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Traditional & Alternative Delivery Methods

**Design-Bid-Build Method (DBB)**
- Under the Design-Bid-Build method, a designer develops plans for the entire facility, and the Owner requests Bids from contractors. Everyone knows his role in this method, but the design for the entire project has to be complete before any construction starts.

**Design-Build Method (DB)**
- In the Design-Build method, the Owner contracts with one team to design and build the facility. This facilitates communication among team members, but the agency loses a level of control and commits all its monetary resources to one entity. Because the design and construction units work together as a team, construction proceeds in one area while another section is still being designed.

**Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) Method**
- This method allows the general contractor to participate as an adviser during the design process. This improves communication between the two parties because the general contractor provides input on the availability and cost of suggested materials and equipment, and also collaborates on other and possibly cheaper alternatives (means and methods).

**Public-Private Partnership (PPP / P3)**
- A P3 is a Contractual relationship between the Louisiana Transportation Authority (LTA) and one or more Private entities that requires the private party to plan, design, finance, construct, operate and maintain a transportation facility for a concession.
YOU ARE 150 YARDS FROM CENTER OF GREEN
YOU ARE 175 YARDS FROM A $200 GLASS WINDOW
CHOOSE YOUR CLUB CAREFULLY!
Delivery Method Selection Matrix

- Present a structured approach to assist the Department in making project delivery decisions
- Analyzes project goals and constraints
- Assigns point values based on selection criteria
- Factors considered in Matrix
  1. Schedule impacts
  2. Complexity & Innovation opportunities
  3. Level of design
  4. Costs and project delivery
  5. Risk Assessment
  6. Competition and contractor experience
Design-Build in Louisiana
The History of Louisiana’s Design-Build Program
Design-Build (DB) Project Summary

- 7 Design-Build Projects (5 Completed)
  - Mississippi River Crossing – John James Audubon (JJA)
  - 3 Interstate Widenings along I-10 and I-12 in Baton Rouge and one along US 90 South of Lafayette
  - 2 New Grade-Separated Interchange

- $683M Total: (Ranging from $24.5M to $355M)

- Performance-based vs. Prescriptive Specifications

- TIMED, State Surplus, Bond, and ARRA Funding

- Procurement Types: Proposal Options, Fixed Budget with Variable Scope, and Low Bid.
Louisiana’s Design-Build Projects

- John James Audubon (JJA) Bridge
- I-12 Widening (O’Neal Lane – Range Ave.)
- I-10 Widening (Siegen–Highland Rd.)
- US 90/ LA 85 Interchange
- US 90 (Albertson’s – Ambassador) → Ongoing
- US 90 / LA 318 Interchange → Ongoing
John James Audubon Bridge
John James Audubon Bridge

- Louisiana’s First Design-Build
- 100% State Funds (TIMED)
- Large Complex Project (at the time of award it was the state’s largest contract to-date)
- 14.6-mile Project
  - 4 lane cable-stayed bridge (12,000 feet)
  - 2 lane roadway approaches (12 miles)
  - 7 conventional bridge structures
John James Audubon Bridge

- Longest Cable Stayed Main Span in Western Hemisphere (1583’ Main Span)
- Innovative Foundation System – Movable Cofferdam
- The Mighty Mississippi River – Historic water levels in 2009 & 2011
- First use of Drilled Shafts in the Lower reaches of the Mississippi.
Movable Cofferdam
JJA Closure Pour
I-12 Widening (O’Neal to Range)

Proposal Selected

- Contractor – James Construction Group
- Price Proposal: $100 Million Surplus
- 1.1% in Change Orders
- Complete and opened to traffic – June 2012

Scope of project:

- New Concrete Pavement Replacement all 6 lanes
- New Twin Amite River Bridges (2600’ +/-)
- Staggered Project Termini
- Widened Overpass Structures (Range Ave & 4H Club Rd.)
I-12 Widening (O’Neal to Range Ave.)
American Recovery Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)

LA DOTD’s Design-Build projects funded through ARRA:

B  US 90 @ LA 85 Interchange (Future I-49 South)
B  I-10 Widening (Siegen–Highland Rd.)
B  I-12 Widening (Pete’s Hwy to Juban)

THE RECOVERY ACT -- -- -- and the -- -- -- FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
Future I-49 Interchange (US 90/LA85)
Future I-49 Interchange (US 90/LA85)

