Ohio DOT

General Information	
Contact Information	**Eric Kahlig** Alternative Project Delivery Administrator 614-387-2406 Eric.kahlig@dot.ohio.gov
Relevant Statute	*ORC 5517.011* • Total dollar value of contracts cannot exceed one billion dollars per fiscal year • No limit on the number or type of projects

DB Program Characteristics	• $2 billion annual construction budget
	• 1995: pilot program of 6 projects, ranging from $250,000 to $14 million
	• 1999: additional DB authority granted
	• $2.4 billion in DB projects to date, ranging from $116,000 to $287 million
	  - 3 mega-projects
	  - 4 large projects
	  - 22 medium projects
	  - 218 small projects (rehabilitation, small bridge)
	• About 14 projects performed annually

Agency Culture, Organization and Training	

Dedicated DB Program Staff	• 1 F/T central office staff
	• 3 P/T central office staff
	• 20-25 P/T district staff
	• Some consultant support used, but mostly handled internally
	• ODOT in general has a hybrid model with regard to degree of centralization
	  - Centralized in funding
	  - Decentralized in decision-making for projects

Outsourcing	• 50% of design is outsourced • 10-20% of CEI is outsourced (probably more in the future)
Internal Issues Related to DB Use	Nothing noteworthy

Industry Issues Related to DB Use	• Contractors have largely accepted DB
	• Consultants are starting to pushback on being under a low bid contractor
	  - Dislike being held to budgets
	  - Fear contractors are bid shopping
	• In the past, ODOT engaged a DB industry forum with representatives from the Ohio Contractor's Association and the ACEC (planning to revive the group in the future; believe it to be a best practice)

Procedural Guidance and Template Documents	• Trying to develop updated and centralized guidance on DB
	• Standard Templates
	  - RFQ/RFP
	  - Instructions to Proposers
	  - General Provisions
	  - Technical Provisions
	  - DB Agreement

Training	• DB training was recently provided to project managers • DB guidance manual is under development

Selection of Project Delivery Method	
Drivers for Using DB	Expedited delivery schedule
Process and Tools	• Decision occurs through discussion of project type and typically at the preliminary engineering stage (10-30% design) • No formal decision tool, but limitations on project types
Key Considerations	*Key Considerations* • Speed of delivery • Potential for innovation • Risks of unknown conditions (DB primarily used on structures) *Project Characteristics that are not Suitable for DB* • Noisewalls • Sign replacement projects • Pavement rehabilitation • Rehabilitation projects requiring judgement as to the appropriate repair
Entity Making the Delivery Decision	Headquarters and Regions

DB Project Development	
Timing of the Delivery Decision	Decision is typically made at the preliminary engineering stage (10-30% design)
Project Development Activities	• Guidance document is available for developing DB scope • ODOT will generally only issue a bid package once NEPA is complete and the necessary environmental clearances have been obtained
Use of Performance Requirements	• Have considered using performance criteria for maintenance of traffic (e.g., not defining width or number of lanes but through-put) • Portsmouth Bypass project include an availability payment with open design and a deduction for service level
Lessons Learned	• Best to use dedicated DB program staff for scoping • Use performance specifications where possible to enable more innovation

Procurement Process	
Delivery Options	*One-Step Low Bid* • Majority of ODOT's DB projects • Used on low risk, non-complex projects where a compressed construction schedule is beneficial or possible but ODOT must provide a high level of design definition and retain control of quality and third party coordination *Two-Step Low Bid* • Only used on select projects with Central Office approval • Used on moderately complex projects that still demand highly qualified firms *Value-Based* • Only used on select projects with Central Office approval • Suited for projects where a low level of design definition is possible, there is greater opportunity for innovation, and the DB Team can assume greater responsibility for quality and third party coordination

Procurement Steps	*One-Step Low Bid*
	
	 1. Project is advertised
	 2. Pre-bid meeting
	 3. Offerors submit bids (must be prequalified)
	 4. Bids are opened to determine the Apparent Low Bidder
	 5. Responsiveness determination is made
	 6. Award
	
