

**SPECIAL EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT NO. 14 (SEP-14)**

**A+C+D Best Value Contracting**

**Fourth Interim Evaluation Report**

**For**

**I-84: Sandy River - Jordan Rd Project - Bundle 210**

**Key Number: 14032**

**ODOT Contract No. 14165**

**Oregon Department of Transportation  
Major Projects Branch  
Salem, OR 97301**

**June 20, 2014**

## **1.0 Introduction**

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) submits this fourth interim evaluation report under the provisions of programmatic Special Experimental Project No. 14 (SEP-14) for the use of A+C+D alternative contracting for transportation projects. The purpose of this interim evaluation report is to fulfill the requirements of this project's SEP-14 Work Plan, as provided by ODOT to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) on November 25, 2009 summarizing the procurement phase of I-84: Sandy River – Jordan Road Project, Bundle 210.

This interim report includes a brief scope of the A+C+D project, a brief history of the procurement process, and a summary of the effects A+C+D delivery method has had on the primary objectives, noted below, as stated in the SEP-14 for this project. This report will be followed by separate interim reports on an annual basis until completion of the experimental project. A final evaluation report will be submitted within four (4) months of completion and ODOT acceptance of the project.

ODOT proposed utilizing the A+C+D alternative best value contracting method to address project needs by evaluating components which include the contractor's qualifications and technical approach, as well as price, which results in a "Best Value" selection. This procurement method encompasses the Oregon Legislature's focus on economic efficiency and stimulation and provides recognition of the value to the public of employing enhanced contracting methods, which will accomplish the required work in the most effective manner.

## **2.0 Project Scope**

The I-84 Sandy River to Jordan Road Project (Project) scope of work is replacing two bridges (06875 and 06875A) and widening two bridges (06945 and 06945A) on Interstate 84 in Multnomah County. Two of the Project bridges span the Sandy River, which is a sensitive environmental area.

The Project also has several complicated construction constraints and technical requirements that required a contractor with specialized expertise in constructing a bridge with steel box girders and drilling eight (8) foot diameter shafts with post-grouting, which are not commonly used in Oregon. In addition the contractor had to plan and stage construction work within the short six (6) week annual in-water work window.

After contract award ODOT identified the need to mitigate the risk of increased flood elevations that would significantly impact communities along the Sandy River. In order to minimize potential flooding ODOT determined that the construction methodology would be revised to eliminate the number of temporary work bridge and detour structure piles placed in the Sandy River.

To compensate for new design and construction approach resulting from a change in site conditions ODOT changed the targeted completion date for the project from November 30, 2013 to November 30, 2014. Project estimated cost is \$71,304,000 for construction and total Project costs was estimated to be \$81,361,000.

### **3.0 Summary of effects of A+C+D method on objectives**

- 3.1** Did the project deliver the high level of quality expected of a contractor team especially experienced in the work items and overall supervision of such a complex project?

The Project has delivered a high quality of work over the life of the Project, but this is not said without issues. The Contractor's supplier had workload prioritization issues and placed another State DOT's order ahead of fabricating the girders for this Project. This delayed girder delivery, which in turn delayed bridge construction by approximately two (2) months. The fabricator placed a rush order on manufacturing the remaining girders. ODOT had concerns about the quality of girder welds, diaphragm fit-up, and variation in lengths. ODOT met with the fabricator to develop and put in place additional quality control measures for implementation by the fabricator. In addition, there were several issues with the eastbound bridge girders not fitting and aligning. These issues included, a slight skew in bent five (5), girders varying in length, substandard falsework not capable of supporting the bridge and a deck pour prior to post tensioning creating torsion in the girders. The schedule delay was made up by ODOT outsourcing to a third party fabricator to fabricate some of the girders and ODOT had the Contractor expedite work on correcting welds and diaphragms misalignments. The corrective actions taken by ODOT and the Contractor resulted in the westbound structure not having the same quality issues with misalignments and inconsistent girder lengths, resulting in a quality-constructed superstructure.

- 3.2** Did the project meet schedule and budget with a minimum of modifications, in particular planning and schedule based issues?

The Project is on schedule and under budget to date and should meet all schedule milestones and completion date and budget expectations.

- 3.3** Did the contractor's submitted proposed technical approaches accurately reflect the approaches taken during construction to maintain schedule, budget and other project goals?

The Contractor, ODOT's program management consultant and ODOT have collaborated on a daily basis throughout the Project. Decisions concerning the project were made to promote efficiency and budget stability. There were some minor change orders issued during this reporting period; however, the high level of collaborations resulted in no impact to schedule or budget.

### **4.0 Reporting**

Interim SEP-14 evaluation reports will be prepared and submitted to FHWA on an annual basis (on or near July), until completion of the experimental project. These reports will focus on the primary objectives for project execution:

- Did the project deliver the high level of quality expected of a contractor team especially experienced in the work items and overall supervision of such a complex project?
- Did the project meet schedule and budget with a minimum of modifications, in particular planning and schedule based issues?
- Did the contractor's submitted proposed technical approaches accurately reflect the approaches taken during construction to maintain schedule, budget and other project goals?

A final evaluation report will be submitted within four (4) months after completion of the experimental project. The final report will contain a summary of how well the Project met the objectives, lessons learned, and recommendations pertaining to the use of the A+C+D project delivery and contracting method on other projects.