

2021-22 Annual Report

Alternative Contracting Special Experimental Project No. 14 (SEP-14) Best Value Contract selection

Introduction

On April 24, 2012, FHWA accepted NYSDOT's proposed work-plan for the use of Best-Value selection of design-bid-build construction contracts through the Federal "Alternative Contracting" SEP-14 program. The work-plan has been extended a few times since then. The latest extension covers projects advertised for bids between April 2021 and December 2022. As part of the work-plan, NYSDOT will provide interim reports and final reports for projects that use Best Value.

The following is the annual report for 2021-22, covering the period from April 1, 2021 to March 31, 2022. The report provides information on how NYSDOT used Best-Value selection during SFY 20/21 and presents plans for future Best-Value candidate projects. It also includes 5 interim project reports and 3 final project reports.

Projects Selection for use of Best-Value

The NYSDOT work plan detailed key reasons why the use of Best-Value selection helps minimize risks on certain projects. Below is a list of the three measures outlined in the work plan that were used to determine whether a project will be a good candidate and to measure the success of the project if Best-Value selection is deemed appropriate:

- **Cost savings:** Minimize change orders by including in the criteria for selection items such as experience with similar projects and conditions, understanding and approach, schedule and quality control.
- **Quality:** The Best-Value selection process allows quality criteria to be used to help score each contractor based on past experience, quality control, and understanding and approach.
- **Time:** A candidate for Best-Value will typically have time constraints due to factors like traffic volumes or environmental restrictions. The selection criteria can include items like durations for portions of the project and/or substantial completion. The durations chosen by the Contractor will become contractual.

All candidate projects for using Best Value selection follow a predetermined process for Best Value applicability prior to designation as Best Value procurement project. Candidate projects are vetted by the Region, and the Project Management Office.

SFY 21/22 - Results of use of Best-Value Contract Selection

Awarded in SFY 21-22

PIN	D#	Project Title	Interim Report	Final Report
X11026	D264422	REPLACEMENT OF THE BRONX RIVER PARKWAY BRIDGE OVER METRO-NORTH RAILROAD	8/11/2021	3/8/2025
X73158	D264369	THE CONSTRUCTION OF MASPETH PARK IN QUEENS COUNTY, NYC	8/24/2022	12/26/2023
880862	D264534	WURTS STREET BRIDGE REHABILITATION – STRUCTURAL STEEL REPLACEMENTS AND REPAIRS, ANCHOR REPAIRS, & CONCRETE REPAIRS	8/24/2022	3/27/2024
X72031	D264507	BRIDGE REPLACEMENT OF EAST 138TH STREET OVER MAJOR DEEGAN EXPRESSWAY	8/24/2022	8/30/2025

Completed in SFY 21-22

PIN	D#	Project Title	Interim Report	Final Report
X73128	D262963	GOWANUS EXPY STEEL REPAIRS CONT. 1. KINGS, NYC	6/19/2017	8/24/2022
080997	D264051	BRIDGE DECK REPLACEMENT AND BRIDGE REPAIRS, SUFFOLK COUNTY	8/14/2020	8/24/2022

The interim report for the project awarded in 20-21 and final reports for projects completed in 21-22 and are included in this Annual 2021-2022 SEP14 report dated 8/24/2022 (see page 13).

Historical Cost and Schedule Analysis

NOTE: No historical analysis was completed for Quality. Due to the fledging nature of the Best Value Program, sufficient time has not passed since the completion of projects to adequately investigate the question of quality with respect to project life.

Beginning with the 2015-2016 annual report, historical data was first analyzed and submitted to determine if BV contracts were indeed historically functioning as expected. Since the same approach, factors analyzed, cost and schedule indicators were used in this year analysis, it makes sense to include the following paragraphs/excerpts from 2015-2016 annual report with revisions to selected text to reflect the current year’s analysis period.

A historical analysis is included in this Year’s Annual Report to examine Cost and Schedule deviations and Comparisons of Best Value vs. Low Bid procurement projects. In order to compare projects in an objective and scientific manner, the following criteria was used to develop a sample population of projects to be compared.

All completed BV projects with a completion date on or before **March 31, 2022** were used in the comparison. This yielded eighteen (18) Best Value Projects. To identify a comparative list of Low Bid projects to compare to, a set of criteria was identified for comparable set of data points.

1. NYSDOT let projects. Only projects using traditional NYSDOT Design Bid Build-Low Bid procurement method and let by the Department were used in the analysis.
2. Time Criteria for identifying projects: All completed Best Value Projects were investigated. Only completed BV projects were used. The earliest Letting Date and the latest Contract Completion date falling approximately near the end of this Annual Report period for completed projects were derived. These two dates were used as the “Time” filtering criteria for the Low Bid projects to be compared. This criteria was used to ensure both Best Value and Low Bid projects encountered the same environmental variables such as inflation, material shortages, and price escalations. For this historical analysis, Low Bid projects having a letting date between May 1, 2012 – October 23, 2019 and a contract completion date on or before **March 31, 2022** were analyzed.
3. Cost Criteria: In order to analyze comparable Best Value and Low Bid costs, a cost criteria also needed to be applied to filter projects. For the Cost Criteria, the lowest and highest Contract Awarded Amount of completed Best Value projects was used. For the comparison, a low value of 9M +/- and a high value of 56.0M +/- was used (three BV projects awarded at \$109M, \$145M, and \$317M were considered outliers, therefore these amounts were not used as the high value).

The above filtering criteria yielded **one hundred and forty-three (143)** Low Bid projects with credible data.

Factors Analyzed:

Schedule: Data was pulled for all Best Value and Low Bid projects meeting the search criteria for Original Contract Completion Date and the Contractor’s last day of work. Those dates were compared and the difference in days computed. Negative days indicate that the Contractor finished work prior to the Original Contract Completion date while positive dates indicate that the Contractor finished work after the Original Contract

Completion. An Average was then completed for all Low Bid and Best Value projects. This average was then compared between the two procurement methods.

RESULTS SIGNIFICANCE: Due to Best Value Procurement considering schedule in the determination of a Best Value Contractor, the expectation is the Schedule Indicator should show on average Best Value Contracts finishing sooner than a comparable Low Bid project. If the results show differently, then the benefits of the Best Value procurement come into question.

Cost: Cost Data for projects consisting of the Engineer's Estimated Cost Prior to Bid, Low Bid Amount or the Best Value winner's bid amount, total Change Order amount, and Final Cost were obtained. From that data for each project the following two cost indicators for each project were calculated:

- **Cost Indicator #1 (COST ESCALATION DURING CONSTRUCTION):** Percent (%) difference between the Final Cost and the Low Bid/Best Value amount: Percentages greater than 100% means that the Final cost was greater than the Low Bid/Best Value Bid by that percentage and conversely, percentages less than 100% meant that the Final Cost was lower than the Low Bid/ Best Value Amount by that percentage. This indicator was used because it shows if, and how much, the Final Cost was higher/lower than the Low Bid/Best Value. It can be used to determine generally if one type of procurement generally yields a higher or lower Final Cost as compared to the Low Bid/Best Value amount.

RESULTS SIGNIFICANCE: For Best Value procurement process to be functioning correctly Cost Indicator #1 should show Best Value and Low Bid projects with comparable indicators. Best Value Cost Indicator #1 being significantly lower than Low Bid projects is beneficial while Best Value Cost Indicator #1 being significantly higher points to Best Value procurement projects driving costs up during construction.

- **Cost Indicator #2 (COST OF BEST VALUE FACTORED INTO BIDS):** Percent (%) difference between the Engineer's Estimate and the Low Bid/Best value amount: Percentages greater than 100% means that the Low Bid/Best value amount was greater than the Engineer's Estimate by that percentage and conversely, percentages less than 100% means that the Low Bid/ Best Value Amount was lower than the Engineer's Estimate by that percentage. This indicator was identified as significant because it can show if Contractor's Bid Costs were generally inflated as compared between the two procurements. Additionally, it identifies whether the Best Value amount (which may not be the lowest price bid for the contract) is at a higher percentage over the estimated cost as compared to traditional Low Bid contracts.

RESULTS SIGNIFICANCE: Since the Best Value procurement process does not necessarily award the contract to the lowest bidder, one would expect this indicator for Best Value projects to be higher on average than Low Bid projects. Additionally, since the Best Value procurement factors includes schedule in its determination of the overall Best Value Contractor, it would be expected that Contractors would factor in the additional costs of accelerated construction into their bids causing this Indicator to be higher on average for Best Value contracts. Any extent of increase should be considered in the determination whether the Best Value procurement process is functioning correctly. Although, a higher value for this indicator is expected for Best Value Contracts, that value should be minor and within an acceptable range. Otherwise, the cost increase impacts the benefits of any schedule acceleration. Since completing projects sooner has a real cost benefit not only to the Department but to the traveling public in the form of fuel and lost time savings, and cost increase this Indicator shows is offset by those benefits so long as the Indicator shows the difference between the two procurement methods to be minor.

100% State funded projects, which do not require FHWA oversight, are not included in the historical BV analysis.

The Historical Analysis for this report yielded the results in Table 1 & Table 2.

