Post Design-Build Evaluation Report

Project Description: I-575 @ Ridgewalk Parkway Interchange
P.I. Number: 0006043
Project Number: CSNHS-0006-00(043)
County: Cherokee
GDOT District: District 6

Date Conducted: February 22, 2013

1. **Project Description:** This project consisted of a new interchange on I-575 at Ridgewalk Parkway. In addition, new auxiliary lanes along I-575 were constructed between the new interchange and Towne Lake Parkway. The project also realigned Old Rope Mill Road approximately 400 feet to the east of its current location to form a four way intersection with Woodstock Parkway and Ridgewalk Parkway. The total project length is approximately 9,300 feet (1.76 miles).
2. **Design-Build delivery goal(s):** *Expedited delivery.*
3. **Project stakeholders:**
   - *GDOT - Project Delivery and Inspection*
   - *C.W. Matthews – Prime Contractor*
   - *Michael Baker (formerly LPA Group) – Prime Designer*
   - *City of Woodstock – Sponsor, managed R/W acquisition*
4. **Project Summary:**

Project Milestone	Date	Procurement Summary	
Public Notice Advertisement (PNA)	9/1/2009	No. of SOQ's received	6
Request for Qualifications (RFQ)	10/2/2009	No. of teams shortlisted/prequalified	6
Statement of Qualifications (SOQ)	11/2/2009	No. of price/technical proposals received	4
Notice to Finalists	11/20/2009	Amount of lowest responsive bid	$ 17,103,631.18
Request for Proposals (RFP)	1/22/2010		
Letting	3/19/2010		
NEPA Approval	4/29/2009		
Award	4/2/2010		
NTP 1	4/28/2010		
NTP 2	1/3/2011		
NTP 3 Conditional	2/7/2011		
NTP 3 Full	3/24/2011		
Contract Completion Date	12/31/2012		
Open to Traffic	11/19/2012		
Construction Complete	11/19/2012		

5. **Design-Build Proposers:**

	Contractor	Designer	Shortlisted or Prequalified (Y/N)	Total Bid
1	C.W. Matthews	LPA Group	Y	$ 17,103,631.18
2	Sunbelt Structures	Moreland Altobelli	Y	$ 18,134,500.00
3	E.R. Snell	Gresham Smith	Y	$ 18,899,431.22
4	Archer Western	Heath & Lineback	Y	$ 19,577,643.00
5	Kiewit Southern	Jacobs	Y	No bid/tech proposal submitted
6	Wright Brothers*	Wilber Smith	Y	No bid/tech proposal submitted

* Provided letter to GDOT formally dropping out.

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: *None.*
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, Construction, Bridge, Materials & Research, Engineering Services, District 6*
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		IJR
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		VE Study Report, approved Survey Control package, existing plan data, approved R/W plans

b. General observations of the RFP contents and/or procurement process:

- *The RFP package contents were adequate.*

c. Were conflicts in project scope identified: ☒ Yes ☐ No

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

- *A scope item stated, "A Value Engineering Study was performed for the project and those recommendations and approved items for implementation are to be adhered to in the final design/construction of the project." The VE Implementation Letter recommended "no" to removing an 8' gore shift, however the comment indicated that it could still be implemented in the future. The 8' gore shift was retained on this project. Recommend for future projects a close scrubbing of VE Study report verses the Design-Build scope of services.*
- *Recommend that the cutoff date for referenced manuals, policies, design criteria, etc… be clearly established in the RFP as the date of advertisement.*

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:

- *Project impacts were reduced.*
- *Design-Build team prepared the Jurisdictional Determination (JD) and coordinated a field visit with USACOE and GDNR. The outcome was a reclassification of one stream to a wetland; and eliminated the need for a stream buffer variance on the project.*
- *Pre-let, R/W was acquired at the intersection of relocated Rope Mill Road/Ridgewalk Pkwy which resulted in total takes of undeveloped parcels at the end of an existing cul-de-sac. This created an opportunity post-let to eliminate a short retaining wall which also minimized the wall's long term maintenance obligation. A small amount of additional easement was acquired during the design phase of the contract by the City of Woodstock to accommodate additional fill slope on an adjacent parcel.*

