

Project Delivery Selection Workshop Summary

Workshop Summary	
Project Name:	North Interstate 25 Project - Segments 5 & 6: Mead to Johnstown (CO 66 to CO 402)
Workshop Date:	Initial Meeting: December 15, 2017 from 9 am – 1 pm Updated with Secondary Factors when additional funding information was known (additional information shown in blue text): March 17, 2018
Workshop Location:	CDOT Loveland Office - 2207 E. Hwy. 402, Loveland, CO 80537
Facilitator:	Dr. Keith Molenaar, University of Colorado, Boulder
Delivery Method Selected:	CM/GC

Workshop Participants	
Name	Email
Mitch Bekhit (CDOT)	mitch.bekhit@state.co.us
Gray Clark (Muller)	gclark@mullereng.com
Steve Gabriszeski (Muller)	sgabriszeski@mullereng.com
Abra Geissler (CDOT)	abra.geissler@state.co.us
Mark Gosselin (RockSol)	gosselin@rocksol.com
Nabil Haddad (CDOT)	nabil.haddad@state.co.us
Steven Heimmer (CDOT)	steven.heimmer@state.co.us
Steven Humphrey (Muller)	shumphrey@mullereng.com
Randy Jensen (FHWA)	randy.jensen@dot.gov
Dave Martinez (RockSol)	martinez@rocksol.com
Keith Molenaar (University of Colorado)	keith.molenaar@colorado.edu
Adnana Murtic (CDOT)	adnana.murtic@state.co.us
Heather Paddock (CDOT)	heather.paddock@state.co.us
Carol Parr (CDOT)	carol.parr@state.co.us

Workshop Participants

Name	Email
Scott Rees (CDOT)	scott.rees@state.co.us
Keith Sheaffer (CDOT)	keith.sheaffer@state.co.us
Peter Sulmeisters (CDOT)	peter.sulmeisters@state.co.us
Melinda Urban (FHWA)	melinda.urban@dot.gov
Brian Varrella (CDOT)	brian.varrella@state.co.us
Natasha Walia (CDOT)	natasha.walia@state.co.us
Gary Strome (CDOT)	gary.strome@state.co.us
Brian Dabling (FHWA)	brian.dabling@dot.gov

Project Delivery Selection Matrix

Overview

This document provides a formal approach for selecting project delivery methods for highway projects. The information below lists the project delivery methods followed by an outline of the process, instructions, and evaluation worksheets for use by CDOT staff and project team members. By using these forms, a brief Project Delivery Selection Report can be generated for each individual project. The primary objectives of this tool are:

- Present a structured approach to assist Agencies in making project delivery decisions;
- Assist Agencies in determining if there is a dominant or optimal choice of a delivery method; and
- Provide documentation of the selection decision.

Background

The project delivery method is the process by which a construction project is comprehensively designed and constructed including project scope definition, organization of designers, constructors and various consultants, sequencing of design and construction operations, execution of design and construction, and closeout and start-up. Thus, the different project delivery methods are distinguished by the manner in which contracts between the agency, designers and builders are formed and the technical relationships that evolve between each party inside those contracts. Currently, there are several types of project delivery systems available for publicly funded transportation projects. The most common systems are Design-Bid-Build (DBB), Design-Build (DB), and Construction Manager/General Contractor (CMGC). No single project delivery method is appropriate for every project. Each project must be examined individually to determine how it aligns with the attributes of each available delivery method.

Primary delivery methods

Design-Bid-Build is the traditional project delivery method in which an agency designs, or retains a designer to furnish complete design services, and then advertises and awards a separate construction contract based on the designer's completed construction documents. In DBB, the agency "owns" the details of design during construction and as a result, is responsible for the cost of any errors or omissions encountered in construction.

Design-Build is a project delivery method in which the agency procures both design and construction services in the same contract from a single, legal entity referred to as the design-builder. The method typically uses Request for Qualifications (RFQ)/Request for Proposals (RFP) procedures rather than the DBB Invitation for Bids procedures. The design-builder controls the details of design and is responsible for the cost of any errors or omissions encountered in construction.

Construction Manager / General Contractor is a project delivery method in which the agency contracts separately with a designer and a construction manager. The agency can perform design or contract with an engineering firm to provide a facility design. The agency selects a construction manager to perform construction management services and construction works. The significant characteristic of this delivery method is a contract between an agency and a construction manager who will be at risk for the final cost and time of construction. Construction industry/Contractor input into the design development and constructability of complex and innovative projects are the major reasons an agency would select the

CMGC method. Unlike DBB, CMGC brings the builder into the design process at a stage where definitive input can have a positive impact on the project. CMGC is particularly valuable for new non-standard types of designs where it is difficult for the agency to develop the technical requirements that would be necessary for DB procurement without industry input.

Facilitation of the tool

When embarking on using the project delivery selection tool for the first time, it is recommended that a facilitator is brought in for the workshop. The facilitator will assist with working through the tool and provide guidance for discussing the project and selection of a delivery method. This individual should be knowledgeable about the process and should be consistently used. The facilitator also helps to answer questions and make sure the process stays on track and the team moves towards a formal selection.

Participation

Using the project delivery selection matrix is only as good as the people who are involved in the selection workshop. Therefore, it is necessary to have a collection of individuals to participate in the selection of the delivery method. The selection team needs to include the project manager, the project engineer, a representative of the procurement/contracting office, and any other CDOT staff that is crucial to the project. In addition, the selection team might want to consider including representatives from specialty units and from the local jurisdictions where the project is located. However, it is important to keep the selection team to a minimum amount of participants. Otherwise, the selection process can take a long time to complete. Normally, 3-7 people represent a selection team, but this number should be based on the specific project being analyzed.

Potential bias

The best approach for the participants of the workshop is to keep an open mind about the delivery method to choose. However, there might be participants that have a preconceived notion about the delivery method to use on a project. When this occurs, it is best to discuss that person's ideas with the entire selection team at the beginning of the workshop. Putting that person's ideas on the table helps others to understand the choice that person has in mind. Then, it is important to acknowledge this person's ideas, but to remind that person to keep an open mind as the team works through the selection process.

Pre-workshop Tasks

Before conducting the selection workshop, a few tasks can be completed by the workshop participants. Preparing for the workshop prior to conducting it will result in a much more concise and informative session. It is advised that participants review all known project information, goals, risks, and constraints prior to the workshop. The best approach is to complete the *Project Delivery Description*, the *Project Delivery Goals*, and the *Project Delivery Constraints* worksheets before conducting the workshop. Completing the three worksheets will shorten the time needed to review the project and allows the workshop team to move right into the selection process.

Project Delivery Selection Process

The process is shown in the outline below and a flowchart on the next page. It consists of individual steps to complete the entire process. The steps should be followed in sequential order.

