



Oklahoma Department of Transportation

Project Management Division

Room C9 Third Floor

Office 522-7601 Fax 522-7612

DATE: January 23, 2004

TO: Consulting Engineering Companies

FROM: Tim Gatz, Project Management Division

SUBJECT: Solicitation for Upcoming Projects

In August 2003 the Oklahoma Department of Transportation hosted a meeting in the auditorium at the Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation to inform the consulting engineering profession of upcoming efforts in the delivery of the 8 Year Construction Work Plan. There, we discussed the desire of the Department to get 18 months ahead of schedule with both highway and bridge design. In addition, each attendee was provided a questionnaire to assist the Department in crafting future consulting services and the most efficient way to solicit, select, and negotiate these contracts. Attached for your information are the responses to these questions. We personally want to thank each engineering firm that took the time to complete this questionnaire as it truly assisted the agency as we move forward in our partnership with the consulting engineering industry.

One of the key comments received was the desire to have the Department solicit engineering services on a quarterly basis. Therefore, this memorandum is the first solicitation of engineering work on a quarterly schedule. It was also the desire of the Department to provide an additional list of projects which were anticipated to be solicited in subsequent quarters for the remainder of the year. As you may be aware, the federal funding picture is not as clear as we had anticipated by January of this year. As this picture becomes clearer from both an annual appropriation and transportation bill perspective, the Department will provide this additional list of upcoming projects.

At this time, the Department is soliciting the services of consulting engineering companies to provide planning, environmental, survey, and design services for critical projects to assist in the delivery of the 8 Year Construction Work Plan. Please find attached a comprehensive list of projects and descriptions for which the Department is seeking the noted services.

In general, your responses to this Solicitation of Interest will be accepted through a single letter identifying the specific projects you are interested in being considered for. Your letter will simply reference the Engineering Contract Number (EC No.) noted in the attached project list and include any information you believe appropriate for the Department's use in determining your capabilities and qualifications to perform the type of work encompassed by that particular contract. Also, we will continue to ask you to provide eight copies of your letter of interest including your CAP 255 form. The CAP 254/255 form and process is still applicable for the time being.

Please remember that this is a SOLICITATION OF INTEREST and not an Request for Proposal. As such, you are only requested to provide information related to your qualifications to perform the work described. Any additional information you choose to provide related to proposed design solutions for the solicited projects or any other prepared Contract/Project specific media is NOT required and is unnecessary for the Department's processes. Proposals will be requested upon entering the interview phase of the Consultant Selection Process.

The deadline for the submittal of your responses will be 4:30 p.m. Friday February 20, 2004. The Department anticipates these contracts to be selected, negotiated, Transportation Commission approved and signed by May 11, 2004. **One notable exception will be the EC 894 related to the I-40 / Kilpatrick Turnpike Feasibility Study. This contract is targeted for approval at the March Commission Meeting and will require a response deadline of 4:30 p.m. on Friday, February 6th, 2004.**

We would also take the opportunity to advise you of coming developments related to the future solicitation of engineering services and our communications.

- 1) The Department is preparing to post information related to Consultants on our website at the following address: <http://www.okladot.state.ok.us/projmgmt/> . You must access this site by typing in the exact address as shown above, as initially it will not be linked to our general information homepage will not be available as general public information. The site should be available sometime during the last week of January, 2004.
- 2) During the course of calendar year 2004, the Department will implement a conversion to an email-based Consultant communication system. This system, in conjunction with the website, will be utilized to keep you updated of solicitations of interest and to distribute other general information. In order to identify your proper email addresses and to insure you continue to receive all pertinent information, **YOU MUST COMPLETE AND RETURN THE ATTACHED EMAIL ADDRESS DESIGNATION FORM.** This form allows you to identify a primary and up to six secondary email addresses that you would like included in our email group.

As always, your assistance, cooperation and patience is greatly appreciated. Please do not hesitate to make us aware of any questions, comments or concerns that you may have as we implement the new solicitation format and the new communication systems.

xc: Director
Chief Engineer
AD - Preconstruction
AD - Operations
Field Division Engineers

**Oklahoma Department of Transportation
 Consultant Forum Meeting
 August 20th, 2003**

**WRITTEN COMMENTS SHEET
 SUMMARY OF CONSULTANT COMMENTS**

Firm name:	Primary Contact:
Address:	EMAIL:
City:	Phone:
State:	FAX:
Zip:	

A. The Department currently utilizes an inclusive solicitation list of Consultants that encompasses all individuals or firms registered to provide professional services in Oklahoma and who have indicated an interest in receiving Solicitations of Interest.

Should the Department consider developing an exclusive solicitation list of Consultants for various work types based on a firm's capabilities as established through a pre-qualification review?

