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Agenda

1. Major Project Spotlight
   • Major Project Requirements from NEPA and Beyond – MI DOT
   • Quality Assurance Plans for DB & P3 Projects – TX DOT
   • Major Projects and Alternative Technical Concepts – FL DOT

2. Major Project Information
   • Financial Plan Guidance Update
   • SHRP2 Round 4
   • Upcoming Major Project Webinars

3. Comments/Questions
Major Project Spotlight: DOT/FHWA Peer Exchange

Peer Exchange Featuring:

Major Project Requirements from NEPA and Beyond – MI DOT
Quality Assurance Plans for DB & P3 Projects – TX DOT
Major Projects and Alternative Technical Concepts – FL DOT
Major Project Requirements from NEPA and Beyond: I-94 Ford Freeway Modernization Project in Detroit, MI

Michigan DOT
Brenda Chapman, Accountant Manager
Terry Stepanski, P.E, Senior Project Manager
Overview of the I-94 Ford Freeway Modernization Project

• Project Overview
  – Complete Reconstruction of 6.7 Miles
  – Widening from 3 Lanes to 4
  – Replace 67 Bridges
  – 20-25 Construction Packages
  – Built Over 24 Years
  – $2.9 Billion in YOE$’s
## Current Schedule

$2.9 Billion in YOE$’s

|-------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
Overview of Major Project Approval Process

- NEPA/ROD – December 2005
- Detailed Engineering Report and Base Cost Estimate – June 2010
- First Cost Estimate Review – April 2011
- First Initial Financial Plan Submitted – August 2011
- New Federal Guidelines Announced – September 2013
- Second CER – November 2013
- Second IFP Submitted – December 2013
- IFP Approved – February 2014
Base Cost Estimate

Base Cost Estimate $1.8 Billion

- Developed as 19 individual contracts
- Stand alone annual packages
- Detail organized in segments, elements and phases as used in IFP supporting workbook
- Easy to update unit costs with current values
- Facilitated scenario planning
Major Project Requirements
First Attempt

2011 IFP

– Traditional Delivery
  • Design Bid Build, 26 Packages

– FY2011 – FY2029

– Financial Plan did not Adequately Demonstrate Ability to Fund the Overall Transportation Program
  • Other Major Projects (I-75, BWB, DIFT)
Challenges to Traditional Thinking - Delivery

- Facilitated Workshops
  - Engineers, Planners, Accountants
- Developed Shared Vision for Success
- Action Plan Follows the Vision
  - Design Modifications
  - Accelerated Delivery
- SHRP2 R10 Demonstration Project
I-94 Delivery Options
MDOT Success Management Workshop

- FY2011 IFP $2.8B complete in FY2029
- Option 1, $1.6B complete in FY2019
- Option 2, $1.4B complete in FY2018
- Option 3, $1.2B complete in FY2017

The chart below is an example of a conceptual accelerated delivery option.
Funding Scenarios

Can We Fund an Accelerated Plan?

• Design Build Packages
  – Changes the authorization schedule
  – Changes the timing of cash flow
• Financed Debt v Inflation Avoidance
• Coverage Ratios and % of Program
• Traditional Revenue Bonds
• Multiple Tranches of GARVEEs
• Mix of Direct and Indirect GARVEEs
MAP-21 and Phasing

• Phasing Should be the Answer!
  – Advanced Bridges
  – Segments as Funding Allowed
  – Offers Greatest Flexibility

• Phasing Not Consistent With the RTP
  – Funding was Already Identified in RTP
  – All Phases are Funded Phases

• All or Nothing
Additional Challenges

Not as Much Time as we Thought!

• The Woodward Bridge Replacement is Needed for Another Project
  – M-1 Street Car letting schedule
• MPO Amendment Due Dates
  – New schedule for due dates TIP and RTP
Creating a Path Forward

Bi Weekly Coordination Meetings
Brought all Disciplines to the Table

- Planning
- Senior Management
  - Environmental
- Senior Project Manager
- Finance
- Real Estate
- Communications
Traditional Allocation of Funds by Region

- Traditional Funding Allocations by Region
  - By Funding Source and Category
  - Templates are Created for Each Region
- $200 Million Per Year Dedicated to Two Major Projects, I-94 and I-75
- Project Readiness Plan in Place
Major Project Core Team

