disturbed Area was less than 1 ac. NPDES Permit was not required.*

13. **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: -

14. **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: *None*

d. Generally describe observations with respect to Design-Build utility coordination:

- *Pre-let coordination occurred with Georgia Power to identify power service points.*
- *Design-Build team was able to avoid all conflicts and "no conflict" letters were received from all Utilities post-let.*

e. Generally describe any areas of improvement with respect to Design-Build utility coordination:

- *Design-Build team suggested that streamlining the utility coordination process in SP 999 for this type of project, or obtaining No-Conflict letters from as many utility owners pre-let could have helped improve the project's schedule*
- *The utility kick-off meeting facilitated by the Design-Build team per Special Provision 999 needs to include Utility owners, SUE sub, and other important participants. All utility meetings need to be conducted with a purpose (e.g. provide first submission plans at the kick-off meeting).*

f. What was the frequency of utility coordination meetings: *Monthly until "no-conflict" letters were received.*

15. **Geotechnical**

a. Was an approved Soils Report included in the RFP package? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, was a Soils Report required for the project? ☐ Yes ☐ No

b. Was an approved BFI included in the RFP package? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, was a BFI required for this project? ☐ Yes ☐ No

c. Was an approved WFI included in the RFP package? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, 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 yes, was a WFI required for this project? ☐ Yes ☒ No

e. Were there any geotechnical issues encountered on construction? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, describe issues and outcome: *None*

16. **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 underbridge lighting design was advanced and accepted by GDOT while the High Mast Lighting design for the interchange was developed. This allowed for work to proceed to*

*avoid the disturbing any potential migratory bird habitat and avoid conflicting with the Masters golf tournament.*

b. Describe the typical frequency for progress meetings? *Monthly - during the design phase.*

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:

- *In most cases GDOT reviewed submittals in an expeditious manner, and in less time than allowed in SP 999.*
- *There were several iterations of comments and submittals associated with the foundation details.*
- *In general, all agreed that review times were adequate.*

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:

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: -

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?

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: *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:

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

17. **Design-Build Innovations**

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

If yes, describe: *The under bridge lighting condition under SR 28/Washington Rd was unique and the Design-Build team presented a unique design solution to balance the tunnel lighting requirements and to meet the existing conditions in order to provide adequate lighting.*

b. Were any Value Engineering Change Proposals (VECP) 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: *It was noted that there were efficiencies gained in delivery time by having real time Contractor/Designer interaction during the course of the Design-Build contract.*

18. **Supplemental Agreement Summary**

| SA No. | Amount | Description |
|---|---|---|
| None | | |
| | | |

19. **DBE**

a. What was the project's DBE goal? *11%*

b. Was it or will it be met? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, generally describe utilitization: *100% of the DBE goal was achieved on non-construction related elements. A 17% DBE utilization was achieved on this project.*

If no, then describe reasons: -

20. **Summary of observations from Office of Innovative Program Delivery (IPD)**

a. Design-Build delivery goals were achieved.

b. The IPD PM did everything in their power to guide the project, and aid in expediting submittal reviews.

c. The progress meetings that were conducted were beneficial and productive.

d. In some cases it appeared that the Design-Build team internal submittal and QC process may have caused some minor delays.

e. This Design-Build project was unique and helped build project experience for GDOT and the Design-Build team.

21. **Summary of observations from Office of Construction**

a. No issues.

22. **Summary of observations from Design-Build team**

a. Design-Build added to the delivery efficiency by having that direct Contractor/Designer interaction.

b. The contract time allowed for Design-Build delivery was aggressive. The under bridge lighting solution took some time to resolve. In hindsight, the focus could have been shifted to High Mast Lighting in order to allow longer lead time to order material.

c. Communication at all levels is critical to keeping every element on schedule.

d. The final inspection was delayed because of a GDOT staff retirement. This was an unavoidable delay that was reconciled, but caused a couple of months delay.

23. **Recommendations**
    a. GDOT consider outlining design parameter for under bridge lighting.
    b. GDOT consider for future projects, identifying when it is appropriate to obtain “No-Conflict” letters or introduce a white lining specification.
    c. Evaluate the close-out process for Design-Build projects.
24. **Notable achievements by early interaction of design and contractor**
    a. Underbridge lighting solution, previously described.
25. **Post Design-Build Evaluation participants:**
    a. Dennis Bius – Brooks Berry Haynie
    b. Carla Holmes – Gresham Smith and Partners
    c. Ron Gipe – Gresham Smith and Partners
    d. Loren Bartlett – GDOT
    e. Kelvin Mullins – GDOT
    f. Robert Lewis – HNTB
    g. David Hannon - HNTB
    h. Edwin Thompson – GDOT District 2 Construction Engineer
    i. Corbett Reynolds – GDOT District 2 Assistant Construction Engineer
    j. Rodney Way – GDOT Area Engineer
    k. Bryan Gibbs – GDOT Construction Liaison
    l. Jamie Lindsey – State Utilities Liaison Engineer
    m. Lynn Bean – District 2 Utility Engineer
    n. Kenny Beckworth – GDOT
    o. Darryl VanMeter - GDOT