1. Suggest that ODOT develop 4 – 6 broad categories (engineering, geotechnical, surveying, construction, etc.) that solicitations may fall under. Firms would then be able to identify the categories for which they wanted to receive solicitations. No pre-qualification would be necessary.
2. We prefer the inclusive solicitation list. It informs us of other opportunities that are on the outer perimeter of our areas of expertise and possibly team with other firms to properly service unique project requirements.
3. No, the firm should know their capabilities. This action will prevent growth and advancement of the consulting firms. By limiting the number pages submitted "as letter of interest" the review and short listing process will be easier for all parties.
4. No. Please keep the list inclusive. Our staff content may change between annual submittals of CAP form. We can make the decision whether our skills are applicable or not. That would not be "too much paperwork" ☺. Also that keeps us informed of what is going to happen in the state – word travels thru verbal networks as well.
5. No
6. Not necessarily.

 Pre-qualification might eliminate small companies that staff up and down depending on the project load and give unfair advantage to large companies that have a larger pool of staff.

 If we pre-qualified under the expectation of work but never got a contract, then pre-qualifying (presumably yearly) would just be an additional paperwork and monetary burden.

 A pre-qualification review might be useful, especially if later RFQ could be a one-page submittal, even email.
7. It sounds good on the outside but it could cause firms that have become qualified to be excluded. If the list was based on the Pre-qualified list it would be good and current for one year.
8. We would support this idea as a way to reduce the number of solicitations, submittals, etc. on a particular project by prequalifying consultants by work type (county bridges, complex bridges, traffic engineering,

rural two-lane, rural multilane, complex urban, surveying, etc.). It would, however, involve a yearly or other periodic submittal by all interested consultants and the associated evaluation by ODOT staff. This type of procedure is effectively done in other states.

9. Yes.
10. Yes.
11. Yes. We believe this would help the Department obtain the most qualified specialty services. All potential engineers/consultants would have a better understanding of which firms are qualified by ODOT's standards.
12. Yes. The Consultants need to be advised as to the different types of lists so that they are not inadvertently left off of a list they feel qualified for.
13. Yes.
14. If the Department goes to email distribution, we would like to get all solicitations. Another option would be to let the Consultant select which type of solicitations he receives (the Feds do something like that).
15. Yes.
16. Developing an exclusive solicitation list of Consultants based upon a firm's capabilities and prequalification would streamline ODOT's current solicitation procedure. Such a system offers advantages including reduced Departmental work effort in preparing the solicitation and less expense through directed mailings to a target audience.

Difficulties arise however when attempting to assure that those best qualified receive the solicitation. How would ODOT identify a project's target group of pre-qualified consultants? Complex projects involve expertise in various disciplines, including roadway, bridge, construction services, et cetera. Trying to classify the appropriate project category for mailings to pre-qualified consultants is difficult at best and could potentially exclude a best-qualified consultant from competing if the project classification is too narrow. Such exclusion would in-turn harm ODOT and the citizens of Oklahoma by precluding the best-qualified consultant from preparing the work.

In order to further streamline the solicitation process and assure all pre-qualified consultants compete equally, ODOT may wish to develop a web-based solicitation process. ODOT could assign a general classification on projects posted to the website and then shift the burden of meeting the appropriate pre-qualification requirements back onto the consultants who elect to respond. Those consultants that meet the pre-qualification requirements would compete for consideration in assisting ODOT with the work, while those consultants that fail to meet the pre-qualification requirements would be deemed non-responsive.

Would it cause your firm hardship if the Department mandated a primary email address in order to receive Solicitations of Interest?

1. Yes, a primary email address might cause a hardship for our firm. We would prefer a "group" email be set up that would contain multiple firm email addresses (such as 6 or 7).
2. We prefer Solicitations of Interest thru the mail, but a primary email address for solicitations would NOT cause hardship.
3. No, that is a great idea.
4. No. That would work just fine.
5. No – Use E-Mail.
6. Email is not a hardship.

7. No hardship at all.
8. No. We would agree to this type of solicitation. It would reduce paperwork, postage, and administrative effort by ODOT for each solicitation. It could be combined with a prequalification procedure as proposed above to further reduce the Department's administrative burden with consultant selection.
9. No.
10. No. That is probably the fastest way to exchange information.
11. No. This would be the most efficient and cost effective approach for all parties concerned.
12. No. This is a good idea.
13. No.
14. No. However, I would like to have the solicitations sent to more than one email address. Sometimes emails get "lost in the mail" or deleted by screening software and we cannot afford to miss an important solicitation.
15. No.
16. A Departmental mandate requiring a primary email for receipt of Solicitations of Interest would not cause an undue hardship on our firm.

B. The Oklahoma Transportation Commission recently approved the Department's 2004 – 2011 Construction Work Plan. Based on the projected resource requirements of the Work Plan, the Department anticipates a continuation of our outsourcing efforts to assist in the expeditious delivery of the encompassed projects.

With consideration for your firm's capabilities, what types of transportation projects are most conducive to outsourcing?

