WEBINAR – FIO/PILOT PROJECTS (INTERNAL) – QUESTIONS

Project: **TxDOT Digital Delivery Program**
Date: January 13, 2026 | 9:00 AM – 10:30 AM CST
Location: Microsoft Teams

QUESTIONS/RESPONSES

1. (Jeff Miles) Why are we not using PW for internal purposes of review of the design files?
   Box.com submissions are not for review purposes. It will be used strictly to share files with contractors and external partners for their awareness as we move through milestones. It is similar to the TxDOT process for larger projects on FTP site. Box.com will help supplement smaller projects like notch and widening projects, and center turn lane addition projects to allow the contractors a peak behind the scenes of what the model creation looks like for better understanding of how they could potentially use it in the future on their end. For the actual design reviews themselves, all your files are going to remain in ProjectWise (PW). With Digital Delivery pilot projects, the reviews will be completed in the Infrastructure Cloud Platform, one of Bentley's web-based applications, which is connected with PW. Pilot project district teams will be receiving additional training on their projects once they get closer to their milestones. The review process is completely separate from what we're showing today with box.com.
2. (Josh Gillis) Is the District responsible for removing files from Box.com at 21 days prior to letting? Or will someone else?
   TxDOT will maintain its established procedure for posting plans early on the FTP site. Districts will remain responsible for transferring the necessary files at least 21 days prior to letting. The final plan processing section has updated their guide on their Crossroads page. If you're in TP&D at the district level and handle the TPP site, you will likely also manage thebox.com site. Each district will only have 2 individuals assigned with access permissions to actually delete and upload files. Please work with your districts and TP&D directors to identify those individuals. At this time, 21 districts have submitted names for assignment.
3. (Jacob Sundin) Can you briefly cover the new simplified PW folder structure that we will be using for our pilot projects, how we use filters, etc?
   The folder structures for the pilot projects will reside under a new data source titled U-DD pilot. Within this structure, each district will maintain a similar format for managing pilot project files. Unlike our traditional approach, which utilizes multiple layers of subfolders such as ENV for traffic control, the new system has been streamlined. Under the design folder, files are categorized simply as either roadway or bridge.
   For our initial pilot project in San Antonio, dedicated subfolders were created for final FTP deliverables and PSNE deliverables; however, most corridor files, alignment files, Adobe documents, and Form 1002s are now consolidated within a single folder structure. Although this may initially seem complex due to the volume of files, the integrated filtering function facilitates efficient searching. For example, entering "1002" in the search bar will retrieve relevant files and folders, while typing "COR" will filter for corridor files only. This capability significantly reduces time spent navigating the directory and simplifies migration to IFC by eliminating the need to research and reestablish multiple reference files across numerous subfolders. Additionally, this structure minimizes character usage within ProjectWise.

This revised organization is designed exclusively for digital delivery pilot projects, of which each district currently participates in one or two. Other ongoing projects utilizing model postings on platforms such as FIO to Box.com will continue to use their existing PW folder structures without change. Each district has a designated point of contact from Design Division to address inquiries related specifically to digital delivery pilot projects. If further demonstrations are needed or if there are questions about filtering, including the 'save searches' tool, please reach out to your contact for assistance.

Please note that the displayed naming convention used for the San Antonio project is currently being updated. Specifically, we are removing CSJ from file names to avoid redundancy. As these pilot projects progress, we aim to establish a more standardized naming convention applicable statewide. Variations in naming may occur as we refine procedures to best meet the needs of all districts.

4. (Bob Pearson) Will Box.com replace the FTP site? Or will PW eventually replace FTP?
   Ultimately, PW will replace both the FTP site and Box.com. Box.com is currently used temporarily to store large DGN and XML files for early plan posting, but the long-term goal is to use PW as the main platform for early plan postings.
5. (Ashton Strong) Any consideration to allow Districts to have more than 2 box.com users for uploading and removing FIO files? Some will have a lot of projects to upload/remove.
   We limited access to a smaller group for now, but districts can request more support staff to have additional access controls if needed. To add users to the Box.com early plan folder structure, submit an ITD ticket. It will be routed for supervisor approval and then set up with the correct permissions. For larger districts like Houston or Dallas, we understand the need for more than two users and are open to discussing this. Please email Adrian Martinez or submit an IT ticket if you require adjustments.
6. (Sergio Garcia, Jr.) Is there some kind of checklist or any guidance as to what is expected to be submitted for each project milestone (30%, 60%, etc.)?
   A new checklist is now available on the digital delivery website - https://www.txdot.gov/business/resources/digital-delivery.html. Once there, the checklist can be found in the “digital delivery documents” section. This comprehensive QC checklist contains all required documentation. While it may be somewhat extensive for early plans posting, we recommend districts begin reviewing the QC checklist now, as its relevance will increase throughout subsequent project phases, especially as we transition to Model as a Legal Deliverable (MALD) projects. The checklist can be accessed by both internal and external users.
7. (Monte Rater)
   Will there be a way to easily identify FIO files, i.e. FIO stated in file name or text/symbol actually placed in the file or some other method to prevent confusion between FIO and later final versions of the corridor or alignments. Won’t the contractor be able to download the FIO files and the final versions, leading the contractor to confuse the files?
   The identification of file types will follow the approach previously outlined by Taylor (or Tyler). At present, only corridor files, alignment files, and one additional type are recommended for uploading to thebox.com under the appropriate district. As communications progress and information is conveyed to contractors, they will understand that any content on box.com is intended exclusively for early plan posting and informational purposes. You can include this information in your descriptor. For example, when naming files for box.com, you might use the CSJ, highway name,