TABLE 1 - Historical Analysis for Best Value Projects

Region	Contract Number	Project ID	Date of Letting	Original Contract Completion Date (Original Completion)	Contractors Last Day of Work (CLDW)	Schedule Indicator: CLDW vs. Original Completion (Calendar Days)	Engineer's Estimate (\$)	BV Cost (Award Amount \$)	Final Cost (\$)	Cost Indicator #1 % Diff (Final Cost vs. BV Cost)	Cost Indicator #2 % Diff (BV Cost vs. Engineer's Estimate)
01	D262025	SABP00	5/24/2012	7/15/2013	7/15/2013	0	24,983,945	29,002,653	28,741,874	99%	116%
01	D262091	152868	2/12/2013	7/31/2016	5/20/2016	-72	134,701,708	145,776,431	145,475,450	100%	108%
01	D262595	105502	2/26/2014	12/31/2015	6/17/2015	-197	9,458,003	11,191,970	10,589,003	95%	118%
01	D262718	172151	10/28/2014	5/25/2016	11/6/2015	-201	18,258,083	22,299,497	21,852,583	98%	122%
01	D263788	172190	9/26/2018	1/17/2020	6/1/2020	136	36,213,888	31,077,048	33,264,421	107%	86%
05	D262652	576080	8/25/2014	6/30/2017	5/12/2017	-49	45,921,169	56,198,817	59,990,215	107%	122%
08	D262044	810628	5/31/2012	6/30/2015	1/16/2015	-165	24,588,406	21,314,000	21,404,167	100%	87%
10	D263406	001766	3/29/2017	9/28/2018	2/22/2019	147	18,517,863	15,765,815	16,006,281	102%	85%
10	D263477	001143	8/2/2017	1/15/2019	9/19/2019	247	14,810,908	15,743,708	15,669,573	100%	106%
10	D263630	080959	1/24/2018	8/29/2019	5/8/2020	253	8,769,326	9,478,335	9,604,656	101%	108%
10	D263845	000616	4/17/2019	3/28/2021	1/21/2021	-66	16,055,706	16,193,713	17,041,361	105%	101%
10	D263860	076135	12/19/2018	10/16/2020	3/18/2021	153	26,897,896	28,208,661	27,460,884	97%	105%
10	D264051	080997	10/23/2019	4/23/2021	4/23/2021	0	20,349,853	14,395,054	14,493,662	101%	71%
11	D262963 *	X73128	12/16/2015	3/31/2018	5/14/2021	1140	49,556,435	52,841,785	81,144,330	154%	107%
11	D263208	X73575	11/16/2016	11/20/2019	4/30/2020	162	127,322,569	109,692,000	105,265,927	96%	86%
11	D263241	X73143	10/26/2016	6/28/2018	12/11/2018	166	8,000,359	11,376,746	12,214,826	107%	142%
11	D263452	X72977	5/24/2017	7/29/2019	8/5/2020	373	348,177,167	317,921,881	299,939,472	94%	91%
11	D263747	X73149	7/13/2018	12/19/2019	12/31/2019	12	85,577,653	53,911,447	45,977,788	85%	63%
Indicator Averages:						53				100%	101%

* Data for contract D262963 was excluded from the BV Indicator Averages calculations above. This contract would be considered an outlier and including its information would not provide a true comparison between Best Value and Low Bid contracts. The work for the steel repairs were completed by the original contract completion date. The remaining time extensions were due mostly for added work to extend the operation and maintenance of the HOV lane, which also increased the final cost by over \$28M. More information on this contract can be found in the Project Final Report (included with this Annual Report).

The filters below were applied in OBIEE (Oracle's Reporting Tool) to define the NYSDOT let projects delivered by Low Bid (Primavera P6 Project Code: D-B-B Low) shown in Table 2. The analysis did not exclude projects where change orders were added for declared emergencies or other change orders.

- *Project Delivery Method is equal to/is in Design-Bid-Build Low Bid*
- *Date of Letting is between 05/01/2012 and 10/23/2019*
- *Current Contract Completion Date is less than or equal to 03/31/2022*
- *Contract Award Amount is between \$9,000,000 and \$56,000,000*

(OBIEE subject area = Site Manager)

TABLE 2 - Historical Analysis for Low Bid Projects

Region	Contract Number	Project ID	Date of Letting	Original Contract Completion Date (Original Completion)	Contractors Last Day of Work (CLDW)	Schedule Indicator: CLDW vs. Original Completion (Calendar Days)	Engineer's Estimate (\$)	Low Bid (Award Amount \$)	Current Contract Amount (\$)	Cost Indicator #1 % Diff (Current Contract Amount vs. Low Bid Award)	Cost Indicator #2 % Diff (Low Bid Award vs. Engineer's Estimate)
01	D262101	108961	10/11/2012	12/31/2014	11/19/2014	-42	12,573,425	10,526,106	11,516,136	109%	84%
01	D262266	105157	3/21/2013	12/31/2016	10/14/2016	-78	30,121,118	28,635,847	31,741,674	111%	95%
01	D262342	133518	7/25/2013	7/31/2015	8/14/2015	14	11,947,424	11,093,457	10,317,097	93%	93%
01	D262653	146042	10/22/2015	12/31/2017	6/30/2018	181	18,404,451	20,311,893	20,250,155	100%	110%
01	D262907	1BOW0A	3/12/2015	11/30/2016	5/31/2017	182	16,135,712	15,615,616	14,698,068	94%	97%
01	D262921	112518	5/21/2015	12/31/2016	11/22/2016	-39	22,326,327	18,547,450	17,130,338	92%	83%
01	D262930	1BOW0E	11/19/2015	6/30/2018	6/29/2018	-1	15,285,529	16,010,378	16,201,920	101%	105%
01	D263014	105171	10/22/2015	11/30/2018	11/7/2018	-23	20,184,321	22,385,330	21,312,536	95%	111%
01	D263107	1BOW0B	2/4/2016	6/15/2018	10/4/2018	111	10,601,807	9,870,474	9,580,270	97%	93%
01	D263301	1BOW0G	2/16/2017	9/30/2019	9/17/2019	-13	16,730,069	13,000,000	11,876,130	91%	78%
01	D263411	108533	4/6/2017	12/31/2018	5/29/2019	149	10,459,494	12,487,250	12,867,305	103%	119%
01	D263505	182286	10/19/2017	8/30/2019	11/27/2019	89	13,454,507	10,425,900	10,500,630	101%	77%
01	D263577	104334	1/25/2018	12/15/2019	11/22/2019	-23	7,733,971	9,745,744	11,847,888	122%	126%
01	D263740	105181	6/21/2018	11/30/2019	10/23/2020	328	11,655,972	10,680,985	11,350,272	106%	92%
01	D263826	130681	11/29/2018	11/30/2020	6/15/2021	197	22,780,759	26,855,269	29,535,303	110%	118%
01	D263980	181040	6/6/2019	10/31/2020	4/19/2021	170	11,932,602	11,672,115	9,846,154	84%	98%