1. Multidisciplinary projects that go across the boundaries of various divisions are most conducive to outsourcing.
2. ODOT should consider outsourcing the following:
Corridor Improvements
Complex Multi-phase Projects
Time Sensitive Projects
3. Roadway, R/W & Utilities, Bridge, Environmental clearance and Site Assessments, Construction management projects.
4. Of course we like bridge replacement projects or roadway projects. Historically, we have prepared plans for over 30 county bridge replacements – using standard designs and performing the hydraulics work ourselves. We are efficient at these. A lot of state hwy bridges would be of this scope also that can be done using the std. designs. The state bridges could be grouped together as in the last advertisement in Lincoln County. We have put as many as 3 bridges together in a single county construction contract (BIA job).
5. Rural and Urban Highways, Bridges, Surveying, Hydraulics/Hydrology
6. Being a bridge design company, of course we believe bridge design would be an ideal candidate for outsourcing.
Rural designs, as mentioned in the meeting, would be good.
Technical subspecialties could be outsourced, geotechnical, right of way, hydraulics.

Bridge repair as we are consultants to bridge repair companies.

7. Bridge replacements, corridor design, traffic engineering, municipal street design, hydraulic and hydrologic studies and mapping.
8. Virtually any type of design or planning project would be conducive to outsourcing. It would appear, however, that smaller projects (bridge rehab, roadway rehab, etc.) would not justify the time and effort required for selection unless several projects could be packaged together in some manner.
9. Small Bridge, Rural Highways, Surveys, City Streets.
10. Any project with a short fuse. Bridge rehab, rural projects could sit on the shelf for a year or two.
11. QC / QA, pavement testing, pavement design, geotechnical services. These are the services we are most familiar with and have experienced that the outsourcing of these services have been seen as beneficial by other agencies we have worked with.
12. Cannot readily think of any that are not conducive to outsourcing, unless it is any project so small that the cost associated with the solicitation is relatively high.
13. Roadway plans, rural & urban, including expressways & parkways, Bridges of most types, Hydraulics & Hydrology for bridges, Ground surveys, Right-of-Way plans.
14. Roadway and Bridge Design, Project Management, Alignment studies.
15. Bridges, road widening, resurfacing.
16. Our firm believes that virtually all transportation projects are conducive to outsourcing, including system planning, preliminary/final design plans, program and construction management, et. Cetera. Rather than pre-determine categories of projects for future outsourcing, ODOT should concentrate on work-load leveling. Under the practice of work-load leveling, consultants truly become an extension of ODOT staff. When work loads exceed the available resources within the Department, ODOT may then utilize the expertise of consultants in meeting the Department's needs.

*Should the Department consider packaging Solicitations of Interest in groups by project type in order to allow Consulting firms to respond with a single statement of qualifications?
Other suggestions?*

1. Yes, we would like to see solicitations packaged in groups by project type. Our suggestion is to limit the number of projects in a group (i.e., 5-6). One concern is that even if a grouping of projects makes sense for an SOQ, it could be difficult to prepare for an interview if the projects are multi-faceted and ODOT is only interested in a firm's experience in one facet of the project. Would firms be informed of the experience they should emphasize during an interview on multiple projects? Would multiple firms be selected to interview for individual projects on a grouped SOQ? Many questions could arise from this scenario.
2. Packages could be by grouped by scope or by area, but allow the consultant to select the projects that best fit their areas of expertise from an exclusive solicitation list.
3. No, packaging solicitation will limit design firms from qualifying for more than one project in each group. However, limiting the number of pages allowed in response to the RFP would be beneficial to all parties.
4. We strongly believe in qualification based selection and a strong emphasis on the interview.
5. This is a good idea. If ODOT were to list a group of bridges around the state to be offered this qtr or this year, we could prioritize our interest by area or region of the state or by knowledge of the river. I'm sure that interviews get to be a chore for you all: the City of Tulsa has addressed this by advertising a list of projects, taking letters of interest, interviewing a group of consultants (all sizes and shapes) qualified to do

the work. Then the interview committee makes assignments of consultants to projects based on size, scope, what they learned about expertise. That method has worked well for us as consultants. We interview once in 3 years!

6. Yes-Package 3 to 4 similar projects.
Short List 7 to 10
7. Would like a way to subscribe to a list of RFQ by project type. For instance using the categories in the 8 Year plan we might subscribe to a list of "bridges and approaches", "grade, drain and bridge", "interchanges", and "bridge repair", with the intent of replying to the first three while encouraging clients to respond to the last.
8. Email list subscriptions would be a way to allow consultants to keep apprised of solicitations. Solicitation list could be categorized, same list as pre-qualifications, for instance, bridges and approaches, interchanges, bridge repair, etc. List could be subscribed to, by category, so even though we were not answering the RFQ for bridge repair for instance, we would know about the projects that are available for our clients.

