

SR 400 @ Northridge Road

Post Design-Build Evaluation Report

16 December 2015



P.I. Number: 751580-

County: Fulton

City: Sandy Springs, Georgia

Location: SR 400 at Northridge Road

GDOT District: Seven

Type of Contract: Design-Build

Post Design-Build Evaluation Meeting Date: 16 December 2015

Table of Contents

1. Project Description 3

2. Project Goals for Converting to Design-Build Delivery 3

3. General Design-Build Project Summary 3

4. Letter of Interest/Statement of Qualification (LOI/SOQ)..... 3

5. Shortlist 3

6. Design-Build Request for Proposals (RFP)..... 4

7. Design-Build Request for Proposal (RFP) Package 4

8. Bid Results..... 5

9. Stipend 5

10. Environmental..... 5

11. Environmental Permitting..... 5

12. NPDES Permit..... 5

13. Right of Way (R/W) 6

14. Utilities 6

15. Geotechnical 6

16. Design and Construction Phases 6

17. Design-Build Innovations 8

18. Supplemental Agreement Summary 8

19. DBE..... 8

20. Summary of observations from Office of Innovative Program Delivery (IPD) 8

21. Summary of observations from Office of Construction 8

22. Summary of observations from Design-Build team 8

23. Recommendations 8

24. Notable achievements by early interaction of design and contractor 8

25. Post Design-Build Evaluation participants: 8

1. Project Description

This project is located in Fulton County, Georgia on SR 400 approximately 5 miles north of I-285 in the City of Sandy Springs.

This project consisted of replacing the existing Northridge Road bridge over SR 400, constructing an additional lane along Northridge Road, improvements to the SR 400 ramps and intersections of Northridge Road at Dunwoody Place and Roberts Drive. A roundabout was also constructed at Northridge Road and Somerset Court. The total project length is approximately 0.4 miles along Northridge Road.

2. Project Goals for Converting to Design-Build Delivery

Expedite delivery through Design-Build contracting and to make use of available State funds from SRTA Toll Reserves.

3. General Design-Build Project Summary

Public Notice Advertisement (PNA)	2/17/2012	No. of price/technical proposals received	5
Request for Qualifications (RFQ)	8/24/2012	Amount of lowest bid	\$9,268,235.96
Statement of Qualifications (SOQ)	9/28/2012	Technical Review Committee	12/20/2012
No. of Design-Build SOQ's received	5	Award/NTP 1 (preliminary design)	2/12/2013
Interviews conducted	N/A	NTP (final phase)	2/14/2013
Shortlist notification	10/19/2012	NTP (construction phase)	1/22/2014
No. of Design-Build teams shortlisted	5	Scheduled completion	9/30/2015
Request for Proposals (RFP)	10/18/2012	Actual completion	9/30/2015
Price/technical proposals received (Letting)	12/14/2012	Open to traffic	8/7/2015

4. Letter of Interest/Statement of Qualification (LOI/SOQ)

GDOT received 5 LOI/SOQs from potential Design-Build teams which are listed below (alphabetical by Contractor).

	Contractor	Designer
1	Archer Western Contractors, LLC	Parsons Transportation Group
2	C.W. Matthews Contracting	Florence & Hutchenson, Inc.
3	E.R. Snell Contractor, Inc.	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.
4	G.P. Enterprises, Inc.	Wolverton & Associates, Inc.
5	Prince Contracting, LLC	T.Y. Lin International

5. Shortlist

GDOT evaluated each proposing Design-Build team based on their LOI/SOQ. GDOT qualified teams all five submitting teams. The shortlist included the following teams (alphabetical by Contractor):

	Contractor	Designer
1	Archer Western Contractors, LLC	Parsons Transportation Group
2	C.W. Matthews Contracting	Florence & Hutchenson, Inc.
3	E.R. Snell Contractor, Inc.	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.
4	G.P. Enterprises, Inc.	Wolverton & Associates, Inc.



5	Prince Contracting, LLC	T.Y. Lin International
---	-------------------------	------------------------

6. 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
- 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 Delivery, Utilities, Construction, Maintenance, Bridge Design, Traffic Operations, Engineering Services and Road Design.*

7. Design-Build Request for Proposal (RFP) Package

The RFP package included:

Item	Yes	No	Notes
Special Provision 999	X		
Costing plans	X		
Approved bridge layouts	X		
Approved concept report/concept revision	X		
Approved IJR/IMR		X	
Approved Environmental Document		X	Env Document was not approved prior to letting.
CAiCE or InRoads files	X		
Microstation files	X		
Approved Design Exceptions/Variations	X		
Approved BFI		X	
Approved WFI		X	
Approved Soils Report		X	
Geotechnical borings	X		Historical Boring Information was Provided
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		Several MOUs were provided as amendments.
Costing Plan Review Report	X		
Draft Transportation Management Plan (TMP)		X	
Other	X		Plans from past projects in project limits

- b. General observations of the RFP contents and/or procurement process:
 - o *C.W. Matthews: Suggestion to revise MOU process to include prior rights information. Contractors still have difficulty obtaining this information from utility owners.*
 - o *Innovative Delivery: Since this project the MOU has been modified for clarity. Although all DB projects are PID, there are still some instances where prior rights may need to be clarified.*
- c. Were conflicts in project scope identified: Yes No
 If yes, what sections should be revised for future RFPs:



8. Bid Results

On 12/14/2012 the project was let. Price and technical proposals were received. Below is the list of Design-Build teams' price proposal results:

	Contractor	Designer	Total Bid
1	C.W. Matthews Contracting	Florence & Hutchenson, Inc.	\$9,268,235.96
2	G.P. Enterprises, Inc.	Wolverton & Associates, Inc.	\$9,629,358.56
3	Archer Western Contractors, LLC	Parsons Transportation Group	\$10,457,000.00
4	E.R. Snell Contractor, Inc.	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	\$11,565,336.00
5	Prince Contracting, LLC	T.Y. Lin International	\$14,548,378.00

9. Stipend

A stipend was not used for this project. In Design-Build contracting, a stipend is typically used as a payment for work product, encourage competition or innovation, and/or compensate unsuccessful submitters for a portion of their development costs. GDOT chose not to utilize a stipend based on the large amount of information that had been prepared and was being advertised as part of the RFP package; as well as the competitive market conditions that existed around the time of the Design-Build procurement phase.