02	D262027	SABP03	5/3/2012	12/31/2013	12/30/2013	-1	21,413,497	17,370,449	17,080,518	98%	81%
02	D262237	213450	3/28/2013	8/31/2014	2/27/2018	1276	12,926,186	12,601,978	30,468,534	242%	97%
02	D262512	213441	3/20/2014	7/31/2017	10/19/2018	445	47,407,678	52,155,203	55,253,814	106%	110%
02	D262929	SBOW0A	5/21/2015	10/17/2017	11/17/2017	31	11,836,684	10,802,349	10,326,399	96%	91%
02	D263572	280532	1/11/2018	10/31/2020	3/31/2021	151	17,760,883	16,515,001	18,377,174	111%	93%
02	D263869	280583	1/24/2019	6/14/2020	9/25/2020	103	13,543,453	15,105,120	18,682,013	124%	112%
03	D262102	350632	11/8/2012	10/31/2014	12/18/2014	48	8,320,742	9,570,645	10,605,704	111%	115%
03	D262818	302811	2/12/2015	11/30/2017	10/31/2017	-30	20,444,922	17,435,754	15,858,133	91%	85%
03	D263123	304552	4/14/2016	11/30/2017	6/29/2018	211	14,347,863	14,088,750	14,363,616	102%	98%
03	D263248	350165	11/3/2016	11/30/2017	7/13/2018	225	12,920,421	10,792,779	11,299,773	105%	84%
03	D263545	350651	9/7/2017	8/15/2018	10/31/2018	77	21,151,592	27,238,115	26,833,949	99%	129%
03	D263767	350652	4/25/2019	9/30/2020	10/7/2020	7	9,786,073	11,183,958	10,584,951	95%	114%
04	D262396	439023	11/21/2013	12/31/2015	4/30/2016	121	14,758,906	13,936,984	13,068,083	94%	94%
04	D262910	459019	8/20/2015	11/30/2016	12/29/2016	29	8,910,494	9,920,001	9,860,082	99%	111%
04	D263114	439013	3/3/2016	8/31/2018	8/31/2018	0	11,534,644	10,960,116	10,448,891	95%	95%
04	D263249	453107	12/15/2016	11/30/2018	1/31/2019	62	15,124,806	13,912,456	14,187,406	102%	92%
04	D263387	439030	4/20/2017	12/31/2019	6/16/2020	168	50,792,464	50,592,147	51,949,093	103%	100%
04	D263668	4940X1	3/8/2018	7/31/2020	1/5/2021	158	10,924,608	10,707,733	10,644,638	99%	98%
05	D261909	500680	5/17/2012	10/31/2013	9/29/2014	333	28,352,538	28,991,731	30,704,402	106%	102%
05	D262028	SABP04	5/10/2012	12/31/2013	11/26/2013	-35	18,597,700	13,654,416	12,147,571	89%	73%
05	D262265	503498	3/28/2013	6/30/2015	7/31/2015	31	16,106,196	14,662,330	14,852,957	101%	91%
05	D262269	551244	3/21/2013	6/30/2014	11/7/2014	130	9,935,482	11,158,438	11,841,366	106%	112%
05	D262425	500684	12/5/2013	12/15/2014	12/10/2014	-5	23,414,786	20,994,225	19,704,142	94%	90%
05	D262552	558044	3/20/2014	12/31/2016	12/27/2016	-4	15,373,972	14,280,865	14,265,411	100%	93%
05	D262671	541054	9/4/2014	6/30/2016	6/5/2019	1070	13,594,468	15,838,470	24,112,227	152%	117%
05	D262727	500699	12/18/2014	9/30/2016	11/10/2016	41	21,709,974	22,232,686	22,085,635	99%	102%
05	D262806	539237	2/5/2015	12/31/2016	12/15/2016	-16	9,195,780	10,068,117	11,338,710	113%	109%
05	D262814	547030	2/5/2015	12/31/2016	10/13/2017	286	11,270,944	10,375,353	9,986,933	96%	92%
05	D263103	512632	3/3/2016	12/31/2016	11/29/2017	333	17,636,828	18,274,117	17,970,388	98%	104%
05	D263214	526848	7/14/2016	12/30/2018	2/1/2018	-332	12,176,246	10,341,596	9,806,449	95%	85%
05	D263566	513445	1/11/2018	7/31/2020	6/4/2020	-57	35,878,245	29,865,355	32,456,696	109%	83%
05	D263803	576190	8/30/2018	7/30/2020	7/30/2020	0	18,915,081	17,982,592	16,944,915	94%	95%
05	D263805	57619B	5/23/2019	11/30/2021	11/30/2021	0	18,573,047	18,759,000	17,526,562	93%	101%
06	D262142	603314	12/13/2012	9/30/2014	9/4/2014	-26	22,756,794	19,398,719	18,196,464	94%	85%
06	D263121	621828	3/17/2016	9/1/2017	9/29/2017	28	24,474,920	20,081,060	19,314,372	96%	82%
07	D262301	714331	3/28/2013	11/30/2014	9/28/2015	302	9,126,935	9,173,173	9,137,105	100%	101%
07	D262447	702406	11/21/2013	11/30/2015	12/23/2015	23	10,740,372	10,652,806	10,276,810	96%	99%
07	D262533	772079	3/6/2014	11/30/2015	5/25/2016	177	18,603,056	19,712,543	17,914,399	91%	106%
07	D262786	7BOW00	1/8/2015	11/30/2016	6/23/2017	205	11,968,512	10,579,895	9,996,712	94%	88%
07	D262787	704426	1/8/2015	11/30/2016	11/30/2016	0	14,733,711	15,653,249	14,810,882	95%	106%
07	D263194	700406	6/16/2016	7/31/2018	7/27/2018	-4	17,629,600	13,046,427	12,593,867	97%	74%
07	D263937	775296	4/25/2019	11/30/2021	11/17/2021	-13	9,987,284	9,292,922	8,967,442	96%	93%
08	D262100	806210	11/8/2012	12/31/2013	8/28/2014	240	10,539,868	10,243,480	14,522,069	142%	97%
08	D262123	856134	1/10/2013	6/30/2014	8/15/2014	46	9,917,881	11,584,000	11,961,265	103%	117%
08	D262370	806209	9/19/2013	6/1/2016	9/30/2016	121	42,329,862	40,777,134	40,919,313	100%	96%
08	D263244	8BOW26	8/25/2016	12/15/2017	9/21/2018	280	12,258,836	17,111,839	19,209,336	112%	140%
08	D263325	809359	11/17/2016	12/29/2017	7/29/2018	212	9,727,712	11,911,756	14,475,591	122%	122%
08	D263386	881282	10/19/2017	12/15/2018	5/23/2019	159	14,494,869	11,867,677	12,419,843	105%	82%
08	D263403	881272	3/8/2018	8/31/2019	5/21/2020	264	12,778,116	13,884,000	14,634,151	105%	109%
08	D263441	811354	4/13/2017	11/30/2018	2/21/2019	83	41,468,546	55,311,990	47,644,975	86%	133%
08	D263467	810631	4/20/2017	6/1/2018	10/31/2018	152	8,222,795	14,514,000	16,094,275	111%	177%
08	D263634	806241	1/25/2018	6/30/2020	6/4/2020	-26	16,114,956	15,861,796	14,694,262	93%	98%
08	D263729	806245	7/12/2018	12/31/2019	6/30/2020	182	10,017,387	16,805,007	16,439,298	98%	168%
08	D263935	823945	4/11/2019	11/27/2021	11/3/2021	-24	22,490,136	23,600,000	23,893,670	101%	105%
08	D263945	812726	6/6/2019	4/30/2021	11/20/2021	204	26,036,697	28,852,933	29,114,639	101%	111%
08	D263971	881405	6/20/2019	11/30/2019	8/27/2020	271	11,339,694	10,960,000	10,380,055	95%	97%
08	D264005	811364	6/27/2019	11/15/2019	8/28/2020	287	8,533,885	9,199,999	9,925,636	108%	108%