Weekly Meetings to Monitor Critical Path and Dependencies

- Senior Project Engineer I-94
- Senior Project Engineer I-75
- Planning Coordinator
- FHWA Division Project Oversight Manager
- Accountant Manager
Cost Estimate Review

• New Process with MAP-21
• Pre-CER Conference
• Built on Prior CER
• Updated Unit Prices in-House for New Base Year Costs
• Focus Was on Critical Risks
Initial Financial Plan Approved

• Trained Support Staff
  – Excel Workbook Linked to Cost Estimate
  – Core Team in Place
• Improved our Discussion of Fiscal Constraint of Overall Program
  – Constrained at MPO Level
• Added Cash Flow Models to Workbook
Lessons Learned and Best Practices

• Develop a Major Projects Core Team
  – Multi-disciplinary
  – Include your Division Office

• Establish Working Partnerships
  – Internal and External
  – FHWA
  – Regional Planning Organization
  – On Board with MDOT
  – Involved and Supportive Relationship
Lessons Learned and Best Practices

• The Team Takes Ownership Over a Single Set of Financial Data
  – Base lined on Cost Estimate and Schedule

• This Data is Used for All Purposes
  – Short and Long Term Scenario Planning
  – MPO LRP/RTP
  – MDOT STIP
  – IFP
  – CER
Brenda Chapman
Accountant Manager
Michigan Department of Transportation
ChapmanB@michigan.gov
Terry Stepanski, P.E.
Senior Project Engineer
Michigan Department of Transportation
stepanskit@michigan.gov
Contact Information

Ryan Rizzo
Project Oversight Manager
Michigan Division
Federal Highway Administration
Ryan.Rizzo@dot.gov
FHWA Innovative Program Delivery Office

Website: [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/project_delivery/index.htm](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/project_delivery/index.htm)

- FHWA MAP-21 Interim Guidance, September 2012
- FHWA Final Major Project Guidance, January 2007
- Financial Plan Guidance, January 2007
- Project Management Plan Guidance, January 2009
- Operational Independence and Non-Concurrent Construction Guidance, December 2009
- Active Major Project Monthly Status
Questions & Input

Submit a question using the chat box

Or

Dial *1 to call in your question by phone
Quality Assurance Program for Design Build (DB) and Public-Private Partnership (PPP) Projects

Texas DOT
Dieter Billek, P.E., Procurement and Implementation Director, Strategic Projects Division

FHWA - TX Division
Jim Travis, Asset Management Engineer
<table>
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<th></th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
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<td>Introduction – TxDOT Approach to DB/PPP Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Major Components of QA Program for DB/PPP Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lessons Learned/Best Practices</td>
</tr>
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<td>4</td>
<td>Questions/Discussion</td>
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</table>
TXDOT APPROACH TO DB/PPP PROJECTS
TxDOT Strategic Projects Program Overview

- $24 Billion in active P3 projects
- Leveraged $6 Billion in State Funds to deliver $24 Billion in projects (4:1)
- Successful Bond Issuance of $2.9 Billion for Grand Parkway in July 2013
- Dedicated agency organization and consultant support

PRE PROCUREMENT
$ 5.5 Billion

PROCUREMENT
$ 5.8 Billion

DESIGN / CONSTRUCTION
$ 10.4 Billion

OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE
$ 2.6 Billion
### Design Build

- TxDOT enters into a contract with a developer to design, construct and possibly maintain the project.
- Developer responsible for QC/QA and inspection.
- TxDOT has an oversight role on testing and inspection (OVTI); as well as Independent Assurance (IA).

### Design Bid Build

- Separate selection process for design and construction.
- Advertise & award the construction contract.
- Construct the project.
- TxDOT maintains responsibility for all QA inspection and testing.
DB/PPP Projects

Benefits

- Faster Delivery
- Cost Savings
- Better Quality
- Singular Responsibility
- Decreased Administrative Burden
- Reduced Risk
- Reduced Litigation Claims
DB/PPP Projects

**PROS**
- Single Entity for Design & Construction
- Methods of construction are reduced by contractor involved in design
- Early start on portions of improvements while completing final design
- Long lead items ordered prior to completed plans
- Developer assumes risk for QA
- Developer assumes risk of unknowns
- Developer assumes risk of design complications
- Innovative design & construction methods