STAGE I - Project Attributes, Goals, and Constraints

- A. Delivery methods to consider
 - 1. Design-Bid-Build
 - 2. Design-Build
 - 3. Construction Manager / General Contractor
- B. Project Description/Goals/Constraints
 - 1. Project attributes
 - 2. Set project goals
 - 3. Identify project dependent constraints
 - 4. Discuss project risks


STAGE II – Primary Factor Evaluation

- A. Assess the primary factors (these factors most often determine the selection)
 - 1. Complexity and Innovation
 - 2. Delivery Schedule
 - 3. Project Cost Considerations
 - 4. Level of Design
- B. If the primary factors indicate there is a clear choice of a delivery method, then:
 - i. Perform a risk assessment for the desired delivery method to ensure that risks can be properly allocated and managed, and then move on to Stage III Part A
- C. If the primary factors do not indicate a clear choice of a delivery method, then:
 - i. Perform a risk assessment for all delivery methods to determine which method can properly allocate and manage risks, and then move on to Stage III Part B

STAGE III – Secondary Factor Evaluation

- A. Perform a pass/fail analysis of the secondary factors to ensure that they are not relevant to the decision.
 - 6. Staff Experience/Availability (Agency)
 - 7. Level of Oversight and Control
 - 8. Competition and Contractor Experience
- B. If pass/fail analysis does not result in clear determination of the method of delivery, then perform a more rigorous evaluation of the secondary factors against all potential methods of delivery

NOTE: Typically, the entire selection process can be completed by the project team in a 3-hour workshop session, as long as each team member has individually reviewed and performed the assessment prior to the workshop.



Flowchart of the Project Delivery Selection Process

Project Delivery Selection Matrix Worksheets and Forms

The following forms and appendices are included to facilitate this process.

Project delivery description worksheet

Provide information on the project. This includes size, type, funding, risks, complexities, etc. All information should be developed for the specific project.

Project delivery goals worksheet – including example project goals

A careful determination of the project goals is an instrumental first step of the process that will guide both the selection of the appropriate method of delivery for the project.

Project delivery constraints worksheet - including example project constraints

Carefully review all possible constraints to the project. These constraints can potentially eliminate a project delivery method before the evaluation process begins.

Project risks worksheet

In addition to project goals and constraints, a detailed discussion of project risks is a critical step that helps with evaluation of the selection factors.

Project delivery selection summary form

The Project Delivery Selection Summary summarizes the assessment of the eight selection factors for the three delivery methods. The form is qualitatively scored using the rating provided in the table below. The form also includes a section for comments and conclusions. The completed Project Delivery Selection Summary should provide an executive summary of the key reasons for the selection of the method of delivery.

Rating Key	
++	Most appropriate delivery method
+	Appropriate delivery method
-	Least appropriate delivery method
X	Fatal Flaw (discontinue evaluation of this method)
NA	Factor not applicable or not relevant to the selection

Workshop blank form

This form can be used by the project team for additional documentation of the process. In particular, it can be used to elaborate the evaluation of the *Assessment of Risk* factor.

Project delivery methods selection factor opportunities / obstacles form

These forms are used to summarize the assessments by the project team of the opportunities and obstacles associated with each delivery method relative to each of the eight Selection Factors. The bottom of each form allows for a qualitative

conclusion using the same notation as described above. Those conclusions then are transferred to the *Project Delivery Selection Summary Form*.

Project delivery methods opportunities / obstacles checklists

These forms provide the project team with direction concerning typical delivery method opportunities and obstacles associated with each of the eight Selection Factors. However, these checklists include general information and are not an all-inclusive checklist. Use the checklists as a supplement to developing project specific opportunities and obstacles.

Risk assessment guidance form

Because of the unique nature of Selection Factor 5, *Assessment of Risk*, this guidance section provides the project team with additional assistance for evaluation of the risk factor including: Typical Transportation Project Risks; a General Project Risks Checklist; and a Risk Opportunities/Obstacles Checklist.

Project Delivery Description

The following items should be considered in describing the specific project. Other items can be added to the bottom of the form if they influence the project delivery decision. Relevant documents can be added as appendices to the final summary report.

Project Attributes
Project Name: North Interstate 25 Project - Segments 5 & 6: Mead to Johnstown (CO 66 to CO 402)
Location: Priority – Segment 6: North I-25, Berthoud to Johnstown (MP 249 to MP 255). From S/O CO 56 to CO 402. Weld and Larimer Counties, CO. Secondary – Segment 5: North I-25, Mead to Berthoud (MP 243 to 249). From CO 66 to S/O CO 56.
Estimated Budget: Segment 6: Estimated \$295M, Total funding for Segments 5 & 6 should be no less than \$200M and could be as much as \$650M in 2018 dollars.
Estimated Project Delivery Period: Segment 6: Approximately 5 years, design estimated in 2018 and 2019, construction expected from 2019 to 2023. Segment 5: Funding unknown, delivery to occur when substantial funding is secured
Required Delivery Date (if applicable): INFRA grant milestones (if application is successful)
Source(s) of Project Funding: State Funds: Potential SB267, RPP Federal Funds: INFRA Grant (if application is successful) Local Funds: Weld County, Greeley, other local communities
Project Corridor: North I-25 between Mead and Johnstown (Segments 5 & 6)
Major Features of Work – pavement, bridge, sound barriers, etc.: Pavement reconstruction, bridge reconstruction, interchange reconstruction, retaining walls, culvert replacement, guardrail, installation of ITS and tolling elements, lighting, traffic signs and permanent pavement markings, park and ride with express bus connectivity.
Major Schedule Milestones: RODs were completed in 2011 and 2017, ROW acquisition in 2018 and 2019, construction commencing in 2019
Major Project Stakeholders: CDOT, HPTE, CDOT Division of Transit and Rail, FHWA, Weld County, Larimer County, Town of Mead, Town of Berthoud, Town of Johnstown, Town of Loveland, NFRMPO, DRCOG, GWRR, Ditch Companies.
Major General Obstacles: Securing funding, accelerated project schedule, environmental clearance, ROW acquisition, utility relocations, traveling public, GWR railroad.
Major Obstacles with Right of Way, Utilities, and/or Environmental Approvals: Great Western Railway approval, potentially up to 60 ROW parcels to acquire, numerous utility relocations, Little Thompson River floodplain CLOMR, ROD reevaluations.
Major Obstacles during Construction Phase: Traffic control and method of handling traffic, especially while maintaining four lanes of traffic during construction, accommodating closures during interchange reconstruction, and the planning for lack of alternate routes. Additionally, utility impacts, ROW not cleared, and coordination with Segments 7 and 8 construction will be challenges.
Safety Issues: Existing high number of vehicle crashes along this corridor and heavy congestion
Sustainable Design and Construction Requirements: Provide for better safety and operations on corridor, thereby reducing pollution and energy usage. Sustainable considerations will be applied to water quality, planning for the FEIS ultimate 3+1 configuration to reduce future throwaway infrastructure.