- Design-Builder - Gilchrist Construction Co.
  - Price Proposal Cost: $24.5 Million
  - Contract awarded -- Jan. 2010
  - Completed– June 2011
  - One (1) Zero-Dollar Change Order

ARRA Funded Project

New Grade-Separated Interchange along US 90 (Future I-49 South Corridor)

- Twin parallel overpass structures
- Performance Based Specifications
- Not-to-Exceed Budget ($32M)
Future I-49 Interchange (US 90/LA85)
I-10 Widening (Siegen to Highland)
I-10 Widening (Siegen to Highland)

- Design-Builder – Boh Bros Construction
  - Price Proposal: $59.99 Million
  - 1.9% in change Orders
  - Scope: Widen I-10 to 6 lanes and construct a new overpass over KCS RR
  - Contract Awarded – February 2010
  - Completed – June 2013
  - Lowest cost proposal was not selected – successfully defended court challenge.

ARRA-Funded Project

Performance Based Specifications

Not to exceed Budget ($60M)
**I-10 Widening (Siegen to Highland)**

### Challenges

- Highly Skewed I-10 Bridge over KCS Railroad
- Railroad Agreement with KCS RR
- Coordination with Adjacent ongoing I-10 DBB Project
- Scheduling & Coordination of construction activities with ENTERGY 230KV Transmission Line
I-10 Widening (Siegen to Highland)
I-10 Widening (Siegen to Highland)

- Accepted a Proposal that was not the lowest cost
  - Challenging Economic Times
  - Stakeholders accustomed to lowest bid
  - Variable Scope: Replacement Bridge versus Widened Bridge
  - Other projects could have been constructed with ARRA

- Legislative Hearing
  - Explanation of Procurement Process
  - Details of Adjectival Scoring System

- Court Hearing
  - Court upheld DOTD’s Award of the project and ability to seek clarification during Procurement process.
Procurement Strategy Changes in Wake of I-10 DB Hearings

- **Actions Taken for On-Going I-12 DB Procurement**
  - Individual Scoring without group consensus
  - Sensitivity Analysis – potential of not awarding to lowest price proposal.
  - Scoring Sheet -- % Weighting of Technical criteria
  - More Prescriptive Specifications (vs. Performance based)

- **Legislative Meetings**
  - Explanation of Process modifications
  - Details of Scoring & Sensitivity Analysis

- **Stakeholder Meetings**
  - AGC, ACEC, FHWA, etc.
  - Perspective Design-Builders

Design-Build Manual Production
I-12 Widening (Range to Juban)
I-12 Widening (Range to Juban)

ARRA-Funded Project
Continue the Widening of Interstate 12 (4 to 6 lanes)
Most Prescriptive-Based Specifications
Not-to-Exceed Budget ($37M)

Proposal Selected
- Contractor – Gilchrist Construction Company
- Original Price Proposal Cost: $36.2 Million
- Lowest cost proposal was selected
- 1.3% in change Orders
- Design-Build Contract awarded -- April 2010
- Complete and opened to traffic -- June 2012

Scope:
- New Asphalt for widened I-12 and rehabilitation of existing lanes
- Widening of several bridge and overpass structures
- Adjacent and Overlapping Design-Build Project
I-12 Widening (Range to Juban)
I-12 Widening (Range to Juban)
US 90 (Future I-49S) @ Albertson’s

- Continue the Widening of US 90 (4 to 6 lanes) to become the future I-49S
- Prescriptive-Based Specifications
- Proposal Selected
  - Contractor – James Construction Group
  - Original Price Proposal Cost: $57.1 Million
  - Design-Build Contract awarded – February 2014
  - Scheduled Completion -- Fall 2017
- Scope:
  - Widen from 4-6 lanes and bring up to Interstate standards
  - Construct frontage road system
  - Parallel bridge structures over BNSF Railroad
US 90 / Albertsons Intersection
US 90 / Albertsons – Future Intersection
US 90/LA 318 Interchange

- Continue the Widening of US 90 (4 to 6 lanes) to become the future I-49S
- New Interchange at US 90 and LA 318
- 1st Design-Build project in LA with R/W Acquisition by Design-Builder
- 1st Design-Build project in LA requiring Environmental document updates and modifications based on DB’s proposal.

