



POTOMAC  
CROSSING  
CONSULTANTS

a joint venture of  
Parsons Brinckerhoff  
URS  
Rummel, Klepper & Kahl

## MEMORANDUM

### Lessons Learned Review Comments

### MA-1A Ground Improvement

**Date:** December 15, 2004

**From:** Jim Ruddell

No.	Issue	Lesson Learned
1.	The folks charged with administering the WWB construction program did not adequately understand the high level of risk that the design solution represented. Based on the uncertainty associated with attempting to predict ground behavior, the construction schedule was in jeopardy. Had we not suffered a two-year delay to progress on the WWB bridge construction, MA-1A would have introduced a program delay in the tens of millions of dollars.	A. The big money in a corridor program is in the schedule. B. The construction team needs to know the schedule risks that accompany specific design solutions in order to make a comprehensive evaluation of costs and schedule risks.
2.	The contract administration costs were nearly 25% of construction costs. 30% of contract administration costs were attributable to office support. These costs are exclusive of designer of record costs for support during construction. Geotechnical contracts inherently entail more oversight in the field and in the office. Also, this contract was for a long contract duration.	Budget 25% of the construction cost for construction administration on future geotechnical construction contracts.
3.	The contractor used well over 80 sources of supply for borrow. This led to extensive efforts to test an inordinate number of sources of supply.	Require the contractor to pay for the lab tests of each source of supply over five sources.
4.		

M:\Construction Management\Maryland\295 Interchange\Contract MA1 - Ramps E, E1, F and R\Electronic Project Files\0800-0899 Quality Assurance and Control\JR Lessons Learned.doc