Project Delivery Goals

An understanding of project goals is essential to selecting an appropriate project delivery method. Therefore, project goals should be set prior to using the project delivery selection matrix. Typically, the project goals can be defined in three to five items and need to be reviewed here. Example goals are provided below, but the report should include project-specific goals. These goals should remain consistent over the life of the project.

Project-Specific Goals
Goal #1: Provide a safe facility for the public as well as a safe work zone for construction and the travelling public.
Goal #2: Provide full geometric standard with a rural median.
Goal #3: Maximize scope of work with the available fiscal resources.
Goal #4: Ensure the longevity of the project, specifically compatibility with the ultimate configuration and emerging technologies.
Goal #5: Improve mobility and traffic operations and increase multimodal connections.

General Project Goals (For reference)

Schedule

- Minimize project delivery time
- Complete the project on schedule
- Accelerate start of project revenue

Cost

- Minimize project cost
- Maximize project budget
- Complete the project on budget
- Maximize the project scope and improvements within the project budget

Quality

- Meet or exceed project requirements
- Select the best team
- Provide a high-quality design and construction constraints
- Provide an aesthetically pleasing project

Functional

- Maximize the life cycle performance of the project
- Maximize capacity and mobility improvements
- Minimize inconvenience to the traveling public during construction
- Maximize safety of workers and traveling public during construction

Project Delivery Constraints

There are potential aspects of a project that can eliminate the need to evaluate one or more of the possible delivery methods. A list of general constraints can be found below the table and should be referred to after completing this worksheet. The first section below is for general constraints and the second section is for constraints specifically tied to project delivery selection.

General Constraints
Source of Funding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sources of funding have been identified but not secured
Schedule constraints: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction must begin by March 2022 (Assuming successful INFRA grant) - Desire to begin toll revenue collections as soon as feasible - Minimize travelling public impacts (time value of money)
Federal, state, and local laws: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comply with North I-25 EIS and all NEPA environmental requirements - MS4 Requirements - SB40 - Air Quality Conformity - FEMA & Local Floodplain Permitting
Third party agreements with railroads, ROW, etc.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Great Western Railway - ROW/Easement agreements - Utility Relocation Agreements - Ditch Company Agreements - Local Agency Coordination - IGA's for Funding Participants - Tolling Authority Agreement
Project Delivery Specific Constraints
Project delivery constraint #1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - \$295 Million Budget is anticipated but uncertain – project will need to be scalable to fit the funding that comes available
Project delivery constraint #2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ROW acquisition – Many parcels will be impacted, increasing likelihood of some condemnation; dynamic market valuations in the region
Project delivery constraint #3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coordination with Segments 7 and 8 project construction, including regional resource availability to deliver these two projects concurrently, both in design and construction
Project delivery constraint #4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Utility relocations – Many utilities including ones with easements; oil and gas wells
Project delivery constraint #5: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Accelerated schedule; desire to be obligated/under construction as soon as feasible

General Project Constraints

Schedule

- Utilize federal funding by a certain date
- Complete the project on schedule
- Weather and/or environmental impact

Cost

- Project must not exceed a specific amount
- Minimal changes will be accepted
- Some funding may be utilized for specific type of work (bridges, drainage, etc.)

Quality

- Must adhere to CDOT standards
- Ensure high quality design and construction constraints
- Adhere to local and federal codes

Functional

- Traveling public must minimally be disrupted during construction
- Mitigate hazardous conditions where safety is a concern
- Return area surrounding project to existing conditions

Project Risks

Identified Project Risks
Project Risk: Deviations from EIS or other past commitments if cost saving measures or alternative design are utilized
Project Risk: Obtain design exception from FHWA
Project Risk: Fluidity and change of course based on resources, funding, timing, and scope of the project.
Project Risk: Meeting aggressive design schedule
Project Risk: Material availability – R40, concrete, etc.
Project Risk: Obtaining railroad agreements in a timely manner
Project Risk: Right-of-Way acquisition in a timely manner
Project Risk: Lead time for utility relocations; oil/gas well impacts; potential for conflict with Department of Defense fiber optic cable
Project Risk: CLOMR/LOMR for Little Thompson River floodplain
Project Risk: Potential for ROD reevaluations/revisions that could affect schedule; obtaining FHWA approvals
Project Risk: Wetland impacts
Project Risk: Construction limitations due to Preble's mouse, nesting birds, ditches, etc.
Project Risk: Potential for lack of personnel resources
Project Risk: Potential need for design exceptions due to funding limitations
Project Risk: Public and stakeholder acceptability of design and impacts
Project Risk: Irrigation ditch coordination in a timely manner

General Risk Categories to Consider

1. Site Conditions and Investigations
2. Utilities
3. Railroads
4. Drainage/Water Quality
5. Environmental
6. Third-party Involvement
7. Organizational
8. Design
9. Construction
10. Right-of-Way

Project Delivery Selection Summary

Determine the factors that should be considered in the project delivery selection, discuss the opportunities and obstacles related to each factor, and document the discussion on the following pages. Then complete the summary below.

PROJECT DELIVERY METHOD OPPORTUNITY/OBSTACLE SUMMARY			
	DBB	DB	CMGC
Primary Selection Factors			
1. Project Complexity & Innovation	++	-	+ / ++
2. Project Delivery Schedule	+	-	+ / ++
3. Level of Design	+	+	+
4. Project Cost Considerations	+	- / +	+
5. Risk Assessment	+	- / +	++
Secondary Selection Factors			
6. Staff Experience/Availability (Agency)	PASS	PASS	PASS
7. Level of Oversight and Control	PASS	PASS	PASS
8. Competition and Contractor Experience	PASS	PASS	PASS

Rating Key	
++	Most appropriate delivery method
+	Appropriate delivery method
-	Least appropriate delivery method
X	Fatal Flaw (discontinue evaluation of this method)
NA	Factor not applicable or not relevant to the selection

Project Delivery Selection Summary Conclusions and Comments

Discussion focused on relevant experiences and opinions from attendees with various expertise in all delivery methods. The team was unable to reach a concrete decision on a single delivery method due to the following outstanding factors which largely impact the final delivery method selection:

- **Scope** – Can the frontage roads be eliminated from the design? This will have implications on innovation, ROW, timing (negotiations and IGAs), and political environment (IGAs may help secure and/or keep SB 267 funding).
- **Budget** - The discussion assumed a \$200M base project with \$87.5M in INFRA Grant funding (award announcement expected in April/May 2018). If INFRA is not secured, the Transportation Commission could possibly approve ~\$40M to add to the base budget. The timing of this ~\$40M in funds needs to be understood as this will impact work packaging options.
- **Timing** - What is the timeline and driver of project delivery in either design and/or construction? Does CDOT need to have a contractor on board by a certain time? Project timing clarification will help drive delivery method.

DBB and CM/GC methods were the clear front runners, never scoring less than appropriate in any Primary Factor category. Though DB did not have any fatal flaws, it scored very low in all Primary Factor categories, and has thus been ruled out as a viable delivery method for this project.