As mentioned in the meeting there is a need to package solicitations in such a way to be able to select to respond to 5 out of 10 projects that might suit us.
9. Solicitation in groups for like-kind project types is a way to minimize the department's resources and time. The consultants should be allowed to respond for portions of the solicitation of interest that they feel comfortable in accomplishing. Sometimes consultants have specific knowledge about a particular project which the department could capitalize on. Our policy is to only respond on projects which we can perform within the deadlines. We have found that this makes us very credible in the eyes of the clients knowing full well that if we say we can perform we will.
10. We would strongly recommend that projects be packaged in groups, either for accomplishment or merely for selection purposes (example: shortlist six firms for three projects). This would reduce cost and effort by consultants and the Department, and would serve to streamline the selection process. It is not necessary to go through a solicitation, shortlisting and interviewing procedure for every individual project. Projects could be packaged by type, size, or other manner.
11. Yes.
12. N/A.
13. Yes. For the services we provide, but for others, there may be certain aspects of jobs that require a different set of expertise.
14. Yes, they should. If the consultant feels particularly suited to any of the projects in a group, they should be allowed to explain why in their transmittal letter.
15. This appears that it would be beneficial to both the consultant and the Department.
16. That would be great. However, we have never felt that the initial letter of interest with the statement of qualifications was a hardship. But with an increased number of solicitations, it could be. ODOT may consider only accepting 254/255s with no additional material.
17. Yes.
18. Although packaging SOIs in groups by project type may economize the solicitation process (i.e., fewer mailings and reduced number or responses for review), I believe this process may work against ODOT's best interests. Frequently, consultants possess unique, specialized knowledge and skill relevant to specific projects. Examples include knowledge gained from living in the project region, past work on adjacent sections of work, and specialized skills such as design of complex bridges and drainage issues. Grouping projects according to type and subsequently soliciting qualifications by group increases the difficulty for a consultant to highlight their special knowledge and skills relevant to a specific project. Consequently, the Department might not have the opportunity to truly recognize a consultants's ability to assist in overall work-load leveling for ODOT.

One possible area of services that lend themselves to a broad solicitation would be “on-call” services. Under this approach, ODOT could utilize a “budget, not to exceed” contract vehicle to cover specific types of work necessary to balance the Department’s peak work-load. These contracts could be awarded to several consulting firms with the understanding that future work depends upon performance. Those consultants selected would then have the opportunity to compete among themselves for elements of work within the limits of the overall on call budget. Those consultants that excel in performance would possess a superior competitive advantage for follow-on work. Consequently, ODOT would recognize the competitiveness necessary to assure quality projects, while reducing the need to re-solicit qualifications.

Should the Department establish a regular time cycle for releasing Solicitations of Interest (monthly, quarterly, twice-yearly, yearly) and are there specific months that would be more conducive to your business planning?

1. We prefer monthly releases; are willing to accept quarterly, but would not like only twice-yearly or yearly releases.
2. Quarterly – January, April, July, October
3. Monthly.
4. A quarterly advertisement would be good. We could anticipate the advertisements.
5. Issue solicitations quarterly. Group projects by type (i.e. bridge rehab, rural, urban, etc). Consider grouping projects by location.
6. Quarterly would be fine. No specific months would be any better or worse.
7. Solicitations of Interest at any time are welcome but probably quarterly is a more manageable schedule for ODOT.
8. Some sort of regular cycle should be established for releasing solicitations of interest. It is understood that there will be exceptions from time to time, but this would allow consultants to better plan their marketing efforts. ODOT’s financially constrained 8-Year Program should allow this to be accomplished. As far as an appropriate time interval, we feel that a quarterly cycle would be appropriate.

An additional recommendation would be for the Department to regularly publish a “look-ahead” list of projects likely to be let out to consultants. This list would provide an advance planning tool by indicating projects likely to be let out to consultants for the next 9 to 12 months or so. The list could be subject to minor changes and would not have to be absolutely final in nature.

9. Yes. No.
10. This would be helpful since it will help consultants to schedule projects and manpower.
11. Routine releases would insure that the Department is getting responses from all parties.
12. We do not see the advantage to this. We would be happy to be considered any time there is a need.
13. Quarterly appears to be a good release cycle. Any month is OK with our firm, for the quarterly release.
14. There will probably always be a need to release some solicitations immediately when a special need or emergency arises. For jobs/projects in the 8-year work plan, I think quarterly works well.
15. No.
16. As stated above, we believe that ODOT should view consultants as an extension of Departmental staff. Consultant services work as an outreach program for ODOT to balance Departmental work load and help ODOT timely achieve the State’s desired goals. With regard to the Department establishing a regular

time cycle for releasing SOIs, the consulting community needs to embrace the concept of serving ODOT as an extension of Departmental staff. Under this rationale, the need for consulting services, as well as the frequency of SOIs, largely depends on the Departments' real time assessment of a balanced work-load. Consequently, specific months for releasing SOIs conducive to the consulting community becomes less important than ODOT's need for balancing the existing work load.