letting year and month, and indicate whether it's a final or initial FIO in the descriptor for added clarity. This approach helps differentiate between FIOs and later final versions of the corridor. Once the final version of the model is ready for letting, all related files should be removed from the box.com folder structure within the 21-day letting window, ensuring no project remnants remain on box.com. At that stage, as the project moves to letting, files are placed on the official FTP site for contractors to download, just like the current process. In this stage, the process is similar to a traditional plan set, as you'll still have a complete 2D PDF. The models serve mainly as visual aids for contractors. To clarify, contractors can download FIO files from box.com, but the final versions will be removed from box.com once they're released and will only be available on the FTP site. Most projects using this approach will continue to rely primarily on traditional 2D PDF plan sets. The version they download allows them to use the model as an additional reference; if they keep it, they can run it through Trimble Business Center, Autodesk Construction Cloud, or any other quantity capture software. This is intended to provide them with more information. However, contractors will ultimately bid on the final package uploaded to the FTP site. For pilot projects—where models are the legal deliverables and serve as the bidding package—the final DGNs and all corresponding digital files will receive a 256-bit hash code encryption, securing the files. There is also a validation tool intended for our website (which couldn't get ITD clearance) that verifies the authenticity of your final DGN or digital file. This tool uses the hash code to compare files, ensuring that the claimed final deliverable matches the official one. Essentially, the hash code secures the binary data of the model or file.
The system generates a hash code for the digital file, which changes if any part of the file—including color, line style, line weight, or metadata—is altered. This allows validation of final versions in design. The process differs for traditional plan sets and digital delivery models used as legal deliverables or pilot projects.

I can see the potential, for example, if corridor alignments can be downloaded for FIO, and then later have a hash. Will the hash code have to be manually checked or will a mechanism be developed to check the hash whenever you open the file, and warn you if you have the incorrect final deliverable file? Contractors could potentially get confused if they open an 80% corridor versus the 100% completed corridor which could subsequently create construction errors. Will there be a mechanism to confirm you're looking at an FIO file or at the final version of the digital deliverable files?
Another district expressed a similar view regarding the automation process. Currently, validation is manual—a user must initiate file comparisons even with the tool available. We're considering automating this in ProjectWise or elsewhere to reduce human error and improve reliability for contractors and designers and agree with your assessment.

Designers and contractors can unintentionally move graphic elements or use the wrong files in digital projects, especially if they're unfamiliar with CAD formats. An automated hash check that verifies the file's integrity each time it's opened would help catch errors like misplaced elements or incorrect deliverables.
We're planning to explore an automated, potentially web-based process. Regarding standardized naming conventions for pilot projects, there will likely be a field at the end of the file name for project managers to add details like "90%" or "FIO" to indicate specific versions, even though most

of the naming will be standardized. This flexibility will help contractors identify files that are not final.

8. (Jeff Miles) I would recommend a minimum of 3 individuals for posting for redundancy, because you may have a large upload volume, have someone out, or staff may move positions.
   We accept that recommendation, and we're flexible—this is just a starting point.
9. (Frank Estrada III) Does this QC checklist list the specific items expected to be delivered digitally for a bridge and/or retaining wall? For example, will the steel reinforcement need to be added to the substructure digitally? What portion of the bridge structure needs to be fully digital in other words?
   The Bridge Level of Development (LOD) determines the extent to which bridge elements are detailed in the design. Regarding LOD 200, LOD 300, and LOD 400, input from the Bridge Division is essential, especially for bridge projects. While I'm not certain if this is specified in the posted QC checklist, it will be addressed in the guidance provided by the divisions. For those starting Digital Delivery pilot projects, it's best to contact your district's Design Division point of contact, who can then involve the Bridge Division for detailed directions. These details will be refined as the pilot projects progress. Regarding steel reinforcement for substructures, we've already had discussions with the Bridge team. At this time, we don't anticipate an immediate need, as including such details requires additional software licenses that we currently do not have. Therefore, we'll continue adhering to the current modeling requirements, which focus mainly on the structural shapes. In the future, we hope to advance to fully modeled reinforcement cages and structural analyses, but we're not there yet. Additionally, Lori mentioned in the chat that the bridge LOD will be used to communicate these expectations. Earlier, we discussed LOD 100 through LOD 400: LOD 400 includes modeling details like rebar inside concrete; LOD 300 involves three-dimensional aspects without internal details; and LOD 200 covers basic two-dimensional information, and so forth. Importantly, defining the specific LOD is not expected at this stage—it will come in a later phase of digital delivery.
10. (Bradley Peikert) How do we accommodate the standard disclaimer in (non-final) digital files?
    To address the standard disclaimer—we now have the updated licensing agreement posted on the new Box.com site, covering both FTP and 3D applications. When users access early plan postings, they're prompted to review and accept the licensing agreement, which outlines their responsibility for any risks or losses when downloading files. This process was approved by our general counsel. If users accept, they proceed to the download page; if not, they return to the bidding page. This ensures compliance with the disclaimer for digital files.
11. (Anonymous) When will the "3-D Models (For Information Only)" Box folder be available to us? I'm not seeing it in my list of folders at this time and I should have been designated as a District Collaborator.
    If you believe you require access, please contact and discuss with your TP&D Director whether or not to be added to the list of approved users. A ticket will then be submitted to ITD for processing. Access procedures vary depending on your method of entry. If you are using the public-facing website and follow the procedures we have outlined, these resources are already available and publicly posted. Anyone should be able to access them. However, it is important to note that unless you are logged in, you will only have external participant viewing permissions. For internal access via Crossroads, go to Applications, select Box.com, and log in. This folder is only accessible to those who have been granted permission.