**CONS**
- Less control of design & construction
- Oversight only
- Maintenance
DB/PPP Projects

- Two-Step Procurement Process
  - Qualification-based Shortlisting
  - Committed Proposal-based Evaluation

- Typical Best Value Determination of Proposals
  - Cost of Project, Includes:
    - Initial Construction Cost
    - Maintenance and Operation Costs
    - Cost Savings Through Innovation
  - Quality Management/Assurance
    - Comprehensiveness of Quality Management Plan
    - Added Value Through Innovative Ideas
    - Contractor’s Safety Performance Record
  - Schedule
    - Time Required to Complete Project

![Pie chart showing the distribution of factors affecting project value: Cost of Project (70% - 80%), Quality of Project (10% - 20%), Schedule (10% - 15%).]
DB/PPP Projects Accomplishments

**Design/Build:**
- SH 130 Segments 1 – 4/ $1.35B  Open to traffic 2006 and 2008
- DFW Connector Dallas/ $1.2B/ October 2013
- Dallas Horseshoe/ $800M/ April 2017
- SH 99 (Grand Parkway) Segments F1, F2, and G/ $1.45B/ November 2015
- Loop 1604 WE/ $84M/ October 2016
- US 77/ $77M/ November 2016
- ESR2P/ $147M/ October 2015

**Concession:**
- SH 130 Segments 5 & 6/ $1.37B Open to traffic May 2013
- North Tarrant Expressway Segments 1 & 2
- I-635 LBJ Freeway/ $3.1B
MAJOR COMPONENTS OF QA PROGRAM FOR DB/PPP PROJECTS
The QA Program utilizes a combination of quality measures to meet program goals:

- Quality Control (QC)
- Quality Assurance (QA)
- Owner Verification (OV)
- Independent Assurance (IA)
- Dispute Resolution
Primary Quality Components

**Quality Control (QC)**
- Developer CQMP required – defines contractor’s internal procedures
- QC is foundation
- Systematic approach
- Clearly defined authority and responsibility for QC plan
- Not used for acceptance but to ensure quality has been incorporated

**Quality Assurance (QA)**
- Developer acceptance inspection & testing by independent CQAF, in accordance with CQMP
- Frequency per Guide Schedule
- Start-up split sample testing with OV for alignment
- Acceptance = QA + OV results
- CQAM assigned = “Engineer” in TxDOT spec book
- Internal Audits to assure CQMP compliance

**Owner Verification (OV)**
- Required by 23 CFR 637 B & TA 6120.3
- Owner’s independent firm
- Min. 10% frequency of QA
- Statistical validation of QA testing
- Oversight of non-validation investigations
- Audits to verify CQMP compliance
- Owner Verification Testing & Inspection Plan (OVTIP)
- Quarterly statistical validation report to FHWA

**Communication**
- Active communication between parties during all phases of work is a critical success factor on these large, fast-moving projects.
Owner Verification Approach

- Three-Tiered Verification Approach
  - Level 1: Continuous F- & t-test analysis
    - Almost real-time verification
    - ~10% of QA test frequency
    - Most critical performance properties
  - Level 2: Independent Verification
  - Level 3: Observation Verification
  - Analysis levels based on keys to performance
  - Established in a project-specific materials risk workshop

- Start-up and quarterly split-sample testing

- Independent Audits to assure QAP/CQMP compliance

- Quarterly FHWA reporting (Additional detail to follow)
FHWA Reporting Requirements

- Quarterly Report (Prepared by OV)
  - Demonstrates that QAP has been followed.
  - Summarizes Material Acceptance Decisions.
  - Presents statistical validation by owner verification of developer performed acceptance tests.
  - Documents any material incorporated into the project represented by a failing test result.
  - Documents results of non-validation investigations and necessary corrective action plans.
  - Incrementally builds supporting documentation for Material Certification.
Independent Assurance (IA)

- Typically handled by AASHTO accredited IA Laboratory, occasionally by a District Laboratory

- Personnel Qualifications
  - Required Certifications (QA, OV, and IA)
  - Proficiency Program

- Laboratory Qualifications
  - AASHTO Accreditation
  - TxDOT or IA Lab Qualification (test methods)
  - Equipment Calibration
  - Documentation Requirements

- Annual Reporting Requirements
LESSONS LEARNED/BEST PRACTICES
A well developed plan ensures a well managed project.