Accordingly, ODOT may wish to consider the development of a web-based solicitation system. One possible format might include a section of "future" projects or areas of work the Department believes to be on the horizon and a section of "open for Solicitation" projects. Projects identified as "future" would include those projects and items of work with no specific time-frame. Website descriptions of these projects and items of work could carry a disclaimer reserving ODOT the right to change the scope and associated construction cost prior to an actual solicitation and include a brief explanation of the expected services, general vicinity, anticipated construction cost, et. Cetera. This section of the website would serve as a "heads-up" for consultants to perform initial research, site reconnaissance, and other "homework" rather than waiting for the actual SOI. Such a section might also mitigate the inundation of requests for information that frequently fall upon ODOT after the solicitation. The second section of the website, "Open for Solicitation" projects, could include a copy of the information historically mailed to consultants with hard copies of the SOI.

C. The Department has identified a need to have projects that can be quickly prepared for advancement to letting and construction ahead of the Construction Work Plan letting date and is considering creating an "on the shelf" project group.

What contracting difficulties should we be aware of before we proceed with such a plan?

1. Changes to specifications and standards; last minute revisions; bid support, etc. Our questions would be: How will unexpected changes be handled? How will plan changes and consultant responsibilities for bidding support be handled? Another concern is to avoid the "boom and bust" cycles which have happened in the past as a result of "on the shelf" projects. If a project is being designed and it is known that it will be put on the shelf for 6 to 18 months, critical decisions are usually delayed and review processes are extended. The project is labeled low priority. When design schedules fall behind more than 18 months an acceptable contract adjustment should be implemented for remobilization of the project design team.

All projects that are reactivated from shelf life should be updated prior to bidding. Many items can change, for example, standards, pay items, pavements typical sections, other materials, field conditions, treatment of special conditions, etc.

2. We are aware of any major contracting difficulties. We are currently working under many long term contracts with our clients and have not faced any major problems.

3. N/A

4. Provide hourly rates for updating plans as needed prior to letting.

5. Would we be paid in full at the "on the shelf" date?

Would we be retained for any changes that develop during the on the shelf period, through no fault of our own but site changes or standards changes?

Would we be penalized if we could not do unanticipated changes? Staffing might change after project "completion" or workload might prohibit availability for rework.

If we were going to be "on call" for 6 to 18 months then that cost would have to be added to the original contract. Or would it be a separate contract?

6. Try not to outpace the available Oklahoma consulting pool.

7. An “on the shelf” project will inevitably have last-minute revisions relating to updated standards, revised design guidelines, right-of-way revisions, etc. The consultant should be given an opportunity to truly complete the project in advance, and a provision should be made in the contract to pay the consultant for any necessary changes due to Department updates. It is not fair to merely hold completion of a project to avoid payment of this type.
8. N/A
9. ODOT review time should be included in all projects and could be beneficial to include certain time limits in the contract.
10. This would have little, if any affect on any services we would be providing.
11. Care must be taken not to penalize consultants for having to wait on services outside his control, such as environmental review or geotech.
12. Plans would possibly need updating if they are “on the shelf” very long. You would have to consider limiting the number of plans on the shelf if you are considering any major update of specifications, standards, or other design criteria.
13. It is often difficult for both the Consultant and the Department to make a project a priority unless it has a real deadline, which is usually the “drop dead” date.
14. Since Standards and procedures (i.e. x-sections, typicals, asphalt types, etc.) are constantly changing, the project would have to be let as designed, or a supplemental negotiated. Obviously “small” changes could be made, but “small” changes are subjective and usually the Consultant and the Department disagree on the level of effort.
15. Projects with difficult environmental issues should remain in-house.
16. On the shelf projects pose problems for both ODOT and the consulting community. One difficulty arises in equitably contracting the services. Specifically, these contacts typically lead to open, inactive work that the administrative departments (i.e. both ODOT and the consultant) must continually track and manage. Accordingly, supplemental agreements typically arise because of the time scale necessary to hold a project in the open, inactive status. Additionally, when work becomes active after an extended pause, the scope is subject to a greater likelihood of change, which again leads to the necessity of a supplementary agreement of contract modification. Consequently, ODOT will need to develop an equitable approach to contracting for these unforeseen instances. Due to the very nature of unforeseen instance on these type of contracts, developing an equitable approach becomes exceedingly difficult.

One possible contracting solution might be to develop a contingency addition to the initial budget. Although allocating an appropriate amount of money to the contingency would be difficult, ODOT may have sufficient historical data to develop a range for particular types of work or projects.

What types of projects do you believe have a greater “shelf life”, or would be minimally impacted by changes in design guidelines and/or standards?

1. Rural projects have a greater “shelf life” as opposed to urban projects. The urban landscape tends to change more often than rural.
Rural projects generally experience less changes in roadside conditions
New Alignments with right-of-way all ready purchased
Fully urbanized areas
2. Bridge Projects (High Shelf Life)
Rural Roadway Projects (Average Shelf Life)
Urban Projects (Low Shelf Life)
Maintenance project (low shelf life, due to changing condition)
3. Shelf life is effect when design policies and requirements are changed.