Proposal Selected

- Contractor – Gilchrist Construction Company
- Original Price Proposal Cost: $55.7 Million
- Design-Build Contract awarded – June 2015
- Scheduled Completion -- July 2017

Scope:
- Widen from 4-6 lanes and bring up to Interstate standards
- Construct elevated interchange at LA 318 with ramps
- Existing frontage roads will be realigned to allow the new ramps to connect to LA 318.
Challenges and Successes
Culture Shift – Roles & Responsibilities

**FHWA**
- Stewardship Agreement to assist in defining roles and responsibilities as it relates to DB projects.
- Participation during procurement, design reviews, and construction administration.

**Designer and Contractor**
- Challenge to re-allocate risk and help Louisiana Contractors new to Design-Build understand that DB is not a “Spec book” project.

**LA DOTD**
- Held to a high level of responsiveness (quick review turnarounds)
- Higher level of scrutiny (public, press, and legislature)
- Required to re-tune their thinking from the Department’s usual way of doing business day-to-day.
Challenge -- Culture Shift (con’t)

Quality Control/Quality Assurance
- Design-Builder responsible for Acceptance Testing
- Design-Builder’s Initial lack of understanding of complete LA DOTD’s traditional role for inspection & acceptance.
- Uneasiness about new roles of QA/QC – con’t to seek DOTD approval before proceeding.
- FHWA-required change to new Quality Assurance Program (QAP) for Design-Build construction projects (OVF and con’t F & t monitoring).

Staffing and Time Constraints
- The Department does not have dedicated staff for innovative project delivery -- personnel are challenged to innovate and take on Design-Build work in addition to their “daily duties”.
- The Department was required to authorize funding (State Surplus and ARRA) within specified time frames.
- Typical Procurement Timeline (1 year) – LA DOTD procured multiple DB Projects within 6 – 8 months.
Challenge -- Contractor Coordination

B. Multiple corridor improvement projects are very challenging from a coordination standpoint.

- The Interstate-12 Design-Build Projects -- Two different Design-Builders within the same work zone.

- The I-10 Design-Build Project: Immediately adjacent to another major interstate reconstruction project (DBB).
Two Design-Builders – Same Work Zone
YOU’LL NEVER GET TO WORK ON TIME HAHA!!
Successes

B LA’s Design-Build Success
► Allowed Proposal Options – Great Value for LA DOTD
► Wide Range of Contract Sizes ($24.5M to $348M)
► Attracted National DB Industry – good exposure for local constructors
► Ability to capture funds (ARRA & Surplus)
► Process Upheld in Court
► Change Order rate -- 1.5% Avg. in COs (DOTD avg. 6-8% with a Goal of 5%)
► Approx. 12-18 months realized in overall time savings (DB vs. DBB)

B National Awards
► DBIA 2011 Transportation Owner of the Year (Highways and Bridges)
► DBIA National Design Excellence Award (JJA)
► ACI Award – 2013 Best concrete roadway and bridge project. (I-10)
► DBIA’s 2015 Design-Build Leadership Award – Jeff Burst, P.E. (LA DOTD)
Successes

Industry perspective:

► "Design Build affords contractors the opportunity to design and construct to their particular strengths, thereby minimizing construction time and improving the quality of the final product." – Boh Bros.

► "We have found that the opportunity for Contractors, Designers and LADOTD officials to collaborate on design and resolution to issues has produced a high quality end product in a short amount of time. We look forward to many Design-Build projects in the future from LADOTD.” – James Construction Group

► “Design-Build allowed us to produce a quality product in a highly travelled area in a shorter amount of time, thereby reducing risk, exposure, and inconvenience to all parties, especially the public.” – Gilchrist Construction Co.
Successes

Industry perspective con’t:

► “The Design Build Delivery method in our experience has been beneficial to the transportation industry. Not only has it allowed projects to be designed and constructed in a condensed time frame, but it has brought to the table value engineering with innovative designs. The partnering between all stakeholders, including the DOTD, contractors, engineers, and FHWA which has taken place during these projects has strengthened the working relationships and increased the level of collaboration between all parties.” -- Volkert

► “Design-Build is a great tool to allow contractors, designers, and LADOTD to work together to deliver quality projects to communities. As designers, it allows us to gain knowledge in many of the day-to-day field processes, and to help us develop solutions to challenges that the typical delivery processes do not.” – Stantec

► “FHWA would like to see more Design-Build from LA DOTD.”
Design-Build Resources (DBIA)

B Design-Build Institute of American (DBIA)

► National Chapter
  - Website: www.dbia.org
  - Commitment to Education
  - “Design-Build Done Right”
  - Advocacy, Education, Certification, Conferences, Resources
  - Owner’s Hotline

► Southwest Regional Chapter (LA, TX, AR, OK, & NM)
  - Website: www.dbia-sw.org

► Louisiana Chapter
Design-build accounts for more than 40% of all design and construction (includes vertical const.).

