Project Delivery Selection Workshop Summary (Volume 24 Issue1)

Updated: January 2024

Workshop Summary	
Project Name:	US-24 RED CLIFF ARCH BRIDGE F-11-T REHAB
Workshop Date:	7/23/2025
Workshop Location:	Virtual
Facilitator:	Casey Valentinelli
Delivery Method Selected:	CMGC

Workshop Participants	
Name	**Email**
Karen Berdoulay	Karen.berdoulay@state.co.us
Peter Lombardi	Peter.lombardi@state.co.us
Sarah Navarro	Sarah.navarro@state.co.us
Casey Valentinelli	Casey.valentinelli@state.co.us
Saylor Perez	Jessica.perez@state.co.us
Patrick Holinda	Patrick.holinda@state.co.us
Amanda Mascerenas	Amanda.mascarenas@state.co.us
Jacob O'Brien	Jacob.o'brien@state.co.us
Natasha Butler	Natasha.butler@state.co.us
Konrad Vallard	Konrad.vallard@state.co.us
Jeffrey Mannlein	Jeffrey.mannlein@state.co.us
Jennifer Klaetsch	Jennifer.klaetsch@state.co.us
Nathan Jean	Nathan.jean@state.co.us

Project 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: US-24 RED CLIFF ARCH BRIDGE F-11-T REHAB
Location: US 24 MM 153-154, Red Cliff, Eagle County
Estimated Budget: Total $38.5M - $57M
Estimated Project Delivery Period: Design July 2025-June 2027, Construction 2028 (will consider early/multiple packages)
Required Delivery Date (if applicable):
Source(s) of Project Funding: Bridge & Tunnel Enterprise
Project Corridor: US 24 S of Minturn
Major Features of Work – pavement, bridge, sound barriers, etc.: Bridge Rehabilitation to remove bridge posting and extend service life by rehabilitating deteriorated steel
Major Schedule Milestones: Procurement – July 2025-January 2026, Scoping January 2026, Rehabilitation Analysis Complete July 2026, FIR December 2026, add DOR, FOR March 2027, AD Summer or Fall 2027.
Major Project Stakeholders: CDOT, Town of Minturn, Eagle County, Forest Service, emergency service providers, traveling public, recreation users, Town of Red Cliff, Town of Leadville, Copper Triangle children's hospital fundraiser.
Major General Obstacles: Historic structure, complex rehabilitation method on steel structure, maintaining traffic with limited detour options, limited construction season at 8,800 elevation, aggressive design schedule, bridge crosses over UPRR inactive line, over Red Cliff primary road and bridge access to town, over the Eagle River. (why complex? 80-yr old steel historic unique arch, 200-ft above the ground, potential unknowns not shown in the as-builts, difficult access, difficult to model and determine strength, not many bridge engineers experienced with these type of older arch structures, the repair work may impact other structural elements unexpectedly, very specialized work requiring extensive repair work, the work may need to done with no live load (may need to work nights), extent for traffic control, burden to adjacent communities)

Major Obstacles with Right of Way, Utilities, and/or Environmental Approvals: ROW: The project may be in an FS easement. If required coordination with the FS since we will do work in the FS easement. Utilities: This bridge crosses an inactive section of UPRR railroad, there are no utilities on the bridge, Environmental Approvals: Environmental challenges with work over the Eagle River and rehabilitation on a historically significant structure and stakeholder coordination with adjacent communities.
Major Obstacles during Construction Phase: Challenge with limited detour options – only 1 option on a narrow local road in very poor condition that requires travel over a local bridge with load restrictions. Construction phasing to minimize delays and restrictions. US 24 is an unpublished detour for I-70 over Vail Pass. Option 2 is SH 91 Fremont Pass and I-70 Vail Pass.
Safety Issues: Structure work over large drop-offs and slopes with exposure to wind and weather, work adjacent to live traffic on US 24 and over live traffic on Water Street. Working with ropes and specialized equipment to access the structure 200-ft above the ground. Rockfall danger and steep loose adjacent slopes.
Sustainable Design and Construction Requirements: Minimize visual impacts to historically significant structure. Working with and potentially removing lead-based paint in confined spaces 200-ft above ground.

Project 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: Complete improvements to extend the life of the structure and remove any overload restrictions and load posting.
Goal #2: Minimize visual impacts to the historically significant structure. Maintain historical integrity of the structure
Goal #3: Complete the project on budget and minimize project delivery time to minimize the duration of overload restrictions and load posting.
Goal #4: Minimize impacts and delays to vehicles and bicyclists through the project area during construction. Route is on a Scenic Byway
Goal #5: Include the implementation of safety components in the design so work can be completed as safely and efficiently as possible.
Goal #6: Through design and construction, maintain a focus on the long term preservation and management of the bridge including using the design model as a template for future projects.