4. As mentioned at the meeting, perhaps the rural projects would lend themselves to time on the shelf . Smaller projects probably would also lend themselves to spending time on the shelf.
5. Bridge rehab, rural projects, bridge replacements.
6. Rural projects.
Bridges.
Bridge Repair
Any repair or maintenance type project - joint sealing etc.
7. Basic bridge overlay projects.
Roadway replacements of over 5 miles in length.
Roadway enhancements in rural areas.
8. Open country rural roadway design projects and bridge/bridge rehab projects would appear to be the least likely to be impacted by changes. It would seem that complex urban projects, urban street projects, and roadway rehab projects would be most likely to be changed.
9. Bridges, Traffic.
10. Bridge rehab. Rural highway projects.
11. N/A.
12. Roadway seems to be more likely to have standards changes. Also, the longer projects are more impacted because of the number of sheets that change.
13. At this time, local government type of projects and certain types of bridges.
14. I believe small projects with fewer elements would have a longer shelf life. However, we need all sizes of projects on the shelf.
15. Bridges, replacement.
16. Shelf life depends largely on project specific conditions and the associated design criteria. Examples include expected right-of-way needs and availability arising from utility and economic development within a region, changed conditions associated with decreases/increases in the motoring public, revised Departmental design criteria arising from changes in design codes and AASHTO guidelines, et. Cetera. Accordingly, bridges and "local, low volume roads" probably lend themselves to greater shelf lives than other, more complex transportation projects.

Assuming that the Department was unable to advance an "on the shelf" project to an early letting, what contracting or project development mechanisms can be utilized to minimize the need for and impact of updating the design information?

1. Contract mechanisms that could be utilized are to provide bid support; provide clauses to allow changes to standards and specifications; provide equitable fees to compensate consultants for making changes.
2. For small changes ODOT could issue an addendum to update the plans.
For large changes ODOT should require the original consultant to update the plans.
Close your eyes and hope for the best!
3. Task order similar to PM/CE and Construction Management program.
4. N/A
5. N/A
6. Insure that all parties are aware of proposed updating of standards. "Right hand knows what left hand is doing." For instance we finish a bridge and then the standard on some part of it, for instance the parapet,

is changed. ODOT should be required to alert the consultant to the probability of upcoming change and minimize the rework.

Is there a way to put an alert or update requirement from the building permit department to ODOT, and therefore consultants, on changes to infrastructure in pending affected areas in city?

7. A separate contract phase to the original design contract that would allow the original consultant to proceed to update plans via a verbal notice to proceed with prearranged work classifications and limited scopes.
8. As mentioned above, a provision could and should be made for paying the consultant to make necessary changes in the final plans as needed due to revisions in Department policies, standards, etc.
9. N/A
10. Many changes to the plans are either due to topo change or revised standards. Topo changes should be reflected on the plans, but standard changes are not essential.
11. N/A.
12. Do not insist on redesign. If possible, use the old standards. Consider summarizing the updates in an addendum type document if the design is not seriously affected. This could be issued separately and would minimize plan changes. Maybe only the pay summary sheet would have to be changed.
13. Possible a project could be let with the understanding that it will be constructed using the criteria, standards and specifications that were current at the time the design plans were completed.
14. I think that as long as the specifications and methods used or to be used are clearly defined in the plans, there is no need to update the design. Asphalt types could be easily changed. However, Federal requirements may dictate changes. ODOT may want to consider quarterly or semi-annual changes to design standards along with a more formal method of notifying Consultants of changes.
15. Put money in the contract for future updating. If no update is necessary, close the contract and return the money to the pot.
16. Because Federal stipulations regarding design criteria frequently attach to project funding, minimizing the need for updating design becomes a difficult issue. As mentioned in Section C.1. above, ODOT may wish to attach a contingency budget to on the shelf projects in order to mitigate contracting and project development concerns.

D. Your time, cooperation and participation in the Consultant Forum are greatly appreciated. Your comments are extremely important to us. Therefore, if you have other general questions, comments or concerns related to the Department's outsourcing processes, please take advantage of this opportunity to convey them. You may utilize the space below and/or attach additional pages as necessary.

1. N/A
2. Quality of Plans should be considered part of the consultant selection process.
ODOT should require that 100 percent of the work be performed by Oklahoma residents who pay local taxes and state income taxes.
Local consultants should help ODOT get the message out to state legislatures to support transportation programs.
ODOT is encouraged to fully support QBS Process.
3. N/A
4. N/A