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:

- *Obtaining the approved NEPA document prior to RFP being advertised was helpful.*
- *After letting, all parties (GDOT, Design-Build team, Woodstock and FHWA) closely coordinated activities needed to acquire additional easement, and perform the re-evaluation.*
- *Stream 5 required SP 107.23.G for the protection of the protection of the Cherokee Darter which meant "Work shall not be allowed in Stream 5 from March 1st through June 15th." The timing of the re-evaluation and ultimate issuance of land disturbing*

authorization by GDOT, which occurred on 2/14/2011, required the Design-Build team to plan and to quickly mobilize so that the Stream 5 culvert was installed by March 1st. GDOT included a note in the revised "green sheet" which stated "Should the culvert construction activities occur immediately following the clearing of the rest of the project area, the buffer can be cleared at that time and no orange fencing would be required."

11. **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:

- *GDOT credited the Design-Build team for leading the JD process, and for acquiring mitigation credits.*
- *Design-Build team suggested GDOT consider creating an allowance for mitigation costs. There is some variability in cost from each mitigation bank, and risk associated with defining streams/wetlands prior to going through the Jurisdictional Determination (JD) process presents some challenges.*

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 Design-Build team did a good job engaging EPD in providing clarification on primary and secondary monitoring locations.*
- *The Design-Build team did a good job maintaining BMPs, and adjusting BMPs as necessary to anticipate any issues.*

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:

- *During the R/W acquisition process, GDOT regularly followed up with the Locals in order to include R/W commitments into the Design-Build scope of services.*
- *R/W commitments were documented via Options. There we no cost-to-cure items.*

c. General observations of the R/W acquisition process:
- *R/W plans were developed from the Costing Plans, and were approved by GDOT.*
- *The City of Woodstock acquired the R/W.*
- *GDOT stipulated that in order to award the project that all R/W must be acquired and certified by the Locals.*
- *On Design-Build projects, all R/W commitments must clearly be documented in the Option statements and in the Design-Build scope of services.*

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 located within the project vicinity: *AGL, AT&T, Cherokee Co W&S, Comcast, Georgia Power, City of Woodstock.*

d. List the utility owners, if any, that included their relocation(s) in the Design-Build contract: *City of Woodstock.*

e. Generally describe observations with respect to Design-Build utility coordination:
- *The City of Woodstock elected to include the relocation of their facility (water line) in the Design-Build contract; and agreed to pay the design/construction costs. The Design-Build team included the lump sum relocation costs in their technical proposal which was the basis for reimbursement to GDOT by the City of Woodstock.*
- *Reconciling in a timely manner a Georgia Power franchise agreement verses reimbursable costs required the Design-Build team to initiate the 'escalation' process. The process was resolved shortly after escalation was initiated. GDOT was not responsible for the relocation costs on Local routes under which a franchise agreement was in place with the Locals.*
- *A Georgia Power switch cubicle was avoided through early coordination with the contractor, designer, GDOT and utility owner.*

f. Generally describe any areas of improvement with respect to Design-Build utility coordination:
- *Recommend a scope item be included in SP 999 which requires the Design-Build team to structure their CPM schedule to reflect all applicable Utility Adjustment Schedule (UAS) activities. This would help utility owners when uploading their activity schedule into GUPS.*

g. What was the frequency of utility coordination meetings: *Monthly.*

15. **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 High Mast Found Investigation required for this project? ☐ Yes ☒ No

e. Were there any geotechnical issues encountered on construction? ☐ Yes ☒ No
   If yes, describe issues and outcome:

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: *GDOT authorized land disturbing activities on 2/7/2011 for the entire project except the area around Georgia Power facilities while the 'escalation' process continued. After the Georgia Power matter was resolved, the remaining portion of the project was authorized on 3/24/2011.*