	 Two-Step Low Bid
	
	 1. RFQ scoring criteria and evaluation plan developed based on project goals
	 2. Advertise RFQ
	 3. Pre-Submission meeting
	 4. Offerors submit SOQs
	 5. Rating and scoring by Technical Evaluation Team
	 6. Executive Evaluation Team reviews and concurs with recommendation of Technical Evaluation Team
	 7. Director approval of shortlist recommendation
	 8. RFP distributed to shortlist
	 9. Offerors prepare and submit bids
	 10. Apparent Low Bidder determined
	 11. Pre-award conference held at which Apparent Low Bidder presents its conceptual design and schedule
	 12. Responsiveness determination
	 13. Award
	
	 Value-Based
	
	 1. RFQ shortlisting step is similar to two-step low bid process
	 2. RFP distributed to shortlist
	 3. Offerors prepare and submit both a Technical Proposal and a Price Proposal
	 4. Responsiveness review of Technical Proposals
	 5. Technical Evaluation Team evaluates responsive Technical Proposals
	   - Each section of the proposal rated from 0 to 100, with a 70 meeting minimum requirements
	   - To determine overall technical score, each section is weighted based on its importance with respect to the project goals

	6. Announce technical scores and open price proposals 7. Determine the Apparent Best Value Bidder 8. Award
Selection Method	• For Value-Based DB, a normalized weighted criteria method is used $$\% \frac{Bidder's\ Technical\ Score}{Highest\ Technical\ Score}$$ $$+$$ $$\% \frac{Lowest\ Price\ Proposal}{Bidder'sProposal\ Score}$$ $$+$$ $$\% \frac{Shortest\ Project\ Duration}{Bidder's\ Project\ Duration}$$ • Price weighting is typically 60-70% • Thus far, all value-based projects have been awarded to the proposer with the lowest price (i.e., none have flipped on technical scores yet)
Bundling DB Projects	
Use of Alternative Technical Concepts (ATC)	• Under both the two-step low bid and value-based options, ODOT may allow proposers to propose ATCs - ATCs make procurement process more intense and may add 2 weeks to schedule, but are viewed as a worthwhile investment of resources for more complicated projects • VECPs are not accepted on DB projects
Stipends	• Per statute, stipends may be awarded to not more than 2 proposers • 0.25 to 1% of the value of the contract for value-based DB only

Other Comments	• Have received some protests and pressure from contractors that did not get shortlisted
	• Scope interpretation issue led to a protest that was dismissed
	• Legislation allows consideration of DBE as an evaluation factor
	  - 20% of technical proposal is diversity and outreach
	  - Seen as way to expand DBE participation

Risk Allocation	
Risk Management Philosophy	Informal risk process is used (i.e., no structured risk analysis process, accept for major projects)
Differing Site Conditions	Shared
Permitting	ODOT will generally only issue a bid package once the necessary environmental clearances have been obtained
Utilities	Shared
Right-of-Way	ODOT Retains
Third Parties	ODOT Retains

DB Contract Administration	
Design Oversight	• Design review is an audit process • DOT typically does not check calculations • DB Team must submit a Quality Management Plan prior to starting (does not necessarily improve quality of design, but forces designer to plan upfront and define its quality control processes) • Final acceptance of design at project closure
Construction Oversight and Quality Management	Traditional owner acceptance process is used
Payment	Start with schedule of values and do breakdown with agreed milestone payments for major components (e.g., footings)
Best Practices and/or Lessons Learned	• Speed of required review is much faster on DB (turnaround of 5-10 days vs. 30 days) • Have tried to have centralized design reviews coordinated by one ODOT person (i.e., one point person per project instead of 15 separate responses)

Performance Outcomes	
Tracking of Metrics	No formal tracking of metrics
Success Factors	*Primary Success Factors* • Clarity of RFP scope and criteria • Interaction of the DB Team • DB Team qualifications • Communication and coordination between all parties • Use of performance specifications • Timely owner reviews/approvals *Secondary Success Factors* • Equitable risk allocation
Other Comments	• Value of ATCs can be high – process promotes an in depth review of scope and design standards, which can identify some scope deficiencies • One-on-one meetings are beneficial