TABLE 2 - Historical Analysis for Low Bid Projects

Region	Contract Number	Project ID	Date of Letting	Original Contract Completion Date (Original Completion)	Contractors Last Day of Work (CLDW)	Schedule Indicator: CLDW vs. Original Completion (Calendar Days)	Engineer's Estimate (\$)	Low Bid (Award Amount \$)	Current Contract Amount (\$)	Cost Indicator #1 % Diff (Current Contract Amount vs. Low Bid Award)	Cost Indicator #2 % Diff (Low Bid Award vs. Engineer's Estimate)
09	D262030	SABP06	6/14/2012	12/31/2013	12/16/2013	-15	22,448,900	19,851,582	18,599,057	94%	88%
09	D262079	906729	7/26/2012	9/30/2014	11/26/2013	-308	12,961,370	11,861,398	9,526,350	80%	92%
09	D262297	935760	9/24/2015	12/29/2017	12/20/2017	-9	25,078,037	20,554,584	20,185,415	98%	82%
09	D262781	901439	12/3/2015	9/30/2017	5/29/2019	606	11,624,486	11,858,426	11,758,115	99%	102%
09	D263018	935800	3/3/2016	2/23/2018	11/30/2017	-85	29,244,052	24,399,140	23,617,238	97%	83%
09	D263302	931400	12/15/2016	12/31/2018	8/23/2019	235	10,356,547	10,460,460	10,303,739	99%	101%
09	D263951	906773	4/25/2019	12/18/2020	5/24/2021	157	9,752,243	11,575,575	10,913,971	94%	119%
10	D262126	011256	10/25/2012	12/31/2014	10/31/2015	304	24,577,729	22,479,986	20,477,113	91%	91%
10	D262168	005421	1/10/2013	1/27/2015	11/20/2015	297	23,993,526	25,577,000	29,171,932	114%	107%
10	D262172	001765	2/21/2013	10/31/2015	1/15/2016	76	23,776,353	16,537,007	18,528,943	112%	70%
10	D262445	005918	11/21/2013	12/31/2015	12/18/2015	-13	15,253,686	13,888,000	11,413,301	82%	91%
10	D262500	022934	2/20/2014	5/30/2016	9/6/2017	464	9,242,255	9,669,670	10,734,783	111%	105%
10	D262656	022949	8/21/2014	12/31/2015	12/30/2015	-1	24,865,880	25,243,000	21,177,043	84%	102%
10	D262659	080920	9/4/2014	7/20/2016	12/31/2016	164	9,388,268	10,874,900	10,759,741	99%	116%
10	D262708	004233	12/4/2014	5/4/2016	9/13/2017	497	9,840,876	10,232,905	9,936,586	97%	104%
10	D262719	OBOW00	12/18/2014	9/30/2017	6/16/2017	-106	22,199,048	27,162,363	26,734,226	98%	122%
10	D262794	001625	2/5/2015	6/30/2017	9/30/2017	92	16,642,192	16,661,662	16,419,726	99%	100%
10	D262801	OCBOW1	1/8/2015	12/30/2016	4/20/2017	111	19,536,093	23,735,285	24,618,105	104%	121%
10	D262897	022947	5/21/2015	6/30/2017	10/18/2018	475	15,023,543	18,418,418	19,210,091	104%	123%
10	D262965	080956	8/20/2015	12/31/2016	12/21/2016	-10	14,949,635	13,957,000	13,886,167	99%	93%
10	D263109	080921	4/21/2016	11/30/2017	12/27/2018	392	10,006,639	13,476,800	13,564,370	101%	135%
10	D263126	080963	6/16/2016	12/15/2017	8/30/2018	258	13,203,763	11,647,000	10,686,296	92%	88%
10	D263237	080932	9/8/2016	12/28/2018	12/4/2018	-24	9,526,189	9,461,294	10,431,053	110%	99%
10	D263287	051736	2/16/2017	6/8/2018	11/28/2018	173	21,791,426	18,693,360	19,187,568	103%	86%
10	D263540	032807	9/7/2017	12/31/2018	9/25/2019	268	11,809,506	10,587,000	9,913,514	94%	90%
10	D263563	080973	9/7/2017	12/28/2018	7/15/2020	565	15,396,388	14,349,000	12,725,847	89%	93%
10	D263565	080990	9/7/2017	12/21/2018	4/23/2019	123	18,872,051	16,564,000	16,080,889	97%	88%
10	D263681	005029	4/26/2018	12/31/2019	5/21/2020	142	19,383,739	15,937,000	12,735,596	80%	82%
10	D263744	001627	6/21/2018	6/30/2021	8/17/2021	48	29,007,698	32,687,178	31,792,320	97%	113%
10	D263752	005926	7/12/2018	6/30/2020	6/30/2020	0	9,677,140	10,657,000	10,235,039	96%	110%
10	D264030	051655	8/8/2019	12/31/2020	12/31/2020	0	16,188,047	18,189,107	17,827,579	98%	112%
10	D264048	004241	10/10/2019	5/11/2021	8/15/2021	96	7,903,624	9,562,798	9,569,387	100%	121%
11	D262162	X80663	2/21/2013	3/31/2014	6/30/2015	456	12,947,968	12,233,135	14,366,169	117%	94%
11	D262197	X73140	3/28/2013	7/31/2016	3/29/2016	-124	35,201,649	27,864,095	25,352,524	91%	79%
11	D262267	XM1251	3/7/2013	4/30/2016	10/27/2017	545	24,274,773	20,378,000	21,279,059	104%	84%
11	D262399	X80657	11/21/2013	4/27/2016	4/27/2016	0	17,372,633	12,438,425	12,881,601	104%	72%
11	D262469	X72040	12/19/2013	6/30/2017	6/28/2017	-2	33,738,793	27,791,804	29,503,710	106%	82%
11	D262482	XM1348	12/19/2013	8/25/2016	8/24/2016	-1	20,034,774	16,758,000	16,151,064	96%	84%
11	D262514	X75988	3/6/2014	4/30/2016	9/13/2018	866	10,998,517	9,721,501	10,753,228	111%	88%
11	D262685	X02505	9/18/2014	11/30/2016	11/18/2016	-12	13,452,345	16,834,670	12,620,140	75%	125%
11	D262687	X73136	10/23/2014	1/22/2017	7/3/2017	162	8,147,880	9,984,859	10,210,672	102%	123%
11	D262696	XM1252	12/18/2014	1/13/2017	12/15/2017	336	22,837,641	23,863,164	21,877,139	92%	104%
11	D262699	X80661	12/4/2014	1/1/2019	1/1/2019	0	57,738,425	55,027,000	55,162,858	100%	95%
11	D262710	XM1448	12/4/2014	7/19/2017	9/22/2017	65	16,350,279	20,070,070	20,032,634	100%	123%
11	D262761	XM1256	2/5/2015	7/1/2017	12/1/2017	153	12,212,275	9,882,440	10,799,358	109%	81%
11	D262804	X10338	2/5/2015	12/31/2016	9/30/2018	638	18,127,396	24,422,969	30,259,914	124%	135%
11	D262962	XM1451	10/8/2015	12/31/2018	12/30/2019	364	21,580,146	28,574,596	30,825,108	108%	132%
11	D262985	X05163	10/22/2015	9/30/2017	8/30/2017	-31	10,322,292	14,593,986	13,450,263	92%	141%
11	D263048	XM1620	12/17/2015	12/31/2017	11/21/2017	-40	11,993,900	11,497,700	11,903,956	104%	96%
11	D263078	XM1548	12/17/2015	9/9/2017	9/8/2017	-1	20,987,139	18,011,500	17,316,047	96%	86%
11	D263250	XM1720	10/20/2016	2/22/2018	2/22/2018	0	11,999,208	11,452,500	11,414,367	100%	95%
11	D263261	XM1260	11/17/2016	3/4/2019	9/28/2019	208	7,593,659	9,288,916	9,063,753	98%	122%
11	D263267	XM1721	12/15/2016	3/4/2019	6/16/2020	470	9,999,912	9,780,350	17,418,719	178%	98%
11	D263289	XM1648	12/15/2016	2/8/2019	12/18/2018	-52	21,899,360	22,987,000	21,679,686	94%	105%
11	D263361	XM1649	2/23/2017	12/21/2018	8/5/2019	227	8,558,139	11,265,257	10,806,205	96%	132%
11	D263372	XM1651	3/9/2017	4/6/2020	10/7/2020	184	17,520,178	19,119,060	22,388,902	117%	109%
11	D263392	XM1560	3/30/2017	1/22/2019	6/6/2019	135	8,627,775	12,707,000	13,389,042	105%	147%
11	D263413	XM1703	3/30/2017	6/4/2019	10/31/2019	149	36,393,920	31,190,000	34,230,485	110%	86%
11	D263526	XM1820	12/14/2017	4/18/2019	7/15/2019	88	9,999,184	9,223,600	17,625,967	191%	92%
11	D263562	XM1748	12/14/2017	1/10/2020	1/6/2020	-4	15,784,398	16,487,000	17,131,594	104%	104%
11	D263571	XM1747	9/7/2017	10/31/2018	12/14/2018	44	14,212,709	12,987,000	11,473,974	88%	91%
11	D263696	XM1749	3/22/2018	8/6/2020	10/22/2020	77	10,459,330	9,785,578	12,288,273	126%	94%
11	D263750	XM1656	8/23/2018	5/27/2021	5/25/2021	-2	34,686,161	29,213,325	24,318,744	83%	84%
11	D263772	XM1849	8/9/2018	3/31/2021	6/7/2021	68	24,630,541	26,715,992	30,881,564	116%	108%
11	D263780	XM1920	9/13/2018	3/19/2020	1/17/2020	-62	10,838,724	10,665,300	10,662,162	100%	98%
11	D263809	XM1922	12/13/2018	5/1/2020	10/19/2020	171	20,024,747	26,680,095	27,793,231	104%	133%
11	D263839	XM1921	11/29/2018	3/9/2021	1/19/2021	-49	9,999,766	10,555,555	9,865,490	93%	106%
11	D263918	XM1860	3/28/2019	2/16/2021	11/17/2020	-91	11,783,104	14,199,865	13,624,693	96%	121%
11	D263919	XM1855	4/11/2019	2/18/2022	2/18/2022	0	18,476,422	17,817,148	15,240,847	86%	96%
11	D263994	XM1949	6/20/2019	12/20/2020	12/2/2020	-18	11,952,373	10,141,000	8,890,852	88%	85%
Indicator Averages:						133				103%	102%

Analysis of Historical Data

The results of the current year and historical data are summarized in the table below:

TABLE 3 Annual Result Summary Schedule & Cost Indicator									
SFY	Schedule (# days finished from planned)			Cost Indicator 1			Cost Indicator 2		
	Best Value	Low Bid	Difference	Best Value	Low Bid	Difference	Best Value	Low Bid	Difference
15/16	-127.0	111	238	99%	96%	-3%	110%	93%	-17%
16/17	-127.0	62	189	99%	97%	-2%	110%	94%	-16%
17/18	-114.0	129	243	100%	102%	2%	112%	93%	-19%
18/19	-74.0	121	195	101%	101%	0%	117%	98%	-19%
19/20	-11.2	136	147	101%	101%	0%	107%	102%	-5%
20/21	56	141	85	101%	103%	2%	103%	102%	-1%
21/22	53	133	80	100%	103%	3%	101%	102%	1%

Schedule Indicator:

This year, like the previous year, the schedule indicator shows that Best Value projects on average, finished 53 days after the planned completion date. While Low Bid projects on an average, continued to finish over 100 days after the planned completion date. The delta of averages between the two procurements remains substantial. This continues to be a significant period of time showing the trend continues and there are significant benefits to construction duration for Best Value Procurement. This year again results adhere to what was expected and planned from the institution of Best Value procurement.

Cost Indicator #1 (COST ESCALATION DURING CONSTRUCTION):

The numbers this year for cost indicator #1 remain practically the same as last year for Best Value projects vs Low Bid. Both, Best Value and Low Bid procurements continued to have averages near 100% showing both types of procurement methods produced projects finishing on or close to budget. Best Value projects performed a little better this year than last year. The analysis of data for BV procurement method showed again that it doesn't, on average, produce escalated construction costs when compared to conventional Low Bid process. The results continue to indicate Best Value procurement is performing as expected.

Cost Indicator #2 (COST OF BEST VALUE FACTORED INTO BIDS)

The numbers this year for cost indicator #2 changed slightly for Best Value projects vs Low Bid, which remained the same. Average awarded BV cost is 1% higher than the Engineers Estimate vs. Low Bid projects, which on average showed an average awarded cost 2% higher than the engineer's estimate. It is expected that Best Value projects will on average produce a slightly higher indicator value because schedule acceleration, and its associated costs are factored into Bids. Additionally, the contract may not be awarded to the lowest bidder possibly causing this indicator to be higher for Best Value projects. The historical data this year again validates the assumptions made for the impacts of implementing Best Value procurement (values over 100%). The trend over the last 4 years indicates that the BV bid amounts are getting closer to the Engineers Estimate.

Consideration is given to the delta for this indicator between the two procurements, the latter being 1% (1%, 5%, 19%, 19%, 16% & 17% for the six previous reporting periods). Without factoring in the implications and Benefit Costs of finishing projects early, this delta appears to be significant. There are often clear monetary benefits to users along with non-monetary ones to accelerating the construction of a project. These benefits offset, partially or wholly, any delta shown by this indicator. With respect to the historical data analyzed to date, Best Value on average delivered slightly behind schedule (53 days). Low Bid projects correspondingly completed on average 4.4 months later than expected (133 days). Computing the delta for this reporting pool of projects shows the Best Value procurement on average finished 2.7 months (80 days) earlier than corresponding Low Bid projects.