It was clear after discussion that a second PDSM meeting was needed when more project information was known, specifically if CDOT is successful with grant and/or other funding pursuits to make a more informed decision between the DBB and CM/GC delivery methods.

Project Delivery Selection Matrix Primary Factors

1) Project Complexity and Innovation

Project complexity and innovation is the potential applicability of new designs or processes to resolve complex technical issues.

DESIGN-BID-BUILD - Allows Agency to fully resolve complex design issues and qualitatively evaluate designs before procurement of the general contractor. Innovation is provided by Agency/Consultant expertise and through traditional agency directed processes such as VE studies and contractor bid alternatives.		
Opportunities	Obstacles	Rating
CDOT maintains control of the design and direction of the project (important related to the frontage road decision)	Higher potential for a dispute with no contractor involvement (design error, etc.)	++
Could use constructability reviews focused on risks (traffic control, phasing, material)	Contractor will not have input on phasing and hauling of material	
Owner driven risks and opportunities will be resolved quicker	Traditional right-of-way process (timing of all acquisitions may be an issue w/o knowing construction priority areas)	
Highly optimized pavement section/design	Lack of contractor innovation could create scope creep and increased time in construction	
Can create scalable projects, based on funding (application of practical based design)	Lack of contractor innovation during construction could lead to increased costs	
Can tap into innovative approaches from Segments 7 & 8		
CMGC - Allows independent selection of designer and contractor based on qualifications and other factors to jointly address complex innovative designs through three party collaboration of Agency, designer and Contractor. Allows for a qualitative (non-price oriented) design but requires agreement on CAP.		
Opportunities	Obstacles	Rating
Contractor input on phasing and hauling of material	Only get one team's input on innovation (ICE, design and contractor)	+ / ++
CDOT maintains control of the design and direction of the project (frontage road coordination)	Could limit innovation depending on the selection of a contractor (pavement)	
Can create scalable projects, based on funding (application of practical based design)	Can create scope creep and increased time on design with lengthy input from multiple directions	
Constructability review from contractor and ICE		
Real time cost estimating and controls		
Early contractor involvement in bridge design and procurement		
Contractor knowledge in procurement of materials, phasing, etc.		
Innovation in pavement design because the owner still maintains control		
DESIGN-BUILD - Incorporates design-builder input into design process through best value selection and contractor proposed Alternate Technical Concepts (ATCs) – which are a cost-oriented approach to providing complex and innovative designs. Requires that desired solutions to complex projects be well defined through contract requirements.		
Opportunities	Obstacles	Rating
Ability to procure a contractor early on (phasing knowledge, working around ROW)	Loss of control of design components	-
Contractor knowledge in procurement of materials, phasing, etc.	Innovation during construction could lead to increased costs	
Competitive design on interchange types	Definition of the scope may lower room for innovation	
Structure innovation (competitive input, phasing and design)		
Contractor owns the design and has the opportunity to be more fluid (utilities, ROW phasing)		

2) Delivery Schedule

Delivery schedule is the overall project schedule from scoping through design, construction and opening to the public. Assess time considerations for starting the project or receiving dedicated funding and assess project completion importance.

DESIGN-BID-BUILD – Requires time to perform sequential design and procurement, but if design time is available has the shortest procurement time after the design is complete.		
Opportunities	Obstacles	Rating
Opportunity to purchase ROW and refine design	Majority of the ROW needs to be purchased before advertising construction	+
Time for IGA coordination and execution, specifically related to the frontage roads	Won't be able to obligate funds until project is ready for construction	
Flexible funding and start dates can be accommodated	Will take time to repackage design and re-bid if it's over the engineer's estimate	
Will be able to deliver design based on known funding		
CMGC - Quickly gets contractor under contract and under construction to meet funding obligations before completing design. Parallel process of development of contract requirements, design, procurements, and construction can accelerate project schedule. However, schedule can be slowed down by coordinating design-related issues between the CM and designer and by the process of reaching a reasonable CAP.		
Opportunities	Obstacles	Rating
Ability to obligate funds earlier in the process to build project in pieces as funding and design is available	Minimal chance for a schedule delay if a construction agreed upon price is not reached	+ / ++
Time for IGA coordination and execution, specifically related to the frontage roads	Possible schedule delay if scope and funding is not figured out, will have a bigger overhead with large team while figuring out correct scope.	
Able to go to construction without 100% design or ROW acquisition, can strategize construction areas with available funding	If timing of funding is incremental, then innovation and efficiency could be reduced	
Flexible funding and start dates can be accommodated		
DESIGN-BUILD - Ability to get project under construction before completing design. Parallel process of design and construction can accelerate project delivery schedule; however, procurement time can be lengthy due to the time necessary to develop an adequate RFP, evaluate proposals and provide for a fair, transparent selection process.		
Opportunities	Obstacles	Rating
Time for IGA coordination and execution, specifically related to the frontage roads	Possible schedule delays if BAFO is needed	-
Can start construction without 100% design or ROW	Lack of CDOT resources & experience during RFP development, as well as the time to write it	
Opportunities to use portions of Segments 7 & 8 procurement documents	Possible schedule delays if scope does not fit financial resources	
Will have a complete schedule of construction at onset of project	Lack of flexibility with adding funding and changing milestone dates	
	If timing of funding is incremental, then innovation is reduced	

3) Level of Design

Level of design is the percentage of design completion at the time of the project delivery procurement.

DESIGN-BID-BUILD - 100% design by Agency or contracted design team, with Agency having complete control over the design.		
Opportunities	Obstacles	Rating

NEPA is completed	Will have more unknown risks without contractor involvement	
Full design would better dictate needed right of way	Less integration between design and construction	+
	No consideration of means and methods during design, missed opportunities for efficiency and innovation	
CMGC - Can utilize a lower level of design prior to procurement of the CMGC and then joint collaboration of Agency, designer, and CMGC in the further development of the design. Iterative nature of design process risks extending the project schedule.		
Opportunities	Obstacles	Rating
Design is early enough to get good contractor engagement	Contractor design input could be slanted towards personal preference based on resources and experience	+
High opportunity for contractor input related to structure selection and construction		
Can breakout work into appropriate packages to push design to the construction world quicker		
DESIGN-BUILD - Design advanced by Agency to the level necessary to precisely define contract requirements and properly allocate risk (typically 30% or less).		
Opportunities	Obstacles	Rating
Conceptual design is early enough to produce a performance-based RFP	With so little design, CDOT will need to provide detailed explanation of constraints and needs. Will most likely miss something in specifications.	+
Conceptual design enough to start utility and geotechnical work		
Design risk will be owned by the contractor		

4) Project Cost Considerations

Project cost is the financial process related to meeting budget restrictions, early and precise cost estimation, and control of project costs.