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, 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 *Designer - No environmental impacts in proximity of project which allowed for some flexibility with cst limits and with making minor modifications.*

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:
 - o *No response*

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): -

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: - No response
- c. List any special circumstances, conditions, or property owner commitments of R/W acquisition: -
- d. General observations of the R/W acquisition process: - No response

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. Was Design-Build Utility MOU's executed? Yes No
- c. List the utility owners, if any, which were included in the Design-Build contract: AT&T, AGL, and City of Atlanta Water, Georgia Power, Comcast, City of Sandy Springs
- d. Generally describe observations with respect to Design-Build utility coordination:
 - o *C.W. Matthews did a great job coordinating with the utility owner on the relocation of existing facilities.*
- e. Generally describe any areas of improvement with respect to Design-Build utility coordination:
 - o No response
- f. 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 HMMFI 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:
- b. Describe the typical frequency for progress meetings? As needed.
- 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:
 - Review times were met on most submittals. Review times did not cause delay to the project.
- 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:
General observations of Schedule of Values:
 - *No response*
- 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 GDOT Construction Office did not see any benefits from using the CPM schedule due to the smaller size and less complex scope of the project. However, the design-build team did see a benefit related to resource planning.*

If yes, any suggested improvements to the use of CPM schedule: *Tailor CPM schedule requirements to more complex jobs.*
- k. Were there any unique issues (to Design-Build) that occurred? Yes No
If yes, describe?
 - *The contractor had extensive dealings with homeowner associations to address their concerns. A communication plan would have been helpful. All agreed C.W. Matthews did a good job addressing the homeowner associations concerns and fielding ongoing concerns.*
- 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
- 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.*
 - *During the development of the RFP a great deal of time was spent evaluating lane closures with the goal being to create as much opportunity for the contractor to perform the work.*
- 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 *They were adequate.*

- 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:

- o *The Design Build Team was able to eliminate a bridge stage from the approach presented in the Costing Plans..*

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

18. Supplemental Agreement Summary

19. DBE

- a. What was the project's DBE goal? There was no DBE goal.

- b. Was it or will it be met? Yes No NA

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

- a. *Design-Build delivery goals were achieved.*
- b. *The progress meetings that were conducted were beneficial and productive.*
- c. *The Design-Build team's ability to minimize utility impacts.*
- d. *From this project, the required classes (prime and sub) are now included in the PNA. This allows teams to make the best teaming decision possible.*

21. Summary of observations from Office of Construction

- a. *Design-Build provided flexibility during construction which was beneficial and allowed for changes to be made on the fly without requiring supplemental agreements.*

22. Summary of observations from Design-Build team

- a. *Good overall project.*

23. Recommendations

- a. *Third party involvement in the submittal approval process must be clearly defined in the RFP and actively managed. . Roles and responsibilities should be identified within a clearly defined and established process.*

24. Notable achievements by early interaction of design and contractor

- a. *Overall constructability of the project.*
- b. *Coordinating with the neighborhoods on plan changes to the entrances modifications.*
- c. *Coordinating with the locals regarding changes to the roundabout design.*

25. Post Design-Build Evaluation participants:

Design-Build Team:

- a. Bob Thompson
- b. Ben Clopper
- c. Massood Shabazzaz
- d. Taylor Stukes

GDOT Construction:

- a. Mohammad Javanmard
- b. James Harry



Engineering Services:

- a. Derrick Cameron

Bridge Office:

- a. Steve Gaston

Innovative Delivery:

- a. Marlo Clowers

HNTB Corporation:

- a. Rob Lewis

POST DESIGN BUILD EVALUATION SIGN-IN SHEET

PI No.: 751580 County: Fulton

Date: 16 December 2015

NON DOT EMPLOYEES PLEASE PROVIDE BUSINESS CARD OR
PRINT E-MAIL ADDRESS LEGIBLY.

DOT EMPLOYEES PLEASE SIGN IN WITH NAME AS SHOWN ON DOT E-MAIL ADDRESS

NAME	COMPANY / OFFICE	PHONE NUMBER	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Derrick Cameron	GDOT/Engineering Services	(404) 631-1223	dcameron@dot.ga.gov
Ben Clopper	Michael Baker	678 8966 6607	ben.clopper@mbeckerintl.com
BOB THOMPSON	CW MATTHEWS	(770) 596-9444 (cell)	bobt@cwmatthews.com
Mohammad Javanmard	GDOT	(404) 326-5227	m.javanmard@dot.ga.gov
Taylor Stukes	HDR ICA	404-601-8662	taylor.stukes@hdrinc.com
Steve Gaston	GDOT Bridge	404-631-1881	sgaston@dot.ga.gov
JAMES HANNY	GDOT CONST	404-632-6235	JHANNY@dot.ga.gov
Robert Lewis	HNTB	404-556-2981	rl@lewis-hntb.com
Mark Claws	GDOT OHS	4) 631-1713	Mclaws@dot.ga.gov
Masood Shabazz	Health & Lineback.com	7-424-1668	mshabazz@health-lineback.com