The average planned construction length for Best Value projects was 755 calendar days or approximately 25 months. The planned construction duration for Low Bid projects used in this historical analysis was 803 days or approximately 27 months.

TABLE 4- Project Duration From Award to Contractor's Last Day of Work							
Best Value							
Region	Contract Number	Project ID	Date of Letting	Contract Award Date	Contractors Last Day of Work	# Days duration	Months Duration
01	D262025	SABP00	5/24/2012	6/22/2012	7/15/2013	388	13
01	D262091	152868	2/12/2013	4/26/2013	5/20/2016	1,120	37
01	D262595	105502	2/26/2014	4/23/2014	6/17/2015	420	14
01	D262718	172151	10/28/2014	1/2/2015	11/6/2015	308	10
01	D263788	172190	9/26/2018	11/29/2018	6/1/2020	550	18
05	D262652	576080	8/25/2014	10/24/2014	5/12/2017	931	31
08	D262044	810628	5/31/2012	7/23/2012	1/16/2015	907	30
10	D263406	001766	3/29/2017	7/11/2017	2/22/2019	591	20
10	D263477	001143	8/2/2017	10/16/2017	9/19/2019	703	23
10	D263630	080959	1/24/2018	4/4/2018	5/8/2020	765	26
10	D263845	000616	4/17/2019	7/12/2019	1/21/2021	559	19
10	D263860	076135	12/19/2018	3/1/2019	3/18/2021	748	25
10	D264051	080997	10/23/2019	2/21/2020	4/23/2021	427	14
11	D262963	X73128	12/16/2015	4/18/2016	5/14/2021	1,852	62
11	D263208	X73575	11/16/2016	4/21/2017	4/30/2020	1,105	37
11	D263241	X73143	10/26/2016	3/24/2017	12/11/2018	627	21
11	D263452	X72977	5/24/2017	7/26/2017	8/5/2020	1,106	37
11	D263747	X73149	7/13/2018	9/5/2018	12/31/2019	482	16
Average Best Value:						755	25

TABLE 5 -Project Duration From Award to Contractor's Last Day of Work							
Low Bid							
Region	Contract Number	Project ID	Date of Letting	Contract Award Date	Contractors Last Day of Work	# Days duration	Months Duration
01	D262101	108961	10/11/2012	11/8/2012	11/19/2014	741	25
01	D262266	105157	3/21/2013	4/19/2013	10/14/2016	1,274	42
01	D262342	133518	7/25/2013	8/30/2013	8/14/2015	714	24
01	D262653	146042	10/22/2015	1/8/2016	6/30/2018	904	30
01	D262907	1BOW0A	3/12/2015	3/27/2015	5/31/2017	796	27
01	D262921	112518	5/21/2015	6/19/2015	11/22/2016	522	17
01	D262930	1BOW0E	11/19/2015	12/23/2015	6/29/2018	919	31
01	D263014	105171	10/22/2015	1/12/2016	11/7/2018	1,030	34
01	D263107	1BOW0B	2/4/2016	2/24/2016	10/4/2018	953	32
01	D263301	1BOW0G	2/16/2017	3/24/2017	9/17/2019	907	30
01	D263411	108533	4/6/2017	6/30/2017	5/29/2019	698	23
01	D263505	182286	10/19/2017	12/27/2017	11/27/2019	700	23
01	D263577	104334	1/25/2018	3/27/2018	11/22/2019	605	20
01	D263740	105181	6/21/2018	7/17/2018	10/23/2020	829	28
01	D263826	130681	11/29/2018	2/15/2019	6/15/2021	851	28
01	D263980	181040	6/6/2019	8/1/2019	4/19/2021	627	21
02	D262027	SABP03	5/3/2012	6/1/2012	12/30/2013	577	19
02	D262237	213450	3/28/2013	6/10/2013	2/27/2018	1,723	57
02	D262512	213441	3/20/2014	5/7/2014	10/19/2018	1,626	54
02	D262929	SBOW0A	5/21/2015	6/17/2015	11/17/2017	884	29
02	D263572	280532	1/11/2018	2/6/2018	3/31/2021	1,149	38
02	D263869	280583	1/24/2019	3/5/2019	9/25/2020	570	19
03	D262102	350632	11/8/2012	12/26/2012	12/18/2014	722	24
03	D262818	302811	2/12/2015	3/19/2015	10/31/2017	957	32
03	D263123	304552	4/14/2016	5/19/2016	6/29/2018	771	26
03	D263248	350165	11/3/2016	1/26/2017	7/13/2018	533	18
03	D263545	350651	9/7/2017	10/4/2017	10/31/2018	392	13
03	D263767	350652	4/25/2019	6/17/2019	10/7/2020	478	16
04	D262396	439023	11/21/2013	12/18/2013	4/30/2016	864	29
04	D262910	459019	8/20/2015	9/17/2015	12/29/2016	469	16
04	D263114	439013	3/3/2016	6/10/2016	8/31/2018	812	27
04	D263249	453107	12/15/2016	5/10/2017	1/31/2019	631	21
04	D263387	439030	4/20/2017	6/8/2017	6/16/2020	1,104	37
04	D263668	4940X1	3/8/2018	7/9/2018	1/5/2021	911	30
05	D261909	500680	5/17/2012	8/3/2012	9/29/2014	787	26
05	D262028	SABP04	5/10/2012	6/1/2012	11/26/2013	543	18
05	D262265	503498	3/28/2013	4/26/2013	7/31/2015	826	28
05	D262269	551244	3/21/2013	6/5/2013	11/7/2014	520	17
05	D262425	500684	12/5/2013	1/23/2014	12/10/2014	321	11
05	D262552	558044	3/20/2014	5/21/2014	12/27/2016	951	32
05	D262671	541054	9/4/2014	10/10/2014	6/5/2019	1,699	57
05	D262727	500699	12/18/2014	4/29/2015	11/10/2016	561	19
05	D262806	539237	2/5/2015	3/19/2015	12/15/2016	637	21
05	D262814	547030	2/5/2015	4/7/2015	10/13/2017	920	31
05	D263103	512632	3/3/2016	8/19/2016	11/29/2017	467	16
05	D263214	526848	7/14/2016	8/15/2016	2/1/2018	535	18
05	D263566	513445	1/11/2018	3/8/2018	6/4/2020	819	27
05	D263803	576190	8/30/2018	10/22/2018	7/30/2020	647	22
05	D263805	57619B	5/23/2019	8/2/2019	11/30/2021	851	28
06	D262142	603314	12/13/2012	1/10/2013	9/4/2014	602	20
06	D263121	621828	3/17/2016	6/10/2016	9/29/2017	476	16
07	D262301	714331	3/28/2013	5/2/2013	9/28/2015	879	29
07	D262447	702406	11/21/2013	12/23/2013	12/23/2015	730	24
07	D262533	772079	3/6/2014	4/18/2014	5/25/2016	768	26
07	D262786	7BOW00	1/8/2015	2/10/2015	6/23/2017	864	29
07	D262787	704426	1/8/2015	2/26/2015	11/30/2016	643	21
07	D263194	700406	6/16/2016	7/21/2016	7/27/2018	736	25
07	D263937	775296	4/25/2019	6/21/2019	11/17/2021	880	29
08	D262100	806210	11/8/2012	12/26/2012	8/28/2014	610	20
08	D262123	856134	1/10/2013	3/7/2013	8/15/2014	526	18
08	D262370	806209	9/19/2013	10/11/2013	9/30/2016	1,085	36
08	D263244	8BOW26	8/25/2016	12/6/2016	9/21/2018	654	22
08	D263325	809359	11/17/2016	12/22/2016	7/29/2018	584	19
08	D263386	881282	10/19/2017	12/15/2017	5/23/2019	524	17
08	D263403	881272	3/8/2018	5/11/2018	5/21/2020	741	25
08	D263441	811354	4/13/2017	6/29/2017	2/21/2019	602	20
08	D263467	810631	4/20/2017	6/16/2017	10/31/2018	502	17
08	D263634	806241	1/25/2018	3/28/2018	6/4/2020	799	27
08	D263729	806245	7/12/2018	8/17/2018	6/30/2020	683	23
08	D263935	823945	4/11/2019	6/3/2019	11/3/2021	884	29
08	D263945	812726	6/6/2019	8/27/2019	11/20/2021	816	27
08	D263971	881405	6/20/2019	8/23/2019	8/27/2020	370	12

