

Post Design-Build Evaluation Report

Project Description: SR400 Widening Construction Project

P.I. Number: 0013367

County: Forsyth

GDOT District: District 1

Date Conducted: January 23, 2019



Project Description: This project proposes to construct one additional 11 foot travel lane, 10 foot inside shoulder (of which 8 feet would be paved), and 11 foot paved outside shoulder in each direction on US 19/SR 400, from the McFarland Parkway interchange north to SR 369 / Brown’s Bridge Road. The project length would be approximately 13.4 miles. The construction of the additional lanes and inside shoulder would take place in the existing median of US 19/SR 400.

1. **Design-Build delivery goal(s): Two Phase Low Bid - Variable Scope Procurement was designed to receive maximum value to the fixed budget.** The scope of the project included a base bid and bidding of several segments each extending further north than the previous segment. The base bid for the project began at McFarland Parkway and extended north to Bald Ridge Marina in Forsyth County, in both directions. The proposals would then include additional segments north of Bald Ridge Marina up to SR 369 and then from SR 369 south to Bald Ridge Marina. The winning proposal including the full scope of the project, from McFarland Parkway to SR 369 in both directions.

2. **Project stakeholders:**

- GDOT – Innovative Delivery, District 1, Environmental Services, Bridge Design
- C.W. Matthews Contracting Co. – Prime Contractor
- ICE – Prime Designer/ Engineer of Record
- Forsyth County (Partially financed the project)
- USACE – Lake Lanier Project Office

3. **Project Summary:**

	Project Milestone	Date
Pre-Let	Public Notice Advertisement (PNA)	12/10/2014
	Request for Qualifications (RFQ)	01/16/2015
	Letter of Interest (LOI)/Statement of Qualifications (SOQ)	02/13/2015
	Notice to Finalists	02/27/2015
	Request for Proposals (RFP)	02/27/2015
	Administrative Package Due	04/24/2015
	Technical Package Due	04/24/2015
	Price Proposal / Project Letting	04/24/2015
Post-Let	Project Award	05/06/2015
	NTP1 – Preliminary Design	06/01/2015
	NTP2 – Final Design Activities	08/03/2015
	Conditional NTP 3A – Limited Construction in Segment 1	10/19/2015
	Conditional NTP 3B – SA#1 Concrete Rehabilitation	11/02/2015
	Conditional NTP 3C – Segment 2/Big Creek Bridge/MS4 Segment 1	01/20/2016
	NTP 3D – Construction	06/30/2016
	Milestone Deadline – All New Lanes Open to Traffic	10/03/2018
	Contract Completion Date (including Supplemental Agreements)	12/06/2019
	Substantial Project Completion	12/06/2019

4. **Design-Build Proposers:**

	Contractor	Designer	Total Bid
1	C.W. Matthews Contracting Co.	Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering	\$47,470,406.25
2	Archer Western Contractors	RS&H	\$53,903,000.00
3	McCarthy Improvement	American Consulting	\$60,947,000.00
4	G.P.'s Enterprises, Inc.	Wolverton & Associates, Inc.	\$61,288,108.30
5	E.R. Snell Contractor, Inc.	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	\$62,977,456.19

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: Five Design-Build Teams submitted LOI/SOQ packages in response to the RFQ and five were notified to be finalists. On April 24, 2015 the Department received five price proposals and corresponding technical proposals.

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

- c. Was a draft RFP released for this project? Yes No

If yes # of releases: N/A

Was a Q&A format provided? Yes No

- d. Were One-on-One meetings held with proposers? Yes No

General panel discussion comment - One on one meetings may be beneficial for Low Bid procurements

- e. List GDOT offices involved in the RFP development: Design Policy & Support, Engineering Services, Environmental Services, Innovative Delivery, Construction, Bridge, District 1, Traffic Operations

7. **Design-Build RFP Package**

- a. List items included in the RFP package:

Item	Yes	No	Notes
DBB Reference Drawings	X		
Approved Existing BFI	X		
Approved Concept Report	X		
Design Criteria	X		
Design Files	X		
Approved Design Variance	X		
Drainage & Erosion Plans	X		
Environmental Working Document	X		
Final Field Plan Review Documents	X		
Geometry (CAiCE & InRoads)	X		
Approved Pavement Design	X		
Right of Way Documents	X		
Railroad Coordination Information		X	N/A
Value Engineering Study		X	