- OVTIP for OV
- CQMP for QA
- Both plans must conform to TxDOT QA
- QA and OV audited for compliance with CQMP and OVTIP
Verify TxDOT test procedures are being performed correctly

Verify equipment calibrations are up-to-date

Verify certifications are current
TxDOT Oversight – Material Issues

- Non-validation investigation and resolution
  - Split testing, watching testers, checking equipment, evaluating sources

- Verify the proper testing is performed according to Guide Schedule of Sampling and Testing
  - Track material quantities and number of tests being performed

- Verify the proper testing is performed on non-rated source materials.
  - Work with CST to develop a frequency of testing
  - Assist QA in finding qualified labs for specialized testing through Construction Division

- Implementing Corrective Action and verifying effectiveness through subsequent achievement of validation
Lessons learned from the Grand Parkway…

- The Developer must submit the Design Quality Management Plan (and any related PMP chapters) prior to initiating design work.
  - Require consistent ISO procedures between contractor and subcontractors.
- The Developer must have his lab in place and certified before any activities that require testing are initiated.
  - Manage risk by limiting the distance materials can travel between site and lab.
- Notify local government authorities (and other stakeholders) that the contractor may engage in early coordination activities.
- Ensure the Developer has an approved Public Information Plan in place if the work requires Developer engage the public.
- Require Developer to add language to the PMP that establishes timeframes for iterative Non Compliance Reports and resolution.
Teamwork: The equation is simple.

NorthGate Constructors + Texas Department of Transportation = DFW Connector
Contact Information

Dieter Billek, P.E.
Procurement and Implementation Director, Strategic Projects Division
Texas Department of Transportation
Dieter.Billek@txdot.gov
Jim Travis
Asset Management Engineer
Texas Division
Federal Highway Administration
(512) 536-5953
James.Travis@dot.gov
Construction QA TechBrief (April 2012)

• Quality Assurance (QA)
  - Not specific role of one entity

• Construction QA Program
  - Six core elements apply to D-B

• Responsibilities
  - Design-Builder = QC
  - Agency = Acceptance
FHWA Technical Assistance
QA for Design-Build Projects

• Design & Construction Quality Assurance
  – Jeff Lewis, RC Const & Project Mgmt Team
    Jeff.Lewis@dot.gov
  – Greg Doyle, MA Division/RC Const & Project Mgmt Team
    Gregory.J.Doyle@dot.gov

• Construction/Materials Quality Assurance
  – Dennis Dvorak, RC Pavement & Materials Team
    Dennis.Dvorak@dot.gov
Questions & Input

Submit a question using the chat box

Or

Dial *1 to call in your question by phone
Major Projects and Alternative Technical Concepts (ATC): I-4 Ultimate Overview and the FDOT ATC Process

Florida DOT
Loreen Bobo, I-4 Ultimate Construction Program Manager
OVERVIEW OF I-4 ULTIMATE IMPROVEMENTS

- **Length**: Over 21 miles from West of Kirkman Rd. to East of SR 434.

- **Cost**: $2.323 billion (yoe) in design/construction costs

- **What**: Reconstruction of mainline & interchanges

- **What**: Addition of 4 Express Lanes (4Express)

- **Design/Construction Duration**: ~ 6 years
OVERVIEW OF I-4 ULTIMATE IMPROVEMENTS

- Reconstruction of 15 interchanges
- 3 System to System interchanges
- Over 60 new bridges
- Over 70 bridge replacements
- 2 new pedestrian crossings at Maitland Blvd. & SR 436
- Increase design speed to 60 MPH
- P3 – Public-Private Partnership
  - Design-Build-Finance-Operate-Maintain
  - Chose I-4 Mobility Partners on 4/23/14
    - Skanska, John Laing Investments, Granite, Lane, HDR, Jacobs, Infrastructure Corp of America
I-4 ULTIMATE

Interstate 4 Typical Section

- 4 Express (Managed) Lanes (2 each direction)
- 6 General Use Lanes + Auxiliary Lane
Emergency access gates will be provided between the Express Lanes and General Use Lanes at a minimum of every two miles.
I-4 ULTIMATE
Planned Access to Express Lanes