TABLE 5 Project Duration From Award to Contractor's Last Day of Work							
Low Bid CONTINUED							
Region	Contract Number	Project ID	Date of Letting	Contract Award Date	Contractors Last Day of Work	# Days duration	Months Duration
08	D264005	811364	6/27/2019	8/1/2019	8/28/2020	393	13
09	D262030	SABP06	6/14/2012	7/9/2012	12/16/2013	525	18
09	D262079	906729	7/26/2012	8/23/2012	11/26/2013	460	15
09	D262297	935760	9/24/2015	11/3/2015	12/20/2017	778	26
09	D262781	901439	12/3/2015	12/23/2015	5/29/2019	1,253	42
09	D263018	935800	3/3/2016	5/6/2016	11/30/2017	573	19
09	D263302	931400	12/15/2016	3/27/2017	8/23/2019	879	29
09	D263951	906773	4/25/2019	6/28/2019	5/24/2021	696	23
10	D262126	011256	10/25/2012	2/25/2013	10/31/2015	978	33
10	D262168	005421	1/10/2013	3/26/2013	11/20/2015	969	32
10	D262172	001765	2/21/2013	4/16/2013	1/15/2016	1,004	33
10	D262445	005918	11/21/2013	12/27/2013	12/18/2015	721	24
10	D262500	022934	2/20/2014	4/22/2014	9/6/2017	1,233	41
10	D262656	022949	8/21/2014	9/12/2014	12/30/2015	474	16
10	D262659	080920	9/4/2014	11/12/2014	12/31/2016	780	26
10	D262708	004233	12/4/2014	1/30/2015	9/13/2017	957	32
10	D262719	OBOW00	12/18/2014	2/20/2015	6/16/2017	847	28
10	D262794	001625	2/5/2015	3/16/2015	9/30/2017	929	31
10	D262801	OCBOW1	1/8/2015	3/6/2015	4/20/2017	776	26
10	D262897	022947	5/21/2015	7/7/2015	10/18/2018	1,199	40
10	D262965	080956	8/20/2015	9/11/2015	12/21/2016	467	16
10	D263109	080921	4/21/2016	5/23/2016	12/27/2018	948	32
10	D263126	080963	6/16/2016	7/11/2016	8/30/2018	780	26
10	D263237	080932	9/8/2016	10/6/2016	12/4/2018	789	26
10	D263287	051736	2/16/2017	5/25/2017	11/28/2018	552	18
10	D263540	032807	9/7/2017	10/4/2017	9/25/2019	721	24
10	D263563	080973	9/7/2017	9/29/2017	7/15/2020	1,020	34
10	D263565	080990	9/7/2017	10/5/2017	4/23/2019	565	19
10	D263681	005029	4/26/2018	8/17/2018	5/21/2020	643	21
10	D263744	001627	6/21/2018	7/23/2018	8/17/2021	1,121	37
10	D263752	005926	7/12/2018	8/23/2018	6/30/2020	677	23
10	D264030	051655	8/8/2019	9/19/2019	12/31/2020	469	16
10	D264048	004241	10/10/2019	11/26/2019	8/15/2021	628	21
11	D262162	X80663	2/21/2013	5/24/2013	6/30/2015	767	26
11	D262197	X73140	3/28/2013	5/30/2013	3/29/2016	1,034	34
11	D262267	XM1251	3/7/2013	5/22/2013	10/27/2017	1,619	54
11	D262399	X80657	11/21/2013	1/8/2014	4/27/2016	840	28
11	D262469	X72040	12/19/2013	3/7/2014	6/28/2017	1,209	40
11	D262482	XM1348	12/19/2013	1/22/2014	8/24/2016	945	32
11	D262514	X75988	3/6/2014	4/28/2014	9/13/2018	1,599	53
11	D262685	X02505	9/18/2014	10/31/2014	11/18/2016	749	25
11	D262687	X73136	10/23/2014	1/9/2015	7/3/2017	906	30
11	D262696	XM1252	12/18/2014	2/10/2015	12/15/2017	1,039	35
11	D262699	X80661	12/4/2014	2/2/2015	1/1/2019	1,429	48
11	D262710	XM1448	12/4/2014	2/24/2015	9/22/2017	941	31
11	D262761	XM1256	2/5/2015	3/17/2015	12/1/2017	990	33
11	D262804	X10338	2/5/2015	4/9/2015	9/30/2018	1,270	42
11	D262962	XM1451	10/8/2015	11/27/2015	12/30/2019	1,494	50
11	D262985	X05163	10/22/2015	12/23/2015	8/30/2017	616	21
11	D263048	XM1620	12/17/2015	1/21/2016	11/21/2017	670	22
11	D263078	XM1548	12/17/2015	1/12/2016	9/8/2017	605	20
11	D263250	XM1720	10/20/2016	11/23/2016	2/22/2018	456	15
11	D263261	XM1260	11/17/2016	3/24/2017	9/28/2019	918	31
11	D263267	XM1721	12/15/2016	1/26/2017	6/16/2020	1,237	41
11	D263289	XM1648	12/15/2016	4/25/2017	12/18/2018	602	20
11	D263361	XM1649	2/23/2017	5/26/2017	8/5/2019	801	27
11	D263372	XM1651	3/9/2017	5/4/2017	10/7/2020	1,252	42
11	D263392	XM1560	3/30/2017	6/15/2017	6/6/2019	721	24
11	D263413	XM1703	3/30/2017	5/17/2017	10/31/2019	897	30
11	D263526	XM1820	12/14/2017	1/25/2018	7/15/2019	536	18
11	D263562	XM1748	12/14/2017	3/6/2018	1/6/2020	671	22
11	D263571	XM1747	9/7/2017	10/5/2017	12/14/2018	435	15
11	D263696	XM1749	3/22/2018	8/29/2018	10/22/2020	785	26
11	D263750	XM1656	8/23/2018	10/11/2018	5/25/2021	957	32
11	D263772	XM1849	8/9/2018	10/4/2018	6/7/2021	977	33
11	D263780	XM1920	9/13/2018	10/29/2018	1/17/2020	445	15
11	D263809	XM1922	12/13/2018	4/16/2019	10/19/2020	552	18
11	D263839	XM1921	11/29/2018	1/17/2019	1/19/2021	733	24
11	D263918	XM1860	3/28/2019	6/25/2019	11/17/2020	511	17
11	D263919	XM1855	4/11/2019	5/30/2019	2/18/2022	995	33
11	D263994	XM1949	6/20/2019	8/2/2019	12/2/2020	488	16
Average Low Bid:						803	27

Conclusions Based on Historical Data:

Based on the historical data for Best Value projects and corresponding comparable Low Bid projects, Federal Highway’s and New York State Department of Transportation’s Best Value program is providing the benefits outlined in the SEP-14 Work Plan.

Lessons Learned

The Department has used Best-Value on D-B-B projects for several years now, and changes have been made based on the feedback we received to improve the Best-Value selection process. The Department will continue to evaluate the use of Best-Value selection on future projects. The Interim and Final reports provide the Department with key information to make the necessary adjustments. Changes and revisions to the Design Bid Build- Best Value procurement process and determination criteria are made for each new project based on an evaluation of past results and the specific project needs.

The time between Letting and Award for Best Value projects has been longer than 45 days. On average, Best Value contracts have been taking 82 days to award. NYSDOT and the Office of the New York State Comptroller (OSC) have been holding quarterly Design Build and Design Bid Build – Best Value project status meetings. One of the goals is to proactively discuss issues that may cause contracts to be awarded late and find ways to mitigate those issues.

NYSDOT’s Office of Contract Management has been conducting debriefings to any Contractor who wishes to participate. This has been beneficial to those Contractors who had submitted a Best Value technical proposal for the first time. We have had a few instances where the Contractor did not meet the minimum technical score threshold of 60%, therefore they were removed from the cost evaluation and total scoring. In addition, Regional Design groups are including/providing information regarding Best Value requirements during the pre-bid meeting presentations, offering additional awareness. Regional Project Managers and Design Consultants (when appropriate) have been asked to participate during the Distribution Meetings to provide an overview of the project, project objectives and discuss areas of interests with the Evaluation Committee. This has been very helpful to the members of the Evaluation Committee.

Future Best-Value Projects

There are three BV projects that are currently in procurement and are expected to be awarded within the next seven months. One project was recently let and is pending award, PIN X02446 was let on August 3, 2022.

Project	Region	Brief Description	Letting Date	Anticipated Award Date
X02446	11	RESURFACING OF THE ROUTE 9A BIKEWAY, NEW YORK CO, NYC	8/3/22	10/3/22
X73151	11	BRIDGE REHABILITATION OF BRUCKNER EXPWY OVER ROSEDALE AVE, BRONX BIN 1075789	12/21/22	3/31/23
X11028	11	REPLACEMENT OF BRONX RIVER PARKWAY BRIDGE OVER AMTRAK/CSX WITH SAFETY AND MOBILITY IMPROVEMENT BETWEEN E177TH STREET AND EAST TREMONT AVE	2/22/23	5/3/23