DESIGN-BID-BUILD - Competitive bidding provides a low-cost construction for a fully defined scope of work. Costs accuracy limited until design is completed. More likelihood of cost change orders due to contractor having no design responsibility.		
Opportunities	Obstacles	Rating
Could deliver alternate bid schedules to control the overall cost and make the project scalable	With a project of this size, it may be difficult to get bids from contractors based on bonding requirements	+
Competitive bid environment	Engineer's estimate could be grossly different based on market conditions or small unit cost discrepancy could cause order of magnitude difference	
	Contractor will be design plans and specs, high likelihood for numerous, costly change orders.	
	Flexibility is lost, can't maximize scope to budget	
	Unknown conditions and plan errors may create claims and delays	
	Potential for a contractor to put in an unreasonably low price and attempt to take advantage of change orders	

CMGC - Agency/designer/contractor collaboration to reduce risk pricing can provide a low-cost project however non-competitive negotiated CAP introduces price risk. Good flexibility to design to a budget.		
Opportunities	Obstacles	Rating
Scalable/ multiple packages coordinated with the contractor	Low likelihood, but it is possible to not come to an agreed upon price	+
Unit price certainty	Only competitive bid environment involves the ICE	
Can reduce with unknown conditions and errors, thereby reducing delays and claims	Paying more for design to break out into multiple packaging	
Will create risk register to flush out cost uncertainty related to risk items and mitigation		
Big advantage to have discussions about pricing in real time with industry experts during pre-construction		
ICE involvement throughout the design process		
Can reinvest money not spent in risk back into scope		
DESIGN-BUILD - Designer-builder collaboration and ATCs can provide a cost-efficient response to project goals. Costs are determined with design-build proposal, early in design process. Allows a variable scope bid to match a fixed budget. Poor risk allocation can result in high contingencies.		
Opportunities	Obstacles	Rating
Competitive market price for both design and construction	May not understand cost overruns until bidding time	-/+
Maximizing scope to a specified financial constraint	Concessions could be made on priority items during BAFO	
Existing contractor teams from other projects that might be able to be more efficient in this process	Cost of additional staff time for procurement	
	Resource availability may be an issue given the current construction projects in the region	

5) Risk Assessment of Delivery Methods

Risk is an uncertain event or condition that, if it occurs, has an effect on a project's objectives. Risk allocation is the assignment of unknown events or conditions to the party that can best manage them. An initial assessment of project risks is important to ensure the selection of the delivery method that can properly address them. An approach that focuses on a fair allocation of risk will be most successful.

DESIGN-BID-BUILD - Risk allocation for design-bid-build best is understood by the industry but requires that most design-related risks and third party risks be resolved prior to procurement to avoid costly contractor contingency pricing, change orders, and potential claims.		
Opportunities	Obstacles	Rating
Opportunity to avoid or mitigate risk through complete design.	Low bid process limits the selection of a quality contractor.	+
Risks related to environmental, railroads, ROW, utilities, etc. are best resolved before procurement.	Owner retains the majority of the risk in "gray areas" not specified in plans or specifications	
	Limited industry input into risks and allocation.	
	Change order risks can be greater and unforeseen.	
	Contractor bids reflect their interpretation of allocation of the risks	

CMGC - Provides opportunity for Agency, designer, and contractor to collectively identify and minimize project risks, and allocate risk to appropriate party. Has potential to minimize contractor contingency pricing of risk, but can lose the element of competition in pricing.		
Opportunities	Obstacles	Rating
Contractor has a better understanding of the risks going into construction.	If Construction Agreement Price cannot be reached, then the typical low-bid risks appear.	++
Innovative opportunities to allocate risk to appropriate parties.	Strong agency management is required to negotiate and optimize risks.	
Opportunities to manage cost risks during CMGC process.	Packaging / phasing could result in an "entrenched/committed" contractor that will have less incentive to negotiate.	
Contractor can help both identify and mitigate risks.	CDOT staff less familiar with CMGC process	
Contractor quality plays a part in the selection of the contractor.		
Opportunity to avoid or mitigate risk through complete design.		
Do not need a detailed project scope to allow project process to proceed.		
DESIGN-BUILD - Provides opportunity to properly allocate risks to the party best able to manage them, but requires risks allocated to design-builder to be well defined to minimize contractor contingency pricing of risks.		
Opportunities	Obstacles	Rating
Transfer of risk from owner to contractor.	Limited time to resolve risks.	-/+
Opportunity for industry review of risk allocation.	Need a detailed project scope for the RFP to get an accurate / comprehensive response from bidders.	
Innovative opportunities to allocate risks to different parties (ex. Schedule, means and methods, phasing).	Poorly defined risks can lead to large change orders and cost.	
Contractor quality plays a part in the selection of the contractor	Contractor may avoid risks or drive the design to decrease cost at the expense of quality/safety.	
	CDOT staff less familiar with DB process	

Project Delivery Selection Matrix Secondary Factors (Pass/Fail)

6) Staff Experience and Availability

Agency staff experience and availability as it relates to the project delivery methods in question.

DESIGN-BID-BUILD - Technical and management resources necessary to perform the design and plan development. Resource needs can be more spread out.		
Opportunities	Obstacles	Rating
		PASS
CMGC - Strong, committed Agency project management resources are important for success of the CMGC process. Resource needs are similar to DBB except Agency must coordinate CM's input with the project designer and be prepared for CAP negotiations.		
Opportunities	Obstacles	Rating
		PASS
DESIGN-BUILD - Technical and management resources and expertise necessary to develop the RFQ and RFP and administrate the procurement. Concurrent need for both design and construction resources to oversee the implementation.		
Opportunities	Obstacles	Rating
		PASS

7) Level of Oversight and Control

Level of oversight involves the amount of agency staff required to monitor the design or construction, and amount of agency control over the delivery process

DESIGN-BID-BUILD - Full control over a linear design and construction process.		
Opportunities	Obstacles	Rating
		PASS
CMGC - Most control by Agency over both the design, and construction, and control over a collaborative agency/designer/contractor project team		
Opportunities	Obstacles	Rating
		PASS
DESIGN-BUILD - Less control over the design (design desires must be written into the RFP contract requirements). Generally, less control over the construction process (design-builder often has QA responsibilities).		
Opportunities	Obstacles	Rating
		PASS

8) Competition and Contractor Experience

Competition and availability refers to the level of competition, experience and availability in the market place and its capacity for the project.

DESIGN-BID-BUILD - High level of competition, but GC selection is based solely on low price. High level of marketplace experience.		
Opportunities	Obstacles	Rating
		PASS
CMGC - Allows for the selection of the single most qualified contractor, but CAP can limit price competition. Low level of marketplace experience.		