5. Our firm was selected for a Garvee project. The fee was negotiated but a work order never issued. Could you look at grouping several similar projects which are in the 8 year plan and hold a selection process to award these projects to firms which had but no longer have Garvee projects?
6. Pre-qualification Review How would pre-qualifying be different than filling out the CAP 254 and CAP 255? Just seems like more paperwork.
- If inclusive means registered in Oklahoma, CAP 255, and sent to ODOT, and results in 180 firms, everyone is “pre-qualified” for every project. If the solicitations are more narrowly broadcast, for instance by email list that can be subscribed to by category, then every one of the 180 firms would not necessarily reply to every solicitation. It would be our job as consultant to keep our subscriptions to the lists relevant.
- Pre-qualifying would need to be updated periodically to be relevant, whereas the subscription list could be updated as often as necessary. Replies could be limited to one page email which would be basically just a statement of interest, or four pages which could include resumes, project descriptions or whatever. Establish a firm page count and enforce it. This could prevent proposal “creep”.
- For “on the shelf “ projects would the original engineer be contractually obligated to do the updating? Would ODOT be contractually obligated to use the original engineer to do the updating? For small consulting firms these could be huge issues.
7. N/A
8. We appreciate the effort made to communicate with the consultant community. We hope that this process continues in the future.
- We feel strongly that ODOT should continue to select consultants primarily based on qualifications to perform any project. Equally important, however, is to make every effort to select firms that will perform the work in the State of Oklahoma with Oklahoma residents. In-state staff capability is a superior definition to “in-state” than simply having an office in the state. Awarding the work to in-state firms is a benefit not only to the consultant community but to the entire state.
- We encourage the continued use and expansion of demand-services contracts. These are a useful tool for the Department to utilize consultant resources on a quick turnaround basis without the time and effort required for a selection process on each project.
9. N/A
10. We appreciate the opportunity to express any opinions and have an input in ODOT's decision making. I certainly appreciate Mr. Streb's comments regarding ODOT – Consultant's partnership. It's obvious that the Department's effort is genuine and is certainly welcomed.
11. N/A.
12. N/A.
13. Some of the items being considered in the “Partnering” discussions need to be implemented.
- Scope of work and fee negotiations are areas that need to be improved. There has been little or no time allowed for meetings, quality control, and in some cases enough cross sections allowed to address drives, section line roads, and other miscellaneous items. Cross sections are important when establishing right-of-way needs.
- There also needs to be better communication between field construction people and the design staff, or consultant with a team work approach.
14. I believe that the 8-year work plan and “on the shelf” plans are excellent ideas and will help the Department and the State of Oklahoma be more proactive and fiscally responsible. The “open door” policy presented at the meeting is welcomed and appreciated. Any challenges can be overcome and are negligible compared to the benefits of such a plan.

15. No logic your selection process. Some firms have \$ millions in contracts, while others have \$ 0. Out of state corporations have contracts while Oklahoma corporations have none.
16. ODOT may wish to develop a section on the existing website that facilitates better communication both internally and among the Department and consulting community. Items of interest might include frequently asked questions, lessons learned (i.e., good and bad) on past projects, and general announcements such as upcoming training opportunities. Additional information might include consultants selected for the recent contract awards and changes in organizational structure (i.e. promotions, changes within the Department).

As members of the consulting community, we appreciate ODOT's request for our input and genuinely hope some of our responses will help in ODOT planning.

Thank you for your comments and please feel free to call on us at your convenience if you have questions related to the completion of this sheet.