- Access to and from the tolled express lanes will be limited
  - Barrier wall separated
    - Slip Ramp Access
    - Direct Ramp Access
  - Six to seven access points in each direction
- Intended for longer trips
- Variable tolling
- All electronic tolling
- Everyone pays
- No heavy trucks
## Costs

### Capital Cost (Design and Construction): $2.4 billion
- $54 million towards local roads

### Operations & Maintenance: $378 million over contract

### Renewal & Replacement: $493 million over contract

### Other (SPV, Insurance, Interest, Finance): Varies
Project key dates and Schedule

- RFQ released: March 8, 2013
- Seven (7) teams responded: April 19, 2013
- Four (4) teams were short-listed: June 5, 2013
- Release Final RFP: October 2013
- Technical proposals due: February 12, 2014
- Financial proposals due: March 13, 2014
- Best value selection: April 23, 2014
- Financial close: July 25, 2014
- Notice to Proceed 1: Fall 2014
- Notice to Proceed 2: Late 2014/Early 2015
- Contract ends: Mid-2054
Request for Proposals

- **Instructions to Proposers (ITP):** Procurement Document
  - Includes a section on the ATC Process

- **Volume I: Concession Agreement (CA)**
  - 435 pages, including 26 Appendices

- **Volume II: Technical Requirements**
  - 495 pages
    - Section 1: Project Description
    - Section 2: Project Requirements and Provisions for Work
    - Section 3: Design and Construction Requirements
      - Attachment 1 – ITS DEPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS
      - Attachment 2 – TOLLS INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS
      - Attachment 3 – QAM and QAF Requirements
      - Attachment 4 – QA/QC Requirement
    - Section 4: Operations & Maintenance Requirements
    - SECTION 5 – HANDBACK REQUIREMENTS

- **Volume III: Additional Mandatory Standards**
I-4 ULTIMATE
Proposal Scores

Technical Proposal Criteria  [Up to 60 points]
- Technical Proposal Qualitative Assessment - 35 points
  - Preliminary Corridor Master Plan Submittal Evaluation Criteria
  - Operation and Maintenance Evaluation Criteria
- Baseline Construction Period - 5 points
- Inclusion of Direct Connection Proposal - 5 points
- Project Technical Enhancements - 15 points

Financial Proposal Criteria  [Up to 40 points]
- Financial Price - 35 points
- Feasibility of Financial Proposal - 5 points
ATC Process

- **Alternative Technical Concepts (ATC’s)**
  - Confidential
    - RFP was not changed if an ATC was allowed
  - 5 meetings with each team, in person
  - Quick turn around needed
  - Team of 25 + people from different disciplines participated in the process.
  - Base Line and Grade – Any deviation of more than 5 feet had to be submitted

- **Alternative Financial Concepts (AFC’s)**
  - Not confidential
  - Teleconferences with each team

- **One on One meetings**
  - Four Meetings with each team
  - Contract Issues rather than technical
Alternative Technical Concepts (ATC’s) From ITP

- Set forth the **process** for FDOT’s review and **acceptance** of technical concepts that **conflict** with the **requirements** of the Contract Documents.
- This process is intended to allow Proposers to **incorporate technical innovation** and **creativity** into their Proposals.
- To be eligible for consideration, proposed ATCs must result in performance, quality and utility of the end product that is **equal to or better** than the **performance, quality** and **utility** of the end product that would result from full compliance with the Contract Documents.
A proposed ATC may not be approved if, in FDOT’s sole discretion, it is premised upon or would require (a) a reduction in quantities without achieving equal or better performance, quality and utility; (b) a reduction in performance, quality, utility or reliability; (c) major changes to the existing Environmental Approvals, including changes that would trigger the need for a supplemental Environmental Impact Statement under NEPA; (d) a Change in Law; or (e) multiple or material additional right of way parcels.
Possible ATC Responses

(A) The proposed ATC is acceptable for inclusion in the Proposal (with such conditions, modifications or requirements as identified by FDOT). Approval dates are noted below. Conditional Approval requirements are provided in Attachment 1.

(B) The proposed ATC is not acceptable for inclusion in the Proposal.

(C) The proposed ATC is not acceptable in its present form, but may be acceptable upon the satisfaction, in FDOT’s sole discretion, of certain identified conditions which must be met or clarifications or modifications that must be made prior to resubmittal (FDOT will not utilize this response after the final submission date for ATCs).