Past & Future SEP 14 Reports Summary

In Construction									
PIN	D#	Project Title	Proposals Due	Award Date	Construction Contract Completion	Interim Report Due	Interim Report sent to FHWA	Final Report Due	Final Report sent to FHWA
X72039	D263821	REHAB OF MDE BETWEEN W.161 ST. & HIGHBRIDGE INT BRONX CO, NY	2/13/2019	5/23/2019	8/23/2023	6/22/2019	8/14/2020	2/19/2024	
004242	D264049	NY25/NY107 BRIDGE REHAB	10/30/2019	2/28/2020	5/27/2022	3/29/2020	8/14/2020	11/23/2022	
X73580	D264076	VAN WYCK EXPRESSWAY VIADUCT REHABILITATION	7/22/2020	10/14/2020	4/6/2024	11/13/2020	8/11/2021	10/3/2024	
X11026	D264422	REPLACEMENT OF THE BRONX RIVER PARKWAY BRIDGE OVER METRO-NORTH RAILROAD	5/19/2021	7/6/2021	9/9/2024	8/5/2021	8/11/2021	3/8/2025	
X73158	D264369	THE CONSTRUCTION OF MASPETH PARK IN QUEENS COUNTY, NYC	3/30/2021	7/19/2021	6/29/2023	8/18/2021	8/24/2022	12/26/2023	
880862	D264534	WURTS STREET BRIDGE REHABILITATION – STRUCTURAL STEEL REPLACEMENTS AND REPAIRS, ANCHOR REPAIRS, & CONCRETE REPAIRS	6/16/2021	8/27/2021	9/29/2023	9/26/2021	8/24/2022	3/27/2024	
X72031	D264507	BRIDGE REPLACEMENT OF EAST 138TH STREET OVER MAJOR DEEGAN EXPRESSWAY	6/18/2021	9/2/2021	3/3/2025	10/2/2021	8/24/2022	8/30/2025	
X73175	D264699	DECK REPLACEMENT OF BRIDGES CARRYING STATEN ISLAND EXPRESSWAY (I-278) OVER RICHMOND AVENUE	2/16/2022	5/6/2022	11/25/2024	6/5/2022	8/24/2022	5/24/2025	
X73168	D264749	REHABILITATION OF WOOLLEY AVE AND BRADLEY AVE BRIDGES OVER STATEN ISLAND EXPRESSWAY (I-278)	3/2/2022	5/10/2022	4/7/2024	6/9/2022	8/24/2022	10/4/2024	
Completed									
PIN	D#	Project Title	Proposals Due	Award Date	Construction Contract Completion	Interim Report Due	Interim Report sent to FHWA	Final Report Due	Final Report sent to FHWA
SABP00	D262025	ACCELERATED BRIDGE PRESERVATION PROGRAM - CONTRACT 1	05/24/2012	06/22/2012	11/24/2014	7/22/2012	06/06/2013	5/23/2015	6/23/2014
105502	D262595	RT.431: WHITEFACE MOUNTAIN ROAD RECONSTRUCTION	02/26/2014	04/23/2014	07/22/2015	5/23/2014	6/2/2015	1/18/2016	5/5/2017
152868	D262091	I-90 OVER HUDSON RIVER (PATROON ISL) BRIDGE	02/12/2013	04/26/2013	06/24/2016	5/26/2013	6/2/2015	12/21/2016	5/5/2017
152885	D263233*	I-90 SCHODACK REST AREA IMPROVEMENTS	06/22/2016	06/30/2016	Contract Terminated				
172151	D262718	I-87: EXIT 4 IMPROVEMENTS. PART 1	10/28/2014	01/02/2015	11/16/2015	2/1/2015	6/2/2015	5/14/2016	5/5/2017
576080	D262652	NY GATEWAY CONNECTIONS IMPROVEMENT TO US PEACE BRIDGE PLAZA	08/25/2014	10/24/2014	06/30/2017	11/23/2014	5/5/2017	12/27/2017	5/11/2018
810628	D262044	SPRAIN BROOK PARKWAY OVER ROUTE 119 BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	05/31/2012	07/23/2012	06/30/2015	8/22/2012	6/2/2015	12/27/2015	5/5/2017
022914	D263143	UPGRADE EB I495 EX51 REST AREA	05/04/2016	05/20/2016	01/31/2017	100% State			
172252	D263652	ADIRONDACKS/GLENS FALLS WELCOME CENTER	1/17/2018	3/2/2018	10/1/2018	100% State			
X73143	D263241	MITIGATION AND RESTORATION OF SGT. DAUGHERTY PARK KINGS, NYC	10/25/2016	3/24/2017	12/14/2018	4/23/2017	6/19/2017	6/12/2019	5/10/2019
X73148	D263007	GOWANUS EXPY STEEL REPAIRS CONT. 2. KINGS, NYC	3/2/2016	7/22/2016	12/5/2018	100% State			
022951	D263584	CR83 over I495 Deck Replacement	12/13/2017	3/16/2018	7/10/2019	100% State			
001766	D263406	RMC OVER FI INLET BRIDGE STEEL REPAIRS	3/29/2017	7/11/2017	2/22/2019	8/10/2017	5/11/2018	8/21/2019	8/14/2020
001143	D263477	NY231 SAFETY IMPVTS @ NSP INTCHNG	8/2/2017	10/16/2017	9/19/2019	11/15/2017	5/11/2018	3/17/2020	8/14/2020
X73149	D263747	SHERIDAN BOULEVARD	7/13/2018	9/5/2018	12/31/2019	10/5/2018	5/10/2019	6/28/2020	8/14/2020
3M0018	D264050	TOMPKINS COUNTY SUBRESIDENCY AT ITHACA TOMPKINS REGIONAL AIRPORT	8/14/2019	12/9/2019	10/20/2020	100% State			
X73575	D263208	REPLACE VAN WYCK EXPY VIADUCTS AT KEW GARDEN INTERCHANGE	11/15/2016	4/21/2017	4/30/2020	5/21/2017	6/19/2017	10/27/2020	8/11/2021
172190	D263788	I87: EXIT 4 ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS, PH.2	9/26/2018	11/30/2018	6/1/2020	12/30/2018	5/10/2019	11/28/2020	8/11/2021
X72977	D263452	REPL K-BR OVER NEWTOWN CR-CONT 2. KGS & QNS COS, NYC	5/24/2017	7/26/2017	8/5/2020	8/25/2017	5/11/2018	2/1/2021	8/11/2021
080959	D263630	BRIDGE REPAIRS (3 LOCATIONS), SUFFOLK COUNTY	1/24/2018	4/4/2018	6/1/2020	5/4/2018	8/7/2018	11/28/2020	8/11/2021
076135	D263860	WALT WHITMAN RD OVER I495 BRIDGE WIDENING	12/19/2018	3/1/2019	10/16/2020	3/31/2019	5/10/2019	4/14/2021	8/11/2021
X73585	D264148	REPLACEMENT OF LIRR ATLANTIC 6 BRIDGE OVER THE VWE	12/4/2019	2/27/2020	12/21/2020	100% State			
000616	D263845	OP SHARED USE PATH TOBAY TO CAPTREE	4/17/2019	7/12/2019	3/28/2021	8/11/2019	8/14/2020	9/24/2021	8/24/2022
X73128	D262963	GOWANUS EXPY STEEL REPAIRS CONT. 1. KINGS, NYC	12/16/2015	4/18/2016	5/31/2021	5/18/2016	6/19/2017	11/27/2021	8/24/2022
080997	D264051	BRIDGE DECK REPLACEMENT AND BRIDGE REPAIRS, SUFFOLK COUNTY	10/23/2019	2/21/2020	4/23/2021	3/22/2020	8/14/2020	10/20/2021	8/24/2022

Interim Report: PIN: X731.58 Contract: D264369

PIN: **X731.58**
Contract: D264369
Reporting Stage: Interim Report
Location: Maspeth Park
County: Queens
Region: 11
Brief description: Construction of Maspeth Park
Awarded to: DeFoe Corp
Bid: \$16,630,256.75
Key information: Award Date – 7/19/2021
 Anticipated Contract Completion Date – 6/14/2023
 Contractor’s Proposed Completion Date (Form SCD) – 4/28/2023
 Adjusted Contract Completion Date – 6/29/2023

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Best Value Special Note technical criteria included the following 3 categories (50 potential points):

- Schedule
 - Form SCD – Table 2: Substantial Completion Date (10 points)
 - Gantt Chart & Construction Schedule Narrative (5 points)
- Construction Approach
 - Means & Methods to perform major work (4 points)
 - Coordination with other agencies (3 points)
 - Issues, Risks, Mitigation (3 points)
- Experience & Past Performance
 - Relevant experience with projects of similar scope, size, and complexity (10 points)
 - Relevant experience with Tangent Piles, Soldier Piles and Lagging, Instrumentation and Monitoring (10 points)
 - Managed contracts on time and under budget to minimize delays, claims and LDs (5 points)

The Cost Bid score was determined by assigning a total of 50 points to the Contractor with the lowest total Bid. Remaining bids received points based on the percent that their bid exceeded the low bid (pro-rated).

For the overall Best Value determination, 50% of the weighting was based on the Technical submission and 50% of the weighting was based on the scoring of the Cost Bid submission. The project was awarded to DeFoe Corp. with a total final score of 97.94.

FINAL COMBINED SCORES

In response to the Best Value Special Note and subsequent Addenda, fourteen (14) proposals were received by the deadline date (Letting). Six (6) of the fourteen, met the submission requirements. The result of the Evaluation Committee, together with the scoring of the Cost submission, is listed below:

Proposer	Total Technical Score	Perfected Technical Score	Perfected Cost Score	Total Score	Total Cost
DeFoe Corp.	45.54	50.00	47.94	97.94	\$16,630,256.75
J.D’Annunzio and Sons, Inc.	44.79	49.18	42.59	91.77	\$18,717,000.00

Grace Industries LLC	39.29	43.14	43.14	86.28	\$18,480,789.00
LoDuca Associates, Inc.	31.64	34.74	50.00	84.74	\$15,944,329.42
Perfetto Contracting Co. Inc.	34.51	37.89	44.19	82.08	\$18,041,000.00
Triumph Construction Corp.	33.81	37.12	43.65	80.77	\$18,264,939.00

SCOPE OF WORK

The project’s objective is to mitigate impacts associated with the replacement of the Kosciuszko Bridge. The new park will enhance the Queens touch-down point of the Bridge’s new greenway link to Brooklyn and create West Maspeth’s first park, walkable from Sunnyside, two neighborhoods underserved by open space. Work under this contract includes:

- New Park consisting of two parcels
- Large parcel to include game tables, basketball court, drinking fountains, adult fitness equipment, drainage infrastructure, sports and pedestrian lighting infrastructure and building
- The building to consist of an office and garage for NYCDPR’s borough maintenance and operations staff, and a comfort station containing restrooms serving the public
- Small parcel to consist entirely of destination skate plaza with professional sports lighting designed to serve all skill levels
- Installation of portions of sidewalk, curb and driveway
- Installation of paved and secured access corridor along BQE retaining wall. Corridor to provide NYSDOT maintenance/inspection access to BQE structure, ITS and drainage infrastructure
- Park to be NYCDPR jurisdiction
- Surrounding sidewalks, curbs and driveways to be NYCDOT jurisdiction
- Maintenance access corridor to be NYSDOT jurisdiction

PROJECT COST

The Original EE was \$16,634,559.55. The BV winning bid was \$16,630,256.75. Currently, there are 3 approved change orders totaling \$18,950, bringing the current contract amount to \$16,649,207.