Design-build averages 6% in cost savings nationally.

Design-build projects have, on average, a 12% faster construction time.

Design-build projects are completed overall, on average, 33% faster than other delivery methods.

Design-build decreases an owner's administrative risk via the single point of Contract responsibility.
DBIA Facts & Stats

B Design-build fosters increased innovation.
B Some of our nation’s most notable projects were completed using Design-Build, including:
  ► Pentagon Renovation
  ► National Renewable Energy Laboratory
  ► I-15 in Utah – 2002 Winter Olympics
  ► Rebuild of the I-35 Bridge after its collapse (connecting Minneapolis and St. Paul)
  ► Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Surge Barrier Project (New Orleans after Katrina)
Design-Build Opportunities Moving Forward

1. Capture transportation funding
   - State Surplus, ARRA, Bond, Designated gas tax (i.e. TIMED)

2. Public perception
   - If Department and Industry are successfully delivering high quality projects on-time and within budget, with no disputes, public perception will be positive.

3. Industry perception
   - Convened industry Task Force to discuss procurement procedures
   - Adopted a Design-Build Procurement Manual
   - Currently drafting a Design-Build Construction Administration Manual
   - Continued dialogue with Industry will be key to maintaining a transparent and successful Design-Build program
4. **Education of the legislature**
   - Education of legislators on Design-Build Best Practices
   - Continuous feedback loop is an on-going process
   - Success of DB projects is the key to positive response
   - Because Design-Build projects must be submitted to legislative committee for approval, it is important to ensure that legislators are apprised of issues regarding Design-Build and expectations are managed.

5. **Education of Industry**
   - New Louisiana DBIA Chapter – Southwest Division
   - Workshops, Task Force, etc. -- Continuous Process Improvement through Feedback Loop
CMAR Overview
Construction Management at Risk (CMAR) is a delivery method which entails a commitment by the Construction Manager (CM) to deliver a project within a Guaranteed Maximum Price.

The intent of CMAR project delivery is to form a partnership with the Owner, the Design Consultant, and the Contractor.

These are processes that allow for early Contractor involvement during the Preliminary design stage.

An important role of the Contractor is to help provide constructability information to reduce risk in the design and construction phase.

It also affords the designer an opportunity to tailor the design of the project to the CMAR contractor’s preferred Means and Methods, access to certain specialized equipment, MOT, provide more detail for GMP Bidding purposes, and reduce construction time.
Why Use CMAR?

“The CM@Risk contracting method is a good option on certain transportation projects, where unique challenges call for contractor involvement during the design phase for the success of the project.”

-- FHWA
States with Enabling Legislation for CMAR

- Alaska
- Arizona
- California
- Colorado
- Florida
- Idaho
- Maryland
- Michigan
- Louisiana
- Minnesota
- Nevada
- Oregon
- Rhode Island
- Tennessee
- Utah
- Vermont
- Washington
CMAR Legislation

Process is detailed in law:

- LA Revised Statute 38:2225.2.4
- LA DOTD has legal authority to use this Delivery method
- Requires a Two-Step Procurement
  - Owner contracts with a Design Consultant using standard 24-102 selection process; and
  - Owner contracts with a Construction Contractor for a 2-Phased process – Pre-construction collaboration with the Design consultant and Phase II is to Bid and construct the project.
CMAR Process

B Contract with Designer

B Two Phase Contract with contractor

- Phase I – Pre-Construction Management

- Phase II – Bid/Construction Phase
CMAR Legislation Con’t

► Project must be estimated at a cost of $25+ Million (new Pilot stipulation)
► Establishes legal “definitions” for CMAR process
► Establishes “Selection Review Committee” membership
  ▶ No more than 5 members
  ▶ (1) from Consulting industry not participating in project
  ▶ (1) from Contracting industry not participating in project
  ▶ (1) from Owner Agency
  ▶ (2) At-Large members
► Establishes RFQ requirements for CMAR contractor
► Requires CMAR cost estimates throughout the process
► Requires a CMAR Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) to construct the project.
When to Use CMAR?

When to go with Construction Manager at Risk:

If the CMAR method provides so many benefits, why isn’t it used on every project?

- Well, not all projects are great contenders for CMAR.
- CMAR is most beneficial when:
  - The design is complex, difficult to define, subject to change and/or has several design options.
  - There is a high coordination requirement with external agencies that make cost over-runs and construction schedule a pressing concern.
  - The project is sequence or schedule sensitive.

The method is less suitable for straight-forward projects that are easily defined and lack schedule sensitivity.

When the project is finished, drivers won’t be able to tell which method was used, but having different options gives DOTD the ability to build the state’s highway system in a more effective manner.
Phase 1: Design w/ Contractor Input

Once a CMAR and Designer are selected:

- Provide constructability feedback
- Identity and mitigate risks
- Develop a cost model
- *Periodically submit Opinions of Probable Construction Cost (OPCC)*
- Bid on project

The contractor will provide advice on:

- Constructability
- Schedule
- Materials
- Equipment
- Cost Estimate/Budget
Phase 2: “Bid” Process

Owner asks Contractor to “Bid” the job

B Two estimates and One Bid:

► Designer-furnished Engineers Estimate -- Typically based on State Averages
► Independent Cost Estimator (ICE)
  ▸ Cost Validation
  ▸ Reflects Current Market Conditions, Production rates, etc.
► Contractor’s Bid
  ▸ Prepared for specific project bid items
  ▸ Typically based on production rates and unit price

B Two Possible Outcomes:

► Owner gets acceptable price (GMP) - Proceed with construction
► Owner doesn’t get a price within an acceptable range (+ 10%):
  ▸ Discuss contractor assumptions on risk and negotiate
  ▸ Refine the design package
  ▸ Rebid project’s GMP with CMAR contractor
  ▸ Convert to Design-Bid-Build
**Keys to a Successful CMAR Program**

- DOTD needs an open and competitive procedure for implementing a CMAR program – Development of CMAR Manual is almost complete.
- Contractor selection process that is transparent to Industry.
- DOTD, Design Community, and Contracting Industry have a solid Partnering environment.
- DOTD staff and Industry dedicated to CMAR delivery.

**Severable Packages**

- Order Girders
- Order State Furnished Equipment
- Build Haul Road
- Clear & Grub
- Early Utility Work
- Stockpile Material
CMAR Benefits

This method offers significant advantages and benefits on unique projects:

- Better designs = “Value Engineering” on the front end
- Increased opportunities for time and cost savings
- Model to implement and increase Innovation in design
- Owner control of the design
- Improved Cost Control (“Price Certain”)
- Risk reduction & allocation
- Improved design quality
- Schedule optimization
- Collaboration (Owner, Designer, and Contractor)
- Exceed Public Expectations
Risk Allocation

D-B-B

D-B

ECI

Contractor Risk

Owner Risk
Public-Private Partnerships (P3) Overview
P3 Process Flow Chart

STEP 1: Proposer submits unsolicited proposal and unsolicited proposal fee

STEP 2: Unsolicited proposal reviewed by LA DOTD Project Manager and staff

STEP 2A: Unsolicited proposal delivered to LTA for review and information

STEP 2B: Advisers retained and unsolicited proposer notified of time frame for review

STEP 2C: Advisers review unsolicited proposal and meet with the Proposer as needed

STEP 2D: Feasibility study conducted

STEP 3A: If LTA determines advertisement of the unsolicited proposal is necessary, LTA requests LA DOTD approval of state-designated project

STEP 3: LTA determination whether to advertise the unsolicited proposal

STEP 4: Advertisement made for 90 days and submitted competitive proposals are reviewed by retained advisors

STEP 4A: After review of proposals, LTA negotiates with one or more proposers

STEP 5: Information on the unsolicited proposal is submitted to the House and Senate Transportation, Highways and Public Works Committees for public hearing

STEP 6: LTA approves or disapproves a proposal and negotiates either a pre-development or comprehensive agreement

STEP 7: LTA and the successful proposer execute the PDA and upon LTA approval of the resultant transportation initiative, negotiate a CA

STEP 7: LTA, the responsible public entity(ies), and the successful proposer enter into a CA

KEY:
- Proposer activity: Green
- LTA activity: Blue
- LTA determination: Yellow
- Legislative activity: Brown
- PDA/CDA executed: Red
LTA CONSIDERATIONS FOR P3 PROJECT SELECTION (Sect. 1.5.1 LTA PPP GUIDELINES)

- Stakeholders desires and commitment
- Political & Institutional Support
- Transportation Need
  - Congestion
  - Safety
  - Economic Opportunity
  - System Connectivity
- Funding Potential
  - Tolling
  - Availability Payments (future DOTD funds)
- Cost/Schedule Risks shifted to Private sector
- Access to Capital Markets & Innovative Procurement
- Private Sector cost–effectiveness through innovation
- Lack of Internal Resources
Tasks to Assist in LTA Determination for P3 Project Selection

B  Review and analysis of the unsolicited proposal
   ➢ Engineering & constructability analysis
   ➢ Traffic demand modeling
   ➢ Toll operations & maintenance analysis
   ➢ Toll & revenue peer review
   ➢ Dedicated revenue source analysis and economic benefit
   ➢ Proposer cost assumptions, risk analysis, and credit vs. cost and O&M analysis
   ➢ Analyze risk and debt/equity investments by entity

B  Perform an Economic Feasibility study to substantiate the proposed project need, feasibility, and financial viability of the proposed project.
Proposal suggests constructing/reconstructing an initial 21 mile bypass of I-10 urban corridor of Baton Rouge

- Begins approximately 6 miles west of new bridge
- New alignment north to new interchange with US 190
- Follow old bridge east to US190/US 61 (Airline Highway) interchange
- Follow US 61 to I-12
- Continue on US 61 to a point to be determined just south of Jefferson
- New alignment to connect to I-10 (near Pecue Lane)

Proposal suggests 2 lanes in each direction tolled on existing ROW; un-tolled frontage roads
P3 Project Layout
Typical Section
Toll Roads and Free Frontage Roads
Independent Advisor Review and Analysis

B Technical Project Review

- Schematics: Alignment, Intersections, On/Off ramps, Bridges, Interchange modifications, Utilities, and ROW
- Typical Section
- R/W and Utility Considerations
- Environmental Issues
- Cost estimate, including assumptions
- Challenges
Independent Advisor Review and Analysis

**Data Collection**
- Traffic Demand models
- Traffic counts and previous studies
- DOTD/MPO planning documents

**Tolling**
- Facility Type
- Policy and Procedures
- Technology
- Tolling points
- Back office considerations
- Viability
Independent Advisor Review and Analysis

B Traffic and Revenue (T&R) Analysis

- Spreadsheet model versus local travel demand model
- Traffic capture rate
- Value of Time, trip time savings, traveler choice
- Toll Rates
- Peak hours and peak traffic
- Peer review
Independent Advisor Review and Analysis

### O&M and Lifecycle Cost Estimates
- Roadway O&M forecast
- Tolling O&M forecast
- Major Maintenance Forecast
- Discussion of Old Mississippi River Bridge condition

### Financial Feasibility
- Capital cost forecast
- O&M/Lifecycle forecast
- Financing Capacity
  - P3 type, term, debt & equity rates/ratio

Range of financing capacity (project financing can support what level of the project’s upfront capital costs)
LTA’s Decision on BUMP Proposal

- LTA decided *not* to advertise for competing proposals.
- LTA requested DOTD to complete the BUMP Economic Feasibility and Tolling analyses for other termini scenarios.
- DOTD will present findings to LTA in Fall 2016 for their determination on whether to advertise for competing proposals.
Future of Alternative Delivery in LA

- Louisiana will use Design-Build and other Alternative Delivery when it makes sense.

- Like all states, Louisiana is meeting the challenge of funding its Transportation Program, and in doing so, the Department will keep all of its project delivery options on the table.

- Not only is Louisiana utilizing Design-Build, but it is beginning to explore other innovative project delivery options such as Construction Management at Risk (CMAR) and Public-Private Partnerships (P3).

- National perspective - Louisiana is open for business!
**Future of Alternative Delivery in Louisiana**

**Potential Projects:**

- LA 1 – Strategic corridor for Petroleum Industry
- Continued I-10 widening toward N.O.
- Continued I-12 widening Eastward – Potential DB
- I-49 South Lafayette to New Orleans
- WBR Expressway – Potential P3
- Florida Avenue – Potential CMAR
- Pre-Construction activities on-going for multiple projects with no dedicated construction funding.
Future of Alternative Delivery in Louisiana

DOTD’s Commitment to Industry:

► Procure DB and other Alternative Delivery Projects in transparent and fair method

► Fairly allocate project risks

► Respond in a timely way and fully engage the Design-Build and/or CMAR Team

► Partner: ‘Even when it’s tough!’

► Continue to utilize DBIA and other National Best Practices to enhance DOTD’s Alternative Delivery Programs
Questions