DIVISION 1				DIVISION ESTIMATE	\$0
COUNTY: WAGONER		CONTRACT NO. EC 891		COUNTY ESTIMATE	\$0
DIV. 1	WAGONER	LET	PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING		
		FFY 2004	SH-51 FROM WAGONER TO TAHLEQUAH (ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES)		
SH051	MI.				
DIVISION 3				DIVISION ESTIMATE	\$19,498,400
COUNTY: MCCLAIN		CONTRACT NO. EC 892		COUNTY ESTIMATE	\$7,653,400
DIV. 3	MCCLAIN	LET 11/2005	GRADE, DRAIN AND SURFACE		\$7,653,400
13574(04)	STPY-044B(319)	FFY 2006	US 62: FROM 0.15 MI WEST OF THE C/L NORTHEAST THROUGH BLANCHARD (RECONST. ADDED CAPACITY)	(H-42) SMC 80/20	
US062	1.04 MI.				
COUNTY: POTTAWATOMIE		CONTRACT NO. EC 893		COUNTY ESTIMATE	\$11,845,000
DIV. 3	POTTAWATOMIE	LET	BRIDGE AND APPROACHES		\$2,383,000
20880(04)	BRIY-0040-5(383)178	FFY 2007	I-40 UNDER SH-102, 5.0 MI EAST OF THE OKLAHOMA COUNTY LINE		
IS040	0.02 MI.				
DIV. 3	POTTAWATOMIE	LET	BRIDGE AND APPROACHES		\$4,640,000
21002(04)	BRIY-0040-5(387)180	FFY 2009	I-40 OVER NORTH CANADIAN OVERFLOW, 6.1 MILES EAST OF OKLAHOMA COUNTY LINE EAST & WEST BOUND	SMC=90/10	
IS040	0.08 MI.				
DIV. 3	POTTAWATOMIE	LET	BRIDGE AND APPROACHES		\$4,822,000
20320(04)	BRIY-0040-5(379)179	FFY 2011	I-40: AT DEER CREEK, 5.3 MILES EAST OF OKLAHOMA COUNTY LINE		
IS040	0.08 MI.		SMC=80/20		
DIVISION 4				DIVISION ESTIMATE	\$5,500,000
COUNTY: CANADIAN		CONTRACT NO. EC 894		COUNTY ESTIMATE	\$0
DIV. 4	CANADIAN	LET	PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING		
		FFY 2004	I-40/KILPATRICK TURNPIKE FEASIBILITY STUDY TO COMPLETE ADDITIONAL MOVEMENTS AT INTERCHANGE		
IS040	MI.				
COUNTY: PAYNE		CONTRACT NO. EC 895		COUNTY ESTIMATE	\$5,500,000
DIV. 4	PAYNE	LET 09/2006	BRIDGE AND APPROACHES		\$5,500,000
20875(04)	BRFY-160A(110)	FFY 2006	SH-51 AT STILLWATER & AN UNNAMED CREEK, 0.5 MI WEST OF STILLWATER		
SH051	0.3 MI.				
DIVISION 5				DIVISION ESTIMATE	\$1,300,000
COUNTY: BECKHAM		CONTRACT NO. EC 896		COUNTY ESTIMATE	\$1,300,000
DIV. 5	BECKHAM	LET	RESURFACE		\$1,300,000
20800(04)	STPY-105A(080)	FFY 9999	I-40B THROUGH ELK CITY		
IS040B	3 MI.				
DIVISION 6				DIVISION ESTIMATE	\$8,736,654
COUNTY: TEXAS		CONTRACT NO. EC 897		COUNTY ESTIMATE	\$8,736,654
DIV. 6	TEXAS	LET	GRADE AND DRAIN		\$2,500,001
20312(04)	NHY-008N(047)	FFY 2009	US-54: FROM 0.5 NORTH OF US-64, EXTEND NORTH 4.3 MILES (PARALLEL LANES)	SMC=80/20	
US054	4.3 MI.				
DIV. 6	TEXAS	LET	GRADE AND DRAIN		\$2,636,653
14971(05)	NHY-008N(007)	FFY 2008	US-54 FR APPROX 5.0 MI NORTH OF OPTIMA EXT NORTH TO 1.25 MI SOUTH OF US-64 IN HOOKER (4 LANE)	CORRIDOR RTE SMC 80/20	
US054	4.75 MI.				
DIV. 6	TEXAS	LET	GRADE, DRAIN AND SURFACE		\$3,600,000
20839(04)	NHY-008N(050)	FFY 2011	US-54 FROM 1.25 MI SOUTH OF US-64 IN HOOKER, NORTH 1.75 MI (CONCRETE)		
US054	1.75 MI.				

DIVISION 7				DIVISION ESTIMATE	\$11,897,759
COUNTY: GRADY			CONTRACT NO. EC 899	COUNTY ESTIMATE	\$0
DIV. 7	GRADY	LET	PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING		
		FFY 2004	US-81 CORRIDOR STUDY FROM N. OF CHICKASHA N. TO UNION CITY TO COMPLETE 4 LANES ON US-81		
US081	MI.				
COUNTY: CADDO			CONTRACT NO. EC 898	COUNTY ESTIMATE	\$6,397,759
DIV. 7	CADDO	LET 01/2006	GRADE, DRAIN AND SURFACE		\$6,397,759
01817(04)	STPY-008B(308)	FFY 2006	SH 152 FR THE JCT OF SH146 EAST TO BINGER. (RECONST + SHLDRS)(NO BRIDGES)	SMC 80/20	
SH152	4.2 MI.				
COUNTY: LOVE			CONTRACT NO. EC 900	COUNTY ESTIMATE	\$5,500,000
DIV. 7	LOVE	LET	BRIDGE AND APPROACHES		\$5,500,000
20264(04)	BRFY-143C(046)	FFY 2007	SH-32: WALNUT BAYOU BRIDGES, 14.7 MILES EAST OF JEFFERSON COUNTY LINE	SMC=80/20	
SH032	0.5 MI.				

E-MAIL ADDRESS DESIGNATION FORM

CONSULTANT FIRM	
FEI NUMBER	
PRIMARY CONSULTANT CONTACT	
NAME OF CONTACT	
MAILING ADDRESS	
PHONE NUMBER	
FAX NUMBER	
E-MAIL ADDRESS	
SECONDARY CONSULTANT CONTACT(S)	
NAME OF CONTACT	
MAILING ADDRESS	
PHONE NUMBER	
FAX NUMBER	
E-MAIL ADDRESS	
NAME OF CONTACT	
MAILING ADDRESS	
PHONE NUMBER	
FAX NUMBER	
E-MAIL ADDRESS	
NAME OF CONTACT	
MAILING ADDRESS	
PHONE NUMBER	
FAX NUMBER	
E-MAIL ADDRESS	
NAME OF CONTACT	
MAILING ADDRESS	
PHONE NUMBER	
FAX NUMBER	
E-MAIL ADDRESS	
NAME OF CONTACT	
MAILING ADDRESS	
PHONE NUMBER	
FAX NUMBER	
E-MAIL ADDRESS	