General Project Goals (For consideration)

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 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: Bridge and Tunnel Enterprise (BTE)
Schedule constraints: Goal to safely complete the project as soon as feasible to minimize the duration of overload restrictions and load posting.
Federal, state, and local laws: State, County laws and regulations, NEPA, hazardous materials
Third party agreements with railroads, ROW, etc.: US Forest Service agreements, Union Pacific Railroad, Town of Red Cliff and Eagle County is Water Street and High Street are needed for a detour.
Project Financing
Does your project have any funding gaps that would require Financing*? No
Project Delivery Specific Constraints
Project delivery constraint #1: Complete project in an accelerated schedule to minimize duration of overload restrictions and load posting.
Project delivery constraint #2: Preserve the integrity of this historically significant structure.
Project delivery constraint #3: Minimize disruption during construction to traveling public and local business.
Project delivery constraint #4: Construction schedules are shorter in high mountain environment (8,800 elevation)
Project delivery constraint #5: Complete finite model/analysis and field re-inspection/CAD model will be time intensive and iterative. Goal to complete by Winter 2026 (move to Risks?)

Project Risks

Identified Project Risks
Project Risk: Environmental The aesthetics of the structure are a contributing feature to the designation as a historically significant structure. Need to rehabilitate bridge which may include adding material to the bridge, changing the aesthetics of the structure.
Project Risk: Quality Rehabilitating a steel structure is complex and is atypical work. It will be critical to identify a qualified and experienced design, contractor and construction management team to work on this project.
Project Risk: Aggressive Design Schedule The goal is to complete the project in an efficient duration to minimize the duration of load posting and extend the service life. The analysis of the rehabilitation method will be time intensive to complete the finite element analysis. There is also RR coordination required which could add time required for design.
Project Risk: Weather Limited work window each season for design field investigation and construction (best field timeframe: May-Oct). Construction at 8,800 feet in elevation that is subject to more extreme weather.
Project Risk: Maintaining Traffic The rehabilitation method may require removing traffic from the structure while work is being completed. There is a limited detour that is a narrow road in poor condition with tight radii over another bridge that is load posted. This road is traveled by commuters from Leadville, bicyclists, it is a Scenic byway and its used by I-70 travelers when Vail Pass closes.
Project Risk: Stakeholders Many stakeholders need to remain involved with the project throughout design and into construction. The team will need to evaluate potential trade-offs between CDOT and stakeholders with varying goals.
Project Risk: Safety Structure work over large drop-offs with exposure to wind and weather, work adjacent to live traffic on US 24 and over live traffic on Water Street.
Project Risk: Safety Portions of the work will be accomplished with ropes or specialized equipment 200-ft above the ground. This could involve unique platforms and implements that will need to be anticipated in the design.
Project Risk: Safety Consideration for evacuation routes and wild fire safety
Project Risk: Likely Changed Conditions in Construction Rehabilitation of an existing structure has unknowns that could require additional or different scope than expected.

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	**CM/GC**	**DB**
Primary Selection Factors			
1. Project Complexity & Innovation	+	+++	++
2. Project Delivery Schedule	+	+++	+
3. Project Cost Considerations	++	++	++
4. Level of Design	++	+++	+
5. Risk Assessment	N/A	Pass	N/A
Secondary Selection Factors			
6. Staff Experience/Availability (Agency)	N/A	Pass	N/A
7.Level of Oversight and Control	N/A	Pass	N/A
8. Competition and Contractor Experience	N/A	Pass	N/A

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 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**
Familiar with traditional DBB	Highly complex design and construction. No contractor feedback in design.	**+**
Owner has full control of the design	No assistance with cost estimating from outside services	
Can introduce/require contractor qualifications (pre-qualify or limited best value)	No contractor feedback on construction phasing, staging, temporary access and traffic control	
Allows for long duration utility coordination through standard process. Can result in pre-construction Utility relocation.	Lack of opportunity for field design, stuck with black and white specs	
	With an aging structure, the condition may change between design and construction, which may result in changed conditions once in construction	
	Utility relocations during construction can be costly and impact schedules. A utility contractor can be a 'third party' on a construction site and can be difficult to manage for a contractor.	
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**
This is a complex design that will be challenging to define technical details in the contract. Contractor will provide feedback on the pre-construction contract which can help with defining the scope of work.	Less competitive atmosphere once a CM is selected to drive further innovation.	**+++**
Contractor feedback in the pre-construction contract on construction phasing, staging, temporary access and traffic control	Not as common delivery method	

