

Post Design-Build Evaluation Report

**Project Description: SR 400 at Abernathy Road NB Ramp Extension &
SR 400 at McFarland Pkwy NB Transition Lane**

P.I. Number: 0010311 & 0010290

Project Number: N/A

County: Fulton & Forsyth

GDOT District: District 1 & 7

Date Conducted: March 6, 2013

1. **0010311 Project Description:** This project consists of constructing a two-lane entrance ramp from northbound Abernathy Road and an auxiliary lane. The total project length is approximately 0.75 miles.
2. **0010290 Project Description:** This project consists of construction of an inside northbound lane from the McFarland Parkway with additional pavement to the Big Creek Bridge on SR 400. The project also consisted of restriping the existing inside lane from near the McGinnis Ferry Road overpass to McFarland Parkway. The total project length is approximately 1.86 miles.
3. **Design-Build delivery goal(s):** *Expedited delivery.*
4. **Project stakeholders:**
 - *GDOT - Project Delivery and Inspection*
 - *C.W. Matthews – Prime Contractor*
 - *Michael Baker (formerly LPA Group) – Prime Designer*
 - *City of Sandy Springs – Local municipality*
 - *Perimeter Community Improvement District – Local business group*

5. **Project Summary:**

Project Milestone	Date	Procurement Summary	
Public Notice Advertisement (PNA)	11/17/2011	No. of SOQ's received	3
Request for Qualifications (RFQ)	12/16/2011	No. of teams shortlisted/prequalified	3
Statement of Qualifications (SOQ)	1/27/2012	No. of price/technical proposals received	3
Notice to Finalists	2/17/2012	Amount of lowest responsive bid	\$ 3,337,287.36
Request for Proposals (RFP)	3/23/2012		
Letting	4/20/2012		
GEPA Approval 0010311	1/11/2012		
GEPA Approval 0010290	1/17/2012		
Award	5/4/2012		
NTP 1	6/11/2012		
NTP 2	6/11/2012		
NTP 3 0010290	7/23/2012		
NTP 3 0010311	8/7/2012		
Contract Completion Date	1/31/2013		
Open to Traffic	12/1/2012		
Construction Complete	1/28/2013		

6. **Design-Build Proposers:**

	Contractor	Designer	Shortlisted or Prequalified (Y/N)	Total Bid
1	C.W. Matthews	LPA Group	Y	\$3,377,287.36
2	Sunbelt Structures	Moreland Altobelli	Y	\$3,468,838.00
3	E.R. Snell	Gresham Smith	Y	\$5,095,805.00

7. Stipend

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

If yes, how much per firm: -

8. 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.*

9. 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 1, District 7*

10. Design-Build RFP Package

- a. List items included in the RFP package:

Item	Yes	No	Notes
Costing plans	X		
Approved bridge layouts		X	N/A
Approved concept report/concept revision	X		
Approved IJR/IMR		X	N/A
Approved Environmental Document	X		
CAiCE or InRoads files	X		
Microstation files	X		
Approved Design Exceptions/Variances		X	Obtained Post Let
Approved BFI		X	N/A
Approved WFI		X	N/A
Approved Soils Report		X	Existing soil surveys from nearby projects were provided
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	N/A

Special Provision 999	X		
Other	X		Approved Survey Control package, Traffic Data and Analysis

- b. General observations of the RFP contents and/or procurement process:
 - o *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:
 - 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:
 - o *Obtaining the approved GEPA document prior to RFP being advertised was helpful.*
 - b. Type of 404 permit required: NWP IP Other None
 - c. 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
 - d. Was a Stream Buffer Variance (SBV) required? Yes No
 - e. List any other permits required by the project (not counting NPDES Permit): *None*
 - f. General observations of the environmental permitting process:

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
- f. If yes, describe the reason(s) and outcome(s): -
- i. Additional comments:
 - o *The Design-Build team did a good job engaging EPD in providing clarification on primary and secondary monitoring locations.*
 - o *The Design-Build team did a good job maintaining BMPs, and adjusting BMPs as necessary to anticipate any issues.*

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: N/A
- c. General observations of the R/W acquisition process: N/A

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): - "No-Conflict" Letters
- b. Were Design-Build Utility MOU's executed? Yes No
- c. List the utility owners, if any, which were located within the project vicinity: *Forsyth County, MARTA, and Sawnee EMC.*
- d. List the utility owners, if any, that included their relocation(s) in the Design-Build contract: *Forsyth County, but there were no conflicts and this was not required.*
- e. Generally describe observations with respect to Design-Build utility coordination:
 - o *No conflict letters were obtained from all utilities in advance of awarding the contract to remove the Design-Build teams responsibility for utility coordination outside the activities normally associated with a construction project.*
- f. What was the frequency of utility coordination meetings: *None.*

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 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:

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: *GDOT authorized land disturbing activities on 7/23/2012 for the PI No. 0010290 to allow construction to begin on this project while the plans for PI No. 0010311 were finalized. NTP for land disturbing activities for PI No. 0010311 was given on 8/7/2012.*

- b. Describe the typical frequency for progress meetings? *Field Coordination*
- 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: *-Perimeter CID was engaged throughout and granted permission for 1 lane closure outside of contract specified hours.*
- 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: *N/A*
If yes, any suggested improvements to the use of CPM schedule: *N/A*
- 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:
 - o *They were adequate.*
 - o *Design-Build team did a great job getting the project complete prior to the holiday lane closure restriction.*
- 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

16. Design-Build Innovations

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

If yes, describe: *This Design-Build team utilized an innovative wall solution that minimized the grading required on the project and expedited construction.*

17. Value Engineering Change Proposals (VECP)

No.	VECP Description	Total Savings	Approved
None			

18. Supplemental Agreement Summary

No.	Amount	Description
None		

19. DBE

- a. What was the project's DBE goal? *0%*
- b. Was it or will it be met? Yes No

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

a. *This project went very well and transitioned from design to construction smoothly.*

21. Summary of observations from Office of Construction

- a. *The Area Office was unfamiliar with the Design-Build process and needed assistance to develop the MC Checklist utilizing Site Manager.*
- b. *There were 2 signs outside of the project limits that should have been included in the project signing and marking plans. The District office has made adjustments to these.*

22. Summary of observations from Design-Build team

a. *There was a general note indicating that final striping should match the existing. This note was included on the staging plans only and not on the Signing and Marking plans. It is recommended that this be included in the Signing and Marking General Notes as well.*

23. Recommendations

a. *Internal GDOT discussions on design-build audits and documentation for materials*

24. Notable achievements by early interaction of design and contractor

a. *Project opened to traffic approximately 72 days early.*

25. Post Design-Build Evaluation participants:

- a. *Steve Matthews – Office of Engineering Services; Loren Bartlett – Innovative Program Delivery; Matt Needham – District 1 Construction; Kris Phillips – District 1 Construction; Tony Bradley – CW Matthews; Tyler McIntosh – LPA/Baker; John Hancock – Innovative Program Delivery; David Hannon - HNTB*