Approved Detour Map		X	N/A
Design-Build Costing Plans	X		
NEPA Categorical Exclusion	X	X	GEPA Type B Letter was provided
Air Assessment Addendum		X	
Type III Noise Screening		X	
Survey Control Package	X		
Existing SUE & SUE QLA		X	Forsyth County Utilities information
MOU and Utility Analysis Sheets	X		MOUs included in the contract
Approved ROW Plans		X	
Cost to Cures		X	N/A
GDOT Shelf, Supplemental, and Reference Specification/Special Provisions	X		

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

Contractor performed LIDAR pre let.

c. Were conflicts in project scope identified: Yes No

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

8. 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

If no, when was the NEPA/GEPA document approved?

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

Did the Design-Build Team provide supporting documentation? Yes No

d. General observations of the pre-let or post-let environmental process:

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

c. Was a Stream Buffer Variance (SBV) required? Yes No

d. List any other permits required by the project (not counting NPDES Permit): USACE Dredging Permit

e. General observations of the environmental permitting process: 2 NWP's obtained to phase construction, USACE Environmental Stewardship commitment to contribute to the DNR Wildlife Impoundment project, minimal dredging @Lake Lanier to offset storage capacity loss.

10. 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
If yes, describe the reason(s) and outcome(s):

i. Additional comments: MS4 Area

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:
o N/A
- c. List any special circumstances, conditions, or property owner commitments of R/W acquisition:
o Environmental Stewardship Commitment for impacts to USACE property
o Big Creek Greenway trail closure notice requirement was completed
- d. General observations of the R/W acquisition process:
o N/A

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): Forsyth County Utilities information provided & white-lining Spec included. Since SR 400 is a Limited Access facility similar to an interstate, utility relocations were viewed as low risk.
- 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:
- d. Generally describe observations with respect to Design-Build utility coordination:
o N/A
- e. Generally describe any areas of improvement with respect to Design-Build utility coordination:
o N/A
- f. What was the frequency of utility coordination meetings?
o N/A

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:

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: Conditional NTP 3A was issued for Conditional NTP 3A – Limited Construction in Segment 1 (First 8 miles NB to SR20 to start widening/paving work), Conditional NTP 3B – SA#1 Concrete Rehabilitation, Conditional NTP 3C – Segment 2/Big Creek Bridge/MS4 Segment 1, NTP 3D – Construction.

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 the 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:

Scaled appropriately for the project

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: Phasing of the permits, variable scope procurement,

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 Restrictions were adequate
- o NB/SB lane closure overlap created onlooker delays
- o Continuous lane closures throughout the weekend were an advantage

- Allowing Lane Closures throughout the weekend (day and night) added efficiency to 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. 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 Pending

15. Design-Build Innovations

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

If yes, describe:

- Phased construction required that multiple NWP be obtained from USACE
- Both Plan and Profile included on same sheet

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

If yes, fill out the below information:

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

e. List other benefits that are not reflected in the cost savings:

- Weekend lane closures (day and night) increased efficiency

16. Supplemental Agreement Summary- Pending liquidated damages final determination.

SA No.	Amount	Description
1	\$140,213.50	Spall Repair Overrun
2	\$454,781.25	Erosion Control Hay bale Checkdams
3	\$8,220,797.37	Replace outside shoulder
4	(\$353,610.29)	Rumble strips in Lieu of Asphalt
5	\$1,913,277.12	Full Depth Slab Replacement
6	(\$235,670.73)	Polymer Overlay Credit
7	\$63,547.14	RPM and Preformed Tape Replacement
8	\$469,170.00	Additional Concrete Slab Repair

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:

18. Summary of observations from Office of Innovative Delivery (OID), Construction, DB Team

- Monthly meetings were beneficial
- 2 week look ahead was beneficial to CEI
- Reduced submittals were beneficial

19. Recommendations

- CPM specifications scalable to the project
- Include PR and/or Communications in Post DB Construction Report checklist
- Get local officials involved early

20. Notable achievements by early interaction of design and contractor

21. Post Design-Build Evaluation participants:

