Consultant Fee Estimation Guidance
Department Response

Posting Date 04-13-15

Q-1: Task 2.3.F.B MOTAA; Consider syncing MOTAA effort guideline to the laundry list of tasks given in the TEM Section 630-5. While probably not necessary for low – medium complexity schemes, high complexity schemes cannot be fully considered using the current tasks. A work-around could be to encourage consultants to submit a detailed list of tasks based on the TEM, with hours, cross referenced to the MOTAA guideline tasks.

A-1: *Agree, High complexity schemes were excluded for consideration per guidelines noted in yellow under Section 20 Maintenance of Traffic. We like the recommendation to encourage consultants to submit a detailed list of tasks based on the TEM, with hours, cross referenced to the MOTAA guideline tasks for the more complex schemes.*

Q-2: Should the task numbers be 3.3.A.B for General Notes and 3.3.A.C for Schematic since they are 2.7.A.B and 2.7.A.C for Stage 1 respectively?

A-2: *Great catch. In the next update we will revise 2.7.A.B to Schematic Plan and revise 2.7.A.C to General Notes to match corresponding Phase 3 tasks. Note: there are several tasks listed that are not listed in order of plan development (L&D section 1301.1 Standard Plans), at this time we will not be changing these.*

Q-3: In the note for 3.3.J.C, the Low/Medium/High guidance refers us to the same item (3.3.J.C). I assume this is supposed to say 3.3.J.B.

A-3: *The guidance should reference 3.3.J.B. We have also discovered this in note 41 for Task 3.3.J.D. Note 41 guidance should also reference 3.3.J.B. Future update will reflect these changes.*

Q-4: The tasks for Utility costs (2.7.H.C, 3.8.C and 4.3.D) use the unit's project, sheet and project. Are all 3 of these supposed to be project?

A-4: *All three should have Unit of Measure of "Project". Task 3.8.C – Utility Costs unit of measure will be revised to "project". Note 43 associated with Task 3.8.C has the unit of measure identified correctly.*

Q-5: When will a new guidance be posted to ODOT's website with updates?

A-5: *Update to guidance posted on website 4-1-15.*

Posting Date 01-12-15

Question-1: Bridge Survey (2.3.A.E) is shown in two different places within the fee guidance (Section 19, Survey; Section 27, Structures)

Answer-1: *Yes, this appears to be a duplication on Task 2.3.A.E-Bridge Survey. Please use hour guidance as shown in Section 19, Survey. Further discussion will be made at the subcommittee level on intent of hours in Section 27, Structures.*

Q-2: In an effort to improve traffic signal designs the Office of Traffic Operations (OTO) has created a new Signal Design Reference Packet. The packet includes signal design references, requirements for design submittals, review checklists, sample plan sheets, calculation tables and typical signal head placements to establish more consistency between internal and external designers and plan reviewers. Will this reduce the effort currently shown in the Fee Guidance?

A-2: *Yes this new guidance may reduce some of the tasks identified in the current Fee Guidance (potentially 10% +/-). Because of the newness of the signal design reference packet we are hesitant in quickly making the adjustment in the fee guidance. We will look at adjustments in roughly 6 months after we have a chance to see and understand the impacts the signal reference packet will have on project development.*

Q-3: For task 4.2.A.P, General Notes, the hours given on pages 21 and 145 do not match.

A-3: *Page 145 is correct. Hours shown for Task 4.2.A.M, General Summary Sheet and Task 4.2.A.P, General Notes on Page 21 need swapped (see corrected info below):*

Task	Unit	Low	Med	High
4.2.A.M – General Summary Sheet	*sheet*	*18*	*20*	*24*
4.2.A.P – General Notes	*sheet*	*4*	*6*	*8*

Q-4: I believe the 12 hours for "high" for schematic plan is a typo. I believe it should be 32 according to the roadway committee's original spreadsheet.

A-4: *Agree. This is reflected in Task 2.7.A.C – Schematic plan shown on page 12 and page 143 (see corrected info below):*

Task	Unit	Low	Med	High
2.7.A.C – Schematic Plan	*sheet*	*20*	*26*	*32*

Q-5: Allowance for Right of Way staking is very low on a per pin basis – can't be done.

A-5: *Further discussion will be made at the subcommittee level.*

Q-6: I have a few minor changes/corrections for future revisions. Nothing that necessarily warrants immediate change.:
1) 3.3. E.G in the table. Add a ")" at the end of the task name.
2) Consider removing the last (blank) line in the table.
3) Note 47 (3.3.E.M.2) – Correct the reference to "4.2.?.?" to "4.2.F.A".

A-6: *Agree, changes/corrections will be made and posted with Log of Changes/Revisions Made.*

Q-7: How does the guidance for Project Management time relate to subconsultants? They would have oversight, set up time, etc. as well as the prime consultant but at a lesser level. Maybe it should be pro-rated based on the percent of hours they have as compared to the prime.

A-7: *The Fee Guidance for Project Management is directed at the Prime Consultant. We agree that subconsultants do have oversight, set up time, etc. at a lesser level. Further discussion will be made at the subcommittee level in determining if it is even feasible to give guidance to pro-rate.*

Q-8: We recently negotiated a fee for a contract modification for detailed plan preparation after completing the preliminary development phase of the work. A 3 span steel bridge superstructure replacement on reconstructed substructure with minimal approach work. We referenced the Consultant Fee Estimation Guidance (CFEG) in three specific items that reinforced our position relative to District's offer:

3.3.I.A – Bridge Plans – based on hours per sheet. Proposed 41, District offer 28, CFEG 35-40. Counteroffer 36. Accepted.

3.8.C – Cost Estimate Structure - Proposed 49, District offer 25, CFEG 40. Counteroffer 40. Accepted.

3.9.B – Project Management - Proposed 56, District offer 30, CFEG 40. Counteroffer 40. Accepted.

Although we did not receive our original estimated level of effort, we believe the use of the CFEG as a reference helped in the negotiation process with District personnel.

Section 3.3.I.A Bridge Plans should be developed with more guidance for structure types, foundation types, and complexity.

A-8: *The Structures subcommittee, when developing the guidance, felt that the unit of measure and or Low, Medium and High was a reasonable guidance for hour estimation. We agree that further discussion is needed at the subcommittee level to see if more guidance is needed. We are finding that the guidance may fall short on the "Low" end of project types.*

Q-9a: The hours for cost estimates (tasks 2.7.H, 3.8, and 4.3) seem very high, particularly for routine, smaller projects such as deck replacements. For example, 32 hours for a roadway cost estimate at Stage 3 for a project defined as "low" seems excessive considering time for quantity takeoffs are already included in the subsummary and general summary tasks. It seems as if project sizes are too variable to try to put the cost estimate hours into three classes (low-medium-high). Perhaps a range of hours could be provided.

Q-9b: The unit for task 2.7.H.A is "project" but the note refers to using the number of sheets from Estimator. However, the unit for tasks 3.8 and 4.3 is "sheets". The unit of "sheet" is unclear. The notes refer to Estimator sheets, which seems unreasonable since these can be several pages even for a small project, at 32 hours per sheet. This doesn't seem right. Is the unit supposed to be "project"?

A-9a & A-9b: *Further discussion will be made at the subcommittee level. Until then, practicality should be used when developing hours for cost estimates and projects should be considered on a case by case basis.*

Q-10*:* I feel that it would be beneficial to have fee guidance for retaining walls.

A-10: *We agree and will pursue fee guidance for retaining walls.*

Q-11: I feel it would be beneficial to have fee guidance for noisewalls.

A-11: *We agree and will pursue fee guidance for noisewalls.*