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: -

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: -

- *Design-Build team felt that monthly required CPM submittals for this project seemed excessive in that when a schedule was submitted, reviewed, comments addressed and resubmitted; that it was time to submit the subsequent month's CPM schedule.*
- *Design-Build team had some issues with using MS Project regarding retained logic.*

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

- *Design-Build team recommended that GDOT allow the use of some constraints and negative lag. GDOT said it is not likely these will be allowed, but will evaluate.*
- *Design-Build team recommended the CPM submittal frequency be evaluated and set based on the complexity of the 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? *Steel/beige.*

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.*
- *A weekend closure of I-575, where I-575 traffic was shifted through the ramps and around the bridge worked well. Design-Build team did a great job.*

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: *This project was the first to implement cellular based ITS cameras, two of which were installed on this project. In addition, a 'piano wall' was used as well.*

18. **Value Engineering Change Proposals (VECP)**

No.	VECP Description	Total Savings	Approved
None			

19. **Supplemental Agreement Summary**

No.	Amount	Description
None		

20. **DBE**
    a. What was the project's DBE goal? *12%*
    b. Was it or will it be met? ☒ Yes ☐ No
21. **Summary of observations from Office of Innovative Program Delivery (IPD)**
    a. *Good work by all. Thank you to the District, City of Woodstock, and Design-Build team for a job well done.*
22. **Summary of observations from Office of Construction**
    a. *Good work by all.*
23. **Summary of observations from Design-Build team**
    a. *Good work by all.*
24. **Recommendations**
    a. *Recommend for future projects to closely review and compare the VE Study report verses the Design-Build scope of services.*
    b. *Recommend that the cutoff date for referenced manuals, policies, design criteria, etc… be clearly established in the RFP as the date of advertisement.*
    c. *Design-Build team suggested GDOT consider creating an allowance for mitigation costs.*
    d. *Recommend a scope item be included in SP 999 which requires the Design-Build team to structure their CPM schedule to reflect all applicable Utility Adjustment Schedule (UAS) activities. This would benefit utility owners when uploading their activity schedule into GUPS.*
    e. *GDOT Construction recommended guidance be included in the Design-Build scope of services regarding Schedule of Values requirements, as well as required supporting information which is provided by the Design-Build team with each monthly pay voucher.*
    f. *Design-Build team recommended that GDOT allow the use of some constraints and negative lag. GDOT said it is not likely these will be allowed, but will evaluate. Design-Build team also recommended the CPM submittal frequency be evaluated and set based on the complexity of the project.*
    g. *GDOT Construction credited the Design-Build team with installing and adequately maintaining BPMs on this project. GDOT Construction suggested emphasizing in subsequent SP 999's the Design-Build team's responsibility to install and maintain BPM's regardless of the project being paid on a lump sum basis.*
25. **Notable achievements by early interaction of design and contractor**
    a. *Project opened to traffic approximately 45 days early.*
    b. *Excellent stakeholder engagement and regular project updates by the Locals.*
    c. *Avoidance of the switch cubicle relocation.*
26. **Post Design-Build Evaluation participants:**
    a. *Steve Matthews – GDOT Engineering Services*
    b. *Darryl VanMeter – GDOT Innovative Program Delivery*
    c. *Steve Gafford – GDOT Utilities*

d. *Kenny Beckworth – GDOT D6 Construction*
e. *Jennifer Deems – GDOT D6 Utilities*
f. *Emory Harris – GDOT D6 Construction*
g. *Lisa Wesley – GDOT D6 Construction*
h. *Melissa Harper – GDOT Construction*
i. *Tony Bradley – C.W. Matthews*
j. *Michael Haithcock – GDOT D6 Preconstruction*
k. *Patrick Bowers – GDOT D6 Construction*
l. *Victor Dang – FHWA GA Division*
m. *Tyler McIntosh – Michael Baker*
n. *Robert Lewis – HNTB*