Assistance with cost estimating from an ICE	Owner has less control over design when comparing with DBB	
Contractor evaluates means and methods as well as technical innovations in design.	Needs to listen to utility company needs and plan for relocations instead of assuming the utilities will take care of the relocations without coordination.	
Contractor can become a project partner during pre-construction including meeting with stakeholders with CDOT to fully understand and address concerns.		
Opportunity for collaboration between contractor and utility company on creative ways to resolve utility relocations. Construction plans can then be discussed and potentially altered based on utility needs. Contractor is at the table early and could agree to help utility with utility relocations.		
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**
Contractor owns design risk, phasing and constructability.	Difficult to put details into the contract, introduces significant risk	**++**
Large opportunity for innovation in design and construction due to the competitive nature of procurement.	Least control over the design, when considering the 3 delivery methods	
With the opportunity for ATCs and stipends, can use the ideas of different contractors/proposals	Least common delivery method in R3	
Expedited design and construction.	A significant level of design and approvals must be completed prior to fully understanding and defining the scope of the work, which may reduce value in using a DB delivery method.	
	Typically does not perform a robust utility coordination effort which can cause issues. May not fully address utility relocation needs due to lack of coordination.	

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**
Ability to fully clear total design in ROW, Environmental and Utilities prior to any construction.	Assumptions are made without contractor feedback on construction timelines and phasing.	**+**
Traditional method that is a well known process.	No ability to accelerate the start of construction due to a linear process.	
Can save time and money with pre-construction utility relocations.	With an aging structure, the condition may change between design and construction, which may result in extra work (extending the schedule)	
	No contractor feedback on design, which could lead to more surprises in construction including a longer schedule.	
	Design duration is longer to fully capture the scope in contract documents.	
	Utility relocations during construction can be costly and impact schedules. A utility contractor can be a 'third party' on a construction site and can be difficult to manage for a contractor.	
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 deliver the project in multiple packages, allowing acceleration of the start of construction to potentially reduce the load posting sooner.	May require conditional clearances if not enough time to clear prior to CAP	**+++**
Ability for LLTP	Ability to make possible early packages severable	
Contractor part of pre-construction field investigation to reduce risks of unknowns.	CAP negotiation process can take time, which can impact the schedule	
Ability for the contractor to address secondary repairs prior to the primary repairs. Example: Strengthening structural members to allow capacity for construction loading	Needs a thorough understanding of utility coordination process to fully address utility company timelines for relocations.	
Contractor input on construction duration, safety, phasing and staging to improve schedule certainty.		

Can expedite utility relocation needs and the understanding of those needs by the contractor. Construction phasing can be amended based on input from the utility company.		
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**
Shifts the schedule risk to the DB.	3rd Party approvals are required which will need to be part of the schedule	**+**
This procurement method is typically quickest to finish construction.	Duration for RFP development is longer to fully capture the scope.	
Expedited design and construction on a project where utilities are not present.	Long procurement 9-12 months process.	
	May not fully perform utility coordination, leaving needed relocations unknown.	

3) 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**
Competitive bid on the defined scope.	High likelihood and risk of multiple change orders that are 100% owner owned.	**++**
Less upfront cost with needing just a designer throughout preconstruction	This is a complex project with potential atypical bid items. It will be challenging to estimate the unique work	
Thorough vetting of reimbursable relocations and the process offers the opportunity to redesign systems to avoid utility relocations which can be costly.	Bid risk. Bids could come in higher than the engineer's estimate and budgeted amount.	
	Low bid contractors many assumptions on utility installations without discussing the needs with utility companies.	
	Can’t optimize scope since no feedback on pricing or alternatives to maintain benefit during design.	
	Reliance on historical cost data rather than quotes on local conditions on this unique scope.	

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**
Can receive contractor feedback on pricing including unique local conditions that affect pricing during design to allow us to maximize scope within the budget.	This is a complex project with potential atypical bid items. It will be challenging to negotiate the unique work	**++**
Innovation during design to cut costs.	Additional costs for ICE and preconstruction CMGC contracts. Potential for additional design costs and requests for things like additional SUE or potholes, increasing costs..	
Owner can control scope to meet budget.	Concern for scope creep which could increase cost.	
Contractor can provide feedback on alternatives to maximize value and benefits.	No competitive bidding.	
Can remove cost for potential risks from the overall cost and only pay if the risks becomes active, potentially saving money.	Can lose power in negotiation with subsequent packages if chose to deliver over multiple packages.	
Can participate in utility relocation efforts.		
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**
Opportunity to maximize scope within the budget as part of the process.	Estimating process is higher risk.	**++**
Competition on DB selection includes price component.	Risk in 3rd party approvals after design is more fully developed which could require an owner caused change that affects price later.	
Innovations can reduce cost.		
Quickest path to cost certainty.		
This method is best when utility relocations are not anticipated.	Can make costly errors by not fully performing utility coordination and can make assumptions on relocations that are not a reality and not communicate effectively with utility companies.	