Opportunities	Obstacles	Rating
		PASS
DESIGN-BUILD - Allows for a balance of price and non-price factors in the selection process. Medium level of marketplace experience.		
Opportunities	Obstacles	Rating
		PASS

Project Delivery Selection Factors Opportunities and Obstacles Checklists

(With project risk assessment and checklists)

1) Project Complexity and Innovation Project Delivery Selection Checklist

DESIGN-BID-BUILD

Complexity and Innovation Considerations

- Agencies control of design of complex projects
- Agency and consultant expertise can select innovation independently of contractor abilities
- Opportunities for value engineering studies during design, more time for design solutions
- Aids in consistency and maintainability
- Full control in selection of design expertise
- Complex design can be resolved and competitively bid
- Innovations can add cost or time and restrain contractor's benefits
- No contractor input to optimize costs
- Limited flexibility for integrated design and construction solutions (limited to constructability)
- Difficult to assess construction time and cost due to innovation

CMGC

Complexity and Innovation Considerations

- Highly innovative process through 3 party collaboration
- Allows for agency control of a designer/contractor process for developing innovative solutions
- Allows for an independent selection of the best qualified designer and best qualified contractor
- VE inherent in process and enhanced constructability
- Risk of innovation can be better defined and minimized and allocated
- Can take to market for bidding as contingency
- Can develop means and methods to the strengths of a single contractor partner throughout preconstruction
- Process depends on designer/CM relationship
- No contractual relationship between designer/CM
- Innovations can add or reduce cost or time
- Management of scope additions
-

DESIGN-BUILD

Complexity and Innovation Considerations

- Designer and contractor collaborate to optimize means and methods and enhance innovation
- Opportunity for innovation through competitiveness of ATC process
- Can use best-value procurement to select design-builder with best qualifications
- Constructability and VE inherent in process
- Early team integration
- Requires desired solutions to complex designs to be well defined through technical requirements
- Qualitative designs can be difficult to define if not done early in design (example. aesthetics)
- time or cost constraints on designer
- Quality assurance for innovative processes can be difficult to define in RFP
- Ability to obtain intellectual property using stipends

2) Delivery Schedule Project Delivery Selection Checklist

DESIGN-BID-BUILD

Schedule Considerations

- Schedule is more predictable and more manageable
- Milestones can be easier to define
- Projects can more easily be “shelved”
- Shortest procurement period
- Elements of design can be advanced prior to permitting, construction, etc.
- Time to communicate/discuss design with stakeholders
- Time to perform a linear Design-Bid-Build delivery process
- Design and construction schedules can be unrealistic due to lack of industry input
- Errors in design lead to change orders and schedule delays
- Low bid selection may lead to potential delays and other adverse outcomes.

CMGC

Schedule Considerations

- Ability to start construction before entire design, ROW, etc. is complete (i.e., phased design)
- More efficient procurement of long-lead items
- Early identification and resolution of design and construction issues (e.g., utility, ROW, and earthwork)
- Can provide a shorter procurement schedule than DB
- Team involvement for schedule optimization
- Continuous constructability review and VE
- Maintenance of Traffic improves with contractor inputs
- Contractor input for phasing, constructability and traffic control may reduce overall schedule
- Potential for not reaching CAP and substantially delaying schedule
- CAP negotiation can delay the schedule
- Designer-contractor-agency disagreements can add delays
- Strong agency management is required to control schedule

DESIGN-BUILD

Schedule Considerations

- Potential to accelerate schedule through parallel design-build process
- Shifting of schedule risk
- Industry input into design and schedule
- Fewer chances for disputes between agency and the Design-Build team
- More efficient procurement of long-lead items
- Ability to start construction before entire design, ROW, etc. is complete (i.e., phased design)
- Allows innovation in resource loading and scheduling by DB team
- Request for proposal development and procurement can be intensive
- Undefined events or conditions found after procurement, but during design can impact schedule and cost
- Time required to define and develop RFP technical requirements and expectations
- Requires agency and stakeholder commitments to an expeditious review of design

3) Project Cost Considerations Project Delivery Selection Checklist

DESIGN-BID-BUILD

Project Cost Considerations

- Competitive bidding provides a low-cost construction to a fully defined scope of work
- Increased certainty about cost estimates
- Construction costs are contractually set before construction begins
- Cost accuracy is limited until design is completed
- Construction costs are not locked in until design is 100% complete
- Cost reductions due to contractor innovation and constructability is difficult to obtain
- More potential of cost change orders due to Agency design responsibility

CMGC

Project Cost Considerations

- Agency/designer/contractor collaboration to reduce project risk can result in lowest project costs
- Early contractor involvement can result in cost savings through VE and constructability
- Cost will be known earlier when compared to DBB
- Integrated design/construction process can provide a cost efficient strategies to project goals
- Can provide a cost efficient response to meet project goals
- Non-competitive negotiated CAP introduces price risk
- Difficulty in CAP negotiation introduces some risk that CAP will not be successfully executed requiring aborting the CMGC process
- Paying for contractor's involvement in the design phase could potentially increase total cost
- Use of Independent Cost Estimating (ICE) expertise to obtain competitive pricing during CAP negotiations

DESIGN-BUILD

Project Cost Considerations

- Contractor input into design should moderate cost
- Design-builder collaboration and ATCs can provide a cost-efficient response to project goals
- Costs are contractually set early in design process with design-build proposal
- Allows a variable scope bid to match a fixed budget
- Potential lower average cost growth
- Funding can be obligated in a very short timeframe
- Risks related to design-build, lump sum cost without 100% design complete, can compromise financial success of the project

4) Level of Design Project Delivery Selection Checklist

DESIGN-BID-BUILD

Level of Design Considerations

- 100% design by agency
- Agency has complete control over the design (can be beneficial when there is one specific solution for a project)
- Project/scope can be developed through design
- The scope of the project is well defined through complete plans and contract documents
- Well-known process to the industry
- Agency design errors can result in a higher number of change orders, claims, etc.
- Minimizes competitive innovation opportunities
- Can reduce the level of constructability since the contractor is not bought into the project until after the design is complete

CMGC

Level of Design Considerations

- Can utilize a lower level of design prior to selecting a contractor then collaboratively advance design with agency, designer, and contractor
- Contractor involvement in early design improves constructability
- Agency controls design
- Design can be used for DBB if the price is not successfully negotiated
- Design can be responsive to risk minimization
- Teaming and communicating concerning design can cause disputes
- Three party process can slow progression of design
- Advanced design can limit the advantages of CMGC or could require re-design

DESIGN-BUILD

Level of Design Considerations

- Design advanced by the agency to level necessary to precisely define the contract requirements and properly allocate risk
- Does not require much design to be completed before awarding project to the design-builder (between ~ 10% - 30% complete)
- Contractor involvement in early design, which improves constructability and innovation
- Plans do not have to be as detailed because the design-builder is bought into the project early in the process and will accept design responsibility
- Clearly define requirements in the RFP because it is the basis for the contract
- If design is too far advanced, it will limit the advantages of design-build
- Carefully develop the RFP so that scope is fully defined
- Over utilizing performance specifications to enhance innovation can risk quality through reduced technical requirements
- Less agency control over the design
- Can create project less standardized designs across agency as a whole

5a) Initial Risk Assessment Guidance

Three sets of risk assessment checklists are provided to assist in an initial risk assessment relative to the selection of the delivery method:

- Typical Transportation Project Risks
- General Project Risks Checklist
- Opportunities/Obstacles Checklist (relative to each delivery method)

It is important to recognize that the initial risk assessment is to only ensure the selected delivery method can properly address the project risks. A more detailed level of risk assessment should be performed concurrently with the development of the procurement documents to ensure that project risks are properly allocated, managed, and minimized through the procurement and implementation of the project.

