POST CONSTRUCTION EVALUATION REPORT

PI No.: 0000765
PROJECT NUMBER: NHS00-0000-00(765), Tift County
I-75 @ CR 418/Omega-Eldorado Road

EVALUATION DATE: October 17, 2013
Let Date: May 20, 2011
Contract Date: June 30, 2011
Original Completion Date: 6-30-13
Current Completion Date: 12-27-13

The plans were prepared by American Engineers.

The project was constructed by The Scruggs Company.

Award Amount: $9,423,458.06
Current Amount: $12,308,217.43 overall change 30.61%

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

PROJECT NHS00-0000-00(765), Tift County consists of the reconstruction of the interchange at I-75 and CR 418/Omega-Eldorado Road

General Comments

Project 0000765 (Interchange) was designed to be constructed before the I-75 widening project. Project 0000765 was placed on the shelf and later removed after the I-75 project was completed. Project 0000765 was not revised prior to let to account for existing topography changes such as tying new proposed ramps to 6-lane section. (Plans showed tying to existing 4-lane section.) A large amount of concrete from the just completed I-75 project had to be removed and hauled off the project. Better coordination between adjoining projects should be conducted in the future.

Supplemental Agreements

SA#1
Description: Modify Special Provision 150.11 and 108.08 for closing of the inside lanes for Bridge Construction in Stage 1 and Stage 2. Inside lane closures for each Stage will be sixty (60) Calendar days in duration each. Establish intermediate Completion Dates and Liquidated Damages for closures. FHWA concurrence conditional on no extension of Intermediate Completion Dates.

Explanation: Due to the existing median width, there is insufficient room for the contractor to work on the bridge in the median. Contractor proposed to allow closing the inside lanes for short durations to construct the center footings and columns.

Special Conditions/Comments: Modify existing Special Provision 150.11and 108 as attached.

Cost: $0.00

When designed I-75 was 2 lane and by the time it was let I-75 had been widened to 3-lane. Plans were not updated due to the fact that it was believed that this project was going to be shelved until 2016 but money was found and it was moved in. Originally nighttime closure only was set up in Special Provision.

With changes in I-75 and the size of crane the contractor was using this had to be revised. It was brought up at the PreCon Meeting. Construction did review the 108.08 and 150.11 prior to letting.

SA#2
Description: Delete and add contract quantities for the required removal and replacement of sections of the existing I-75 shoulders with concrete paving and grading of the areas between the I-75 mainline and ramps.

Cost: $2,700,671.52

Topo was not updated. This project was supposed to have been let prior to phase 1 originally. Significant redo for ramps was required. Added 6 months to contract time. Phase 1 was also built different than design due to a bust in the CAICE file which was also used for this design of the ramps. Also 108.08 was revised for outside lane closures. Biggest cost was the additional concrete quantity used. Earthwork and concrete removal and disposal accounted for other cost. Contractor stated that it would be helpful to have a grading plan or cross section extensions in this area.

SA#3
Description: Add Extra Work item to provide Undercut Excavation beyond 750 cubic Yards excavated on Ramps A, B, C, & D in accordance with Specification 210.5.C.

Cost: $ 32,580.00

Bad Material was found which was also found on Phase 1 so the District wasn't surprised. There was a history of drainage problems at interchange area. Interchange location is a bowl with drainage flowing toward interchange in both directions.

SA#4
Description: Added a quantity of 3935 SY of permanent soil reinforcing mat to the contract.

Cost: $15,346.50

Contractor encountered problems getting grass to grow in some ditch areas so this item was added to the contract. More water was in the ditch than originally thought. This item wasn't originally included in contract. Matting for slope was originally included in the plans.

SA#5
Description: Added contract item 004-0022 Extra Work for excavation of a retention area and grading of a new ditch as indicated on revised plans dated August 9, 2012.

Cost: $60,700.00

Northbound off ramp, problems when it rained with water running over ramp. In prior Phase 1, there was an existing pipe that had been removed. This project installed a pipe and redesign work was done to move water to the other side which included taking the water down Williams Road. Contractor stated that more survey data should have been collected to provide more plan information.

SA#6
Description: Added additional contract quantities to provide for construction of drainage structures as shown on the revised plan sheets dated 10/01/12 and 10/05/12 and also provide funding for use of concrete curb in lieu of asphalt curb.