4) 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**
Traditional method of delivery. Less iterations.	Potential for more design errors or changes in construction, potentially leading to change orders or disputes.	**++**
Less evaluation of innovations and changes, less of a burden on specialty units on changes.	Limited construction input during design. No contractor buy-in until construction.	
Provides the most thorough assessment of utility conflicts and conflict resolution prior to construction.	Minimizes competitive innovation opportunities.	
CMGC - Can utilize a lower level of design prior to procurement of the CMGC and then 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**
Multiple bid packages to address early goals	Redesign and coordination with specialty units may be needed for potential changes and innovations.	**+++**
Contractor at the table during design, and implementing efficiencies in the design in regards to safety, access and phasing	Utility company can be rushed and their relocation design may not be fully vetted.	
More quality assurance of design work, and the owner can give input and level of acceptance on level of risk		
Flexibility of scope/more nimble design based on real cost numbers		
During design, CM can provide input on feasibility to reduce load restrictions in an early construction package.		
Allows for direct communication between contractor and utility company.		
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**
Constructability innovation from DB.	Designer may need to adopt complex finite element analysis by others to finish the design.	**+**
This method is best when utility relocations are not anticipated.	Quality concerns with contractor's design. Difficult to define conformance versus out of conformance. Conflict in interpreting the code for this complex design.	

	A significant level of design and approvals must be completed prior to fully understanding and defining the scope of the work, which may reduce value in using a DB delivery method.	
	Difficult to put details into the contract, introduces significant risk	
	Does not fully understand the cost and schedule implications of utility relocations. Can lead to under-developed efforts since the handoff from the UC consultant to the design firm can be cumbersome.	

5) Risk Assessment of Delivery Methods

Risk is an uncertain event or condition that, if it occurs, influences 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**
		N/A

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**
Ability to allocate risk appropriately between CDOT and CMGC contractor.	Design changes can impact clearance schedules and costs.	**Pass**
Collaborate during the design to minimize and avoid risk if possible.	Need an experienced CDOT team and it takes more time and management to oversee a CMGC project.	

Due to the nature of the work and age and condition of the structure, change conditions are expected after the start of construction and cannot be fully mitigated in the design phase (e.g. after blast cleaning it is discovered that the extent of deterioration is more extensive than anticipated based on inspection findings). This results in a high probability of change orders and a heightened level of risk exposure. Risks can be quantified and tracked in a risk register to assign costs to risks and remove those costs from the estimates and only pay for the risk if it becomes active.	May impact budget due to need for al utility information prior to construction.	
Contractor can provide feedback on traffic control, constructability, staging, safety (working at heights & lead paint) and phasing throughout design to minimize risk		
Contractor can provide feedback to reduce risk of environmental impacts and reduce geographic impacts (rockfall, slopes, limits of disturbance).		
Utility coordination opportunities can exist outside of standard practice by contractor coordinating directly with utility company.		

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
		N/A

Project Delivery Selection Matrix

Secondary Factor

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**
		N/A
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**
Program East has delivered other CMGC projects in Eagle County in recent history. Staff are very experienced in this delivery method.	Requires more involvement from the Owner to oversee and manage the project.	**Pass**
Program East has experience in rehabilitation of bridges, notably Red Cliff Bridge rehab.		
Project team is available for the work.		
Bridge support team and R3 Specialty units have CMGC experience, including working on a recent major US 50 steel structure rehab project.		
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**
		N/A

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**
		N/A
CMGC - Most control by Agency over both the design, and construction, and control over a collaborative agency/designer/contractor project team		
Opportunities	**Obstacles**	**Rating**
CDOT can maintain control over the design process.		**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**
		N/A

8) Competition and Contractor Experience

Competition and availability refer to the level of competition, experience and availability in the marketplace 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**
		N/A
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**
Qualified contractors are interested in this project.		**Pass**
Qualifications based selection allows for selection of high quality contractors.		

Scope and size of the project is likely to open up the contractor pool and incentivize out of state contractors.		
DESIGN-BUILD - Allows for a balance of price and non-price factors in the selection process. Medium level of marketplace experience.		
Opportunities	**Obstacles**	**Rating**
		N/A