The following is a list of project risks that are frequently encountered on transportation projects and a discussion on how the risks are resolved through the different delivery methods.

1) Site Conditions and Investigations

How unknown site conditions are resolved. For additional information on site conditions, refer to 23 CFR 635.109(a) at the following link: <http://ecfr.gpoaccess.gov/>

DESIGN-BID-BUILD

Site condition risks are generally best identified and mitigated during the design process prior to procurement to minimize the potential for change orders and claims when the schedule allows.

CMGC

CDOT, the designer, and the contractor can collectively assess site condition risks, identify the need to perform site investigations in order to reduce risks, and properly allocate risk prior to CAP.

DESIGN-BUILD

Certain site condition responsibilities can be allocated to the design-builder provided they are well defined and associated third party approval processes are well defined. Caution should be used as unreasonable allocation of site condition risk will result in high contingencies during bidding. The Agency should perform site investigations in advance of procurement to define conditions and avoid duplication of effort by proposers. At a minimum, the Agency should perform the following investigations:

- 1) Basic design surveys
- 2) Hazardous materials investigations to characterize the nature of soil and groundwater contamination
- 3) Geotechnical baseline report to allow design-builders to perform proposal design without extensive additional geotechnical investigations

2) Utilities

DESIGN-BID-BUILD

Utility risks are best allocated to the Agency, and mostly addressed prior to procurement to minimize potential for claims when the schedule allows.

CMGC

Can utilize a lower level of design prior to contracting and joint collaboration of Agency, designer, and contractor in the further development of the design.

DESIGN-BUILD

Utilities responsibilities need to be clearly defined in contract requirements, and appropriately allocated to both design-builder and the Agency:

Private utilities (major electrical, gas, communication transmission facilities): Need to define coordination and schedule risks, as they are difficult for design-builder to price. Best to have utilities agreements before procurement. Note – by state regulation, private utilities have schedule liability in design-build projects, but they need to be made aware of their responsibilities.

Public Utilities: Design and construction risks can be allocated to the design-builder, if properly incorporated into the contract requirements.

3) Railroads (if applicable)

DESIGN-BID-BUILD

Railroad risks are best resolved prior to procurement and relocation designs included in the project requirements when the schedule allows.

CMGC

Railroad impacts and processes can be resolved collaboratively by Agency, designer, and contractor. A lengthy resolution process can delay the CAP negotiations.

DESIGN-BUILD

Railroad coordination and schedule risks should be well understood to be properly allocated and are often best assumed by the Agency. Railroad design risks can be allocated to the designer if well defined. Best to obtain an agreement with railroad defining responsibilities prior to procurement

4) Drainage/Water Quality Best Management Practices (construction and permanent)

Both drainage and water quality often involve third party coordination that needs to be carefully assessed with regard to risk allocation. Water quality in particular is not currently well defined, complicating the development of technical requirements for projects.

Important questions to assess:

- 1) Do criteria exist for compatibility with third party offsite system (such as an OSP (Outfall System Plan))?
- 2) Is there an existing cross-drainage undersized by design Criteria?
- 3) Can water quality requirements be precisely defined? Is right-of-way adequate?

DESIGN-BID-BUILD

Drainage and water quality risks are best designed prior to procurement to minimize potential for claims when the schedule allows.

CMGC

The Agency, the designer, and the contractor can collectively assess drainage risks and coordination and approval requirements, and minimize and define requirements and allocate risks prior to CAP.

DESIGN-BUILD

Generally, the Agency is in the best position to manage the risks associated with third party approvals regarding compatibility with offsite systems, and should pursue agreements to define requirements for the design-builder.

5) Environmental

Meeting environmental document commitments and requirements, noise, 4(f) and historic, wetlands, endangered species, etc.

DESIGN-BID-BUILD

Risk is best mitigated through design prior to procurement when the schedule allows.

CMGC

Environmental risks and responsibilities can be collectively identified, minimized, and allocated by the Agency, the designer, and the contractor prior to CAP

DESIGN-BUILD

Certain environmental approvals and processes that can be fully defined can be allocated to the design-builder. Agreements or MOUs with approval agencies prior to procurement is best to minimize risks.

6) Third Party Involvement

Timeliness and impact of third party involvement (funding partners, adjacent municipalities, adjacent property owners, project stakeholders, FHWA, PUC)

DESIGN-BID-BUILD

Third party risk is best mitigated through design process prior to procurement to minimize potential for change orders and claims when the schedule allows.

CMGC

Third party approvals can be resolved collaboratively by the Agency, designer, and contractor.

DESIGN-BUILD

Third party approvals and processes that can be fully defined can be allocated to the design-builder. Agreements or MOUs with approval agencies prior to procurement is best to minimize risks.

5b) General Project Risk Checklist (Items to consider when assessing risk)

Environmental Risks	External Risks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delay in review of environmental documentation • Challenge in appropriate environmental documentation • Defined and non-defined hazardous waste • Environmental regulation changes • Environmental impact statement (EIS) required • NEPA/ 404 Merger Process required • Environmental analysis on new alignments required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders request late changes • Influential stakeholders request additional needs to serve their own commercial purposes • Local communities pose objections • Community relations • Conformance with regulations/guidelines/ design criteria • Intergovernmental agreements and jurisdiction
Third-Party Risks	Geotechnical and Hazmat Risks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unforeseen delays due to utility owner and third-party • Encounter unexpected utilities during construction • Cost sharing with utilities not as planned • Utility integration with project not as planned • Third-party delays during construction • Coordination with other projects • Coordination with other government agencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unexpected geotechnical issues • Surveys late and/or in error • Hazardous waste site analysis incomplete or in error • Inadequate geotechnical investigations • Adverse groundwater conditions • Other general geotechnical risks
Right-of-Way/ Real Estate Risks	Design Risks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Railroad involvement • Objections to ROW appraisal take more time and/or money • Excessive relocation or demolition • Acquisition ROW problems • Difficult or additional condemnation • Accelerating pace of development in project corridor • Additional ROW purchase due to alignment change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design is incomplete/ Design exceptions • Scope definition is poor or incomplete • Project purpose and need are poorly defined • Communication breakdown with project team • Pressure to delivery project on an accelerated schedule • Constructability of design issues • Project complexity - scope, schedule, objectives, cost, and deliverables - are not clearly understood
Organizational Risks	Construction Risks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inexperienced staff assigned • Losing critical staff at crucial point of the project • Functional units not available or overloaded • No control over staff priorities • Lack of coordination/ communication • Local agency issues • Internal red tape causes delay getting approvals, decisions • Too many projects/ new priority project inserted into program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pressure to delivery project on an accelerated schedule. • Inaccurate contract time estimates • Construction QC/QA issues • Unclear contract documents • Problem with construction sequencing/ staging/ phasing • Maintenance of Traffic/ Work Zone Traffic Control