(D) The proposed ATC appears to comply with the Contract Documents and does not require an ATC as to the specific provision of the Contract Documents identified by the Proposer in its proposed ATC (provided, however, that should it turn out that the concept as incorporated into the Proposal is not within the requirements of the Contract Documents, FDOT reserves the right to require compliance with the requirements of the Contract Documents, in which event the Proposer will not be entitled to modify its Proposal or receive additional compensation or a time extension under the Agreement).

(E) Although the submittal does not require an ATC because it appears to comply with the Contract Documents, it may not be included in the Proposer’s Proposal and FDOT will modify the Contract Documents to preclude the concept.
## I-4 Ultimate ATC Stats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th># of ATC’s submitted</th>
<th># of ATC’s submitted (including resubmittals)</th>
<th># received on Final deadline</th>
<th>Average Response Time to Final Decision (Days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average per team</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# I-4 Ultimate ATC Stats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team (four teams total)</th>
<th># of ATC’s submitted</th>
<th>A’s # approved</th>
<th># submitted in Proposal</th>
<th>B’s # denied</th>
<th>D’s # not ATC's</th>
<th># Retracted by team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average per team</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38%
- Project Website: www.Moving-4-Ward.com

- Public Information and Community Outreach will be Incorporated

- Mobile App being developed

- Project Video
Thank You
Loreen Bobo
I-4 Ultimate Construction Program Manager
District 5
Florida Department of Transportation
Lureen.Bobo@dot.state.fl.us
NEW! ACM Virtual Library

www.fhwa.dot.gov/construction/contracts/acm/

What You’ll Find:

• Enabling Legislation
• Sample Manuals of Instruction
• Skill Sets: Essential project management knowledge for public owners
• Procurement Strategies
• Contracting Samples:
  ◦ Request for Proposal (RFP) templates
  ◦ Key elements of construction & services contracts
• Risk Registries and Risk Allocation Guidance
• Performance Measures to Gauge Success

Federal-aid Support & Available Tools

www.fhwa.dot.gov/federal-aidessentials/catmod.cfm?id=81
FHWA ACM Core Team

Rob Elliott – *Team Manager*
Jeff Lewis – *Team Lead*

- **Design-Build (D-B)**
  - Lead: Jerry Blanding; Co-lead: Jeff Lewis

- **Construction Manager/General Contractor (CM/GC)**
  - Lead: John Haynes; Co-Lead: Ken Atkins

- **Alternative Technical Concepts (ATC’s)**
  - Lead: Craig Actis; Co-lead: David Unkefer

- **Over-Arching Issues**
  - Jerry Yakowenko (Contract Admin.)
  - Greg Doyle (Quality Assurance)
  - Deborah Vocke (Marketing)
Questions & Input

Submit a question using the chat box

Or

Dial *1 to call in your question by phone
Major Project Announcements

Project Delivery Team
Office of Innovative Program Delivery
Financial Plan Updates

- **Financial Plan Guidance**
  - Comment period in Federal Register closed on October 7th
    - Received 10 comments from various organizations
    - Most comments were related to OINCC, phasing plans, P3 assessments, timing of submission, financing costs
  - Financial Plan Guidance is currently being finalized and the goal is to post final guidance by spring 2014
  - Internal and external webinars will be scheduled in 2014 to introduce guidance
Managing Risk in Rapid Renewal Projects (R09) and Project Management Strategies for Complex Projects (R10)

- Assistance includes up to $30,000 grant plus combination of technical assistance, demonstration workshops, or training
- Website: http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/goshrp2/ImplementationAssistance
- Contact Carlos Figueroa at Carlos.Figueroa@dot.gov or 202-366-5266
Questions & Input

Submit a question using the chat box

Or

Dial *1 to call in your question by phone
Upcoming Webinars

Quarterly Major Project Webinar (FHWA)
Tuesday, August 5th
1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. (EDT)

Joint DOT/FHWA Major Project Webinar
Tuesday, November 4th
1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. (EST)

Contact LaToya at latoya.johnson@dot.gov or 202-366-0479 if you have topic ideas for upcoming webinars
Jim Sinnette
Project Delivery Team Leader
Office of Innovative Program Delivery
Federal Highway Administration
(202) 366-1561
James.Sinnette@dot.gov