Cost: $19,097.00

Added 9 metal drain inlets that were not in original plans. Construction stated that the additional drainage items should have been caught at FPR Stage.

SA#7

Description: Additional pay items and quantities required to construct pavement markings on the signing and marking plan sheets.

Explanation: The work is required to correct signing and marking problems and missing pay items not included in the original plans or quantities.

Special Conditions/Comments: No additional funding is needed. Additional pay items need to be added to the Construction Report.

Cost: $0.00

Item shown on plans but no quantity was included in estimate. “No cost” due to other items in plans not being used.

Allotment Request

AR#1

Description: Additional funds are required due to the overrun of item 402-1812, Recycled Asphalt Conc. Leveling, Including Bitum. Material & Lime. This overrun was required to raise the elevation of the existing roadway to the elevation of the new concrete paving and to allow for the traffic shift from Stage 1 to Stage 1A.

Cost: $258,520.94

There was an existing pay item but the quantity wasn’t enough. Originally it showed compacted fill with temporary paving but this wouldn’t work under traffic.

Leveling was added on top of the new roadway for tie-in at the ramp. Difference in elevation between the old and new bridge presented a problem.

19 mm and GAB cost were saved because they didn’t tear out what was already constructed and just leveled.

Project Over-runs or Under-runs: Quantities for 19 mm Superpave, striping and slope paving were shown on the plan sheets but omitted from the Summary of Quantities.

Significant Quantity Overruns: Leveling, Traffic Control, Undercut Excavation, Plain PC Concrete Pavement Cl 3, Indentation Rumble Strips (Continuous), Storm Drain Pipe, Underdrain Pipe, 18 in Drain Inlet, temporary Pipe Slope Drain, Stone Dumped RipRap, Additional MSE Backfill,

Project Delays:

no significant delays

Problems with recommended sequence of construction or traffic control:

Plans were built on existing I-75 being 4-lanes but at time of letting had been widened to 6-lanes.

Problems with plan notes or special provisions:

Contractor would prefer cross-sections to be included verse just a “grade to drain” note on the plans.

Will any project features create future maintenance problems:

May have some in the vicinity were the retention area that is still low and wet. Don’t expect any washing just hard to maintain due to wetness.. On southbound ramp recommend that a pipe could have been installed instead of the ditch.

Were there any unique features that could have been handled differently by design:

More accurate topo- plans updated to reflect existing conditions that changed.

Was anything handled differently on this project (such as a different method of payment or new special provision or special detail?

None

Did the Contractor initiate any value engineering proposals?

No

Describe any errors and omissions in the plans, specifications, and detailed estimate:

Some quantities were shown on the plans but omitted on detailed estimate.

Describe the reasonableness or accuracy of the following items. (Rank each one as very good, good, fair, or poor)

Utility Relocation Plan: good

Soils and foundation Information: fair

Estimate of Quantities: fair

Horizontal and Vertical Alignment: good

Earthwork: fair

Staging Plans: fair

Erosion Control Plans: good

Material Specifications: good

Bridge Plans: very good

Right-of-Way Plans: good

Provide details of any public input or comments obtained during the construction phase

None

PERSONNEL PRESENT

POST CONSTRUCTION EVALUATION SIGN-IN SHEET

Project No.: **County:** **PI No.:**

Date:

PE CHARGING UNIT:

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

	NAME	OFFICE / COMPANY	E-MAIL ADDRESS (NON-GDOT)
1	Steve Matthews	GDOT-Engineering Services	
2	Christy Lovett	GDOT-Engineering Services	
3	Karyn Matthews	GDOT - Program Delivery	
4	SCOTT CHAMBERS	GDOT - DIST- CONST	
5	Tom Fravel	American Engineers, Inc.	tfravel@aei.cc
6	LEE WALDROP	THE SCRUGGS Company	lwaldrop@scruggscompany.com
7	mike Fisher	The Scruggs Co.	mFisher@scruggscompany.com
8	Randy Rathburn	GDOT - District Const.	
9	ANDY GIDDENS	GDOT - Area 8 Const.	
10	Victor Dang	FHWA	
11	Rod Pederson	GDOT-Area 8 AE	
12	Tim Warren	GDOT UTILITIES	
13	Tony Cravey	GDOT CONST	
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			