5c) Assessment of Risk Project Delivery Selection Opportunities/Obstacles Checklist

DESIGN-BID-BUILD

Risk Considerations

- Risks managed separately through design, bid, build is expected to be easier
- Risk allocation is most widely understood/used
- Opportunity to avoid or mitigate risk through complete design
- Risks related to environmental, railroads, & third party involvement are best resolved before procurement
- Utilities and ROW best allocated to the agency and mostly addressed prior to procurement to minimize potential for claim
- Project can be shelved while resolving risks
- Agency accepts risks associated with project complexity (the inability of designer to be all-knowing about construction) and project unknowns
- Low-bid related risks
- Potential for misplaced risk through prescriptive specifications
- Innovative risk allocation is difficult to obtain
- Limited industry input in contract risk allocation
- Change order risks can be greater

CMGC

Risk Considerations

- Contractor can have a better understanding of the unknown conditions as design progresses
- Innovative opportunities to allocate risks to different parties (e.g., schedule, means and methods, phasing)
- Opportunities to manage costs risks through CMGC involvement
- Contractor will help identify and manage risk
- Agency still has considerable involvement with third parties to deal with risks
- Avoids low-bidding risk in procurement
- More flexibility and innovation available to deal with unknowns early in the design process
- Lack of motivation to manage small quantity costs
- Increase costs for non-proposal items
- Disagreement among Designer-Contractor-Agency can put the process at risk
- If CAP cannot be reached, additional low-bid risks appear
- Limited to risk capabilities of CMGC
-
- Strong agency management is required to negotiate/optimize risks
- Discovery of unknown conditions can drive up CAP, which can be compounded in phased construction

DESIGN-BUILD

Risk Considerations

- Performance specifications can allow for alternative risk allocations to the design builder
- Risk-reward structure can be better defined
- Innovative opportunities to allocate risks to different parties (e.g., schedule, means and methods, phasing)
- Opportunity for industry review of risk allocation (draft RFP, ATC processes)
- Avoid low-bidding risk in procurement
- Contractor will help identify risks related to environmental, railroads, ROW, and utilities
- Designers and contractors can work toward innovative solutions to, or avoidance of, unknowns
- Need a detailed project scope, description etc., for the RFP to get accurate/comprehensive responses to the RFP (Increased RFP costs may limit bidders)
- Limited time to resolve risks
- Additional risks allocated to designers for errors and omissions, claims for change orders
- Unknowns and associated risks need to be carefully allocated through a well-defined scope and contract
- Risks associated with agreements when design is not completed
- Poorly defined risks are expensive
- Contractor may avoid risks or drive consultant to decrease cost at risk to quality

6) Staff Experience and Availability Project Delivery Selection Checklist

DESIGN-BID-BUILD

Staff Experience and Availability Considerations

- Agency, contractors and consultants have high level of experience with the traditional system
- Designers can be more interchangeable between projects
- Can require a high level of agency staffing of technical resources
- Staff's responsibilities are spread out over a longer design period
- Can require staff to have full breadth of technical expertise

CMGC

Staff Experience and Availability Considerations

- Agency can improve efficiencies by having more project managers on staff rather than specialized experts
- Smaller number of technical staff required through use of consultant designer
- Strong committed agency project management is important to success
- Limitation of availability of staff with skills, knowledge and personality to manage CMGC projects
- Existing staff may need additional training to address their changing roles
- Agency must learn how to negotiate CAP projects

DESIGN-BUILD

Staff Experience and Availability Considerations

- Less agency staff required due to the sole source nature of DB
- Opportunity to grow agency staff by learning a new process
- Limitation of availability of staff with skills and knowledge to manage DB projects
- Existing staff may need additional training to address their changing roles
- Need to “mass” agency management and technical resources at critical points in process (i.e., RFP development, design reviews, etc.)

7) Level of Oversight and Control Project Delivery Selection Checklist

DESIGN-BID-BUILD

Level of Oversight and Control Considerations

- Full agency control over a linear design and construction process
- Oversight roles are well understood
- Contract documents are typically completed in a single package before construction begins
- Multiple checking points through three linear phases: design-bid-build
- Maximum control over design
- Requires a high-level of oversight
- Increased likelihood of claims due to agency design responsibility
- Limited control over an integrated design/construction process

CMGC

Level of Oversight and Control Considerations

- Preconstruction services are provided by the construction manager
- Obtaining input from the CMGC to enhance constructability and innovation
- Provides agency control over an integrated design/construction process
- Agency must have experienced staff to oversee the CMGC
- Higher level of cost oversight required

DESIGN-BUILD

Level of Oversight and Control Considerations

- A single entity responsibility during project design and construction
- Obtaining input from the Design-Builder to enhance constructability and innovation
- Overall project planning and scheduling is established by one entity
- Can require a high level of design oversight
- Can require a high level of quality assurance oversight
- Limitation on staff with DB oversight experience
- Less agency control over design
- Control over design relies on proper development of technical requirements

8) Competition and Contractor Experience Project Delivery Selection Checklist

DESIGN-BID-BUILD

Competition and Contractor Experience Considerations

- Promotes high level of competition in the marketplace
- Opens construction to all reasonably qualified bidders
- Transparency and fairness
- Reduced chance of corruption and collusion
- Contractors are familiar with the DBB process
- Risks associated with selecting the low bid (the best contractor is not necessary selected)
- No contractor input into the process
- Limited ability to select contractor based on qualifications

CMGC

Competition and Contractor Experience Considerations

- Allows for qualifications based contractor procurement
- Agency has control over an independent selection of best qualified designer and contractor
- Contractor is part of the project team early on, creating a project “team”
- Increased opportunity for innovation due to the diversity of the project team
- Currently there is not a large pool of contractors with experience in CMGC, which will reduce the competition and availability
- Working with only one contractor to develop the CAP can limit price competition
- Requires a strong project manager from the agency
- Teamwork and communication among the project team

DESIGN-BUILD

Competition and Contractor Experience Considerations

- Allows for a balance of qualifications and cost in design-builder procurement
- Two-phase process can promote strong teaming to obtain “Best Value”
- Increased opportunity for innovation possibilities due to the diverse project team
- Need for DB qualifications can limit competition
- Lack of competition with past experience with the project delivery method
- Reliant on DB team selected for the project
- The gap between agency experience and contractor experience with delivery method can create conflict