CONTRACT TIME

The Contractor’s proposed completion date was 4/28/2023. It was adjusted in the award letter to 6/29/2023 due to late award. Currently, there is no additional approved Time Extension Change Order to adjust the completion date.

FINAL REPORT DUE DATE

Final Reports for Best Value Projects are due 6 months after completion of project work. For PIN X731.58, the construction contract completion date is 6/29/2023. The final report is due 12/26/2023.

Interim Report: PIN: 8808.62 Contract: D264534

PIN: **8808.62**
Contract: D264534
Reporting Stage: Interim Report
Location: Wurts Street Bridge over Rondout Creek City of Kinston, Town of Esopus
County: Ulster
Region: 8
Brief description: Bridge rehabilitation - structural steel replacements and repairs, anchor & concrete repairs
Awarded to: Wurts Bridge Constructors LLC
Bid: \$44,927,000.00
Key information: Award Date – 8/27/2021
 Anticipated Contract Completion Date – 11/27/2023
 Contractor’s Proposed Completion Date (Form SCD) – 9/28/2023
 Adjusted Contract Completion Date – 10/9/2023

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Best Value Special Note technical criteria included the following 3 categories (50 potential points):

- Schedule
 - Form SCD – Table 2: Substantial Completion Milestone Date (8 points)
 - Gantt Chart & Construction Schedule Narrative (7 points)
- Construction Approach
 - Means & Methods to perform major work (10 points)
 - Issues, Risks, and Mitigation (5 points)
- Experience & Past Performance
 - Relevant experience with projects of similar scope, size, and complexity (10 points)
 - Managed contracts on time and under budget to minimize delays, claims and LDs (5 points)
 - Record of meeting M/WBE/DBE goals (5 points)

The Cost Bid score was determined by assigning a total of 50 points to the Contractor with the lowest total Bid. Remaining bids received points based on the percent that their bid exceeded the low bid (pro-rated).

For the overall Best Value determination, 50% of the weighting was based on the Technical submission and 50% of the weighting was based on the scoring of the Cost Bid submission. The project was awarded to Wurts Bridge Constructors LLC (A. Servidone, Inc / B. Anthony Construction Corp., JV, GCCOM Construction Company, Inc, Northeast Structural Steel, Inc, and J. D’annunzio & Sons, Inc.) with a total final score of 91.85.

FINAL COMBINED SCORES

In response to the Best Value Special Note and subsequent Addenda, five (5) proposals were received by the deadline date (Letting). The result of the Evaluation Committee, together with the scoring of the Cost submission, is listed below:

Proposer	Total Technical Score	Perfected Technical Score	Perfected Cost Score	Total Score	Total Cost
Wurts Bridge Constructors LLC	33.74	41.85	50.00	91.85	\$44,927,000.00
D.A. Collins Construction Co., Inc	36.96	45.84	44.93	90.77	\$49,999,347.09
American Bridge Co.	40.31	50.00	39.09	89.09	\$57,470,000.00

Yonkers Contracting Company, Inc	34.76	43.12	44.30	87.42	\$50,711,740.00
Skanska ECCO III WSB Joint Venture	38.59	47.87	36.32	84.19	\$61,848,354.60

SCOPE OF WORK

The Wurts Street bridge is rated in Poor Condition and is currently closed to vehicular and pedestrian traffic. This is mainly a result of the advanced level of steel corrosion in many of the bridge’s critical structural members. The proposed rehabilitation work includes:

- Repairing substructure concrete, which is rated poor or severe in many areas
- Replacing or repairing bearings
- Repairing the steel truss, floor beams, and stringers which are rated poor or severe in many areas
- Replacement or repair of gusset plates rated poor or severe and replacement of all suspender cables
- There are yellow flags related to the deterioration of the eye bars at the anchor blocks. A rock anchor system for off-loading the cable forces will be installed and the eye bars will be rehabilitated to restore their original capacity. A new dehumidification system with remote monitoring capability will be installed to eliminate future deterioration
- Replacing the tower anchor bolts for mitigation of the seismic forces
- Replacing the structural deck and overlay using an 8” light weight structural deck and chromium reinforcement. The use of light weight concrete deck with chromium rebar steel reinforcement will achieve the design goal of matching the bridge’s original dead load
- Replacing the sidewalk with a new 4” concrete slab
- Cleaning and painting the existing stiffening truss members, wind truss members, floor system members, and tower members below the roadway level
- Replacement of the bridge rail
- Replacement of the pedestrian railings
- Removing the existing roadway lighting system and installing new lighting, including a decorative necklace lighting system
- Replacing/installing access platforms, cables, and railings to improve access for inspection of main cables and towers

PROJECT COST

The Original EE was \$49,023,290.16. The BV winning bid was \$44,927,000. Currently, there is 1 pending change order for added work for \$221,649.00.

CONTRACT TIME

The Contractor’s proposed completion date was 9/28/2023. The date was adjusted to 10/9/2023 due to late award. Currently, there is no additional approved Time Extension Change Order to adjust the completion date.

FINAL REPORT DUE DATE

Final Reports for Best Value Projects are due 6 months after completion of project work. For PIN 8808.62, the construction contract completion date is 9/29/2024. The final report is due 3/27/2024.

Interim Report: PIN: X720.31 Contract: D264507

PIN: **X720.31**
Contract: D264507
Reporting Stage: Interim Report
Location: 138th Street over Major Deegan Expressway, Bronx, NY
County: Bronx
Region: 11
Brief description: Bridge replacement of East 138th Street over the Major Deegan Expressway
Awarded to: ECCO III Enterprises, Inc.
Bid: \$47,360,000.00
Key information: Award Date – 9/2/2021
 Anticipated Contract Completion Date – 5/28/2025
 Contractor’s Proposed Completion Date (Form SCD) – 2/26/2025
 Adjusted Contract Completion Date – 3/3/2025

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Best Value Special Note technical criteria included the following 3 categories (50 potential points):

- Schedule
 - Form SCD – Table 2: Substantial Completion Date (10 points)
 - Form SCD – Table 3: Impacts to Traffic (5 points)
 - Gantt Chart & Construction Schedule Narrative (5 points)
- Construction Approach
 - Means & Methods to perform major work (7 points)
 - Coordination with other agencies (5 points)
 - Issues, Risks, Mitigation (3 points)
- Experience & Past Performance
 - Relevant experience with projects of similar scope, size, and complexity (10 points)
 - Managed contracts on time and under budget to minimize delays, claims and LDs (5 points)

The Cost Bid score was determined by assigning a total of 50 points to the Contractor with the lowest total Bid. Remaining bids received points based on the percent that their bid exceeded the low bid (pro-rated).

For the overall Best Value determination, 50% of the weighting was based on the Technical submission and 50% of the weighting was based on the scoring of the Cost Bid submission. The project was awarded to ECCO III Enterprises, Inc. with a total final score of 100.00.

FINAL COMBINED SCORES

In response to the Best Value Special Note and subsequent Addenda, three (3) proposals were received by the deadline date (Letting) and all met the submission requirements. The result of the Evaluation Committee, together with the scoring of the Cost submission, is listed below:

Proposer	Total Technical Score	Perfected Technical Score	Perfected Cost Score	Total Score	Total Cost
ECCO III Enterprises, Inc.	44.87	50.00	50.00	100.00	\$47,360,000.00
E.E. Cruz & Company, Inc.	39.97	44.54	49.19	93.73	\$48,144,421.37
Beaver Concrete Construction Co., Inc.	25.12			*	\$50,336,271.37

*Did not meet the minimum 30 point (60% of possible 50 points) technical requirement

SCOPE OF WORK

The bridge is in a severe state of deterioration, beyond its service life, and in a constant state of repair. The bridge will be replaced using staged construction to minimize the traffic impacts. Work under this contract includes:

- Bridge replacement with new steel superstructure, new concrete bridge deck, and new integral abutments. The existing pier would be eliminated
- Reconstruction of the Major Deegan Expressway concrete pavement under the bridge
- East 138th Street roadway, sidewalk, and bicycle lane reconstruction including ADA curb ramps
- Protection and relocation of utilities within the project limits including Verizon communication lines, Con Edison electrical lines and gas main, NYCDEP water main and sewers, and ITS facilities
- Reconstruct highway lighting and traffic signals along East 138th Street and the bridge underdeck lighting
- Model-based contract delivery

PROJECT COST

The Original EE was \$59,606,775.50. The BV winning bid was \$47,360,000.00. Currently, there is 1 approved change order for item number change and overrun. The change order is for \$30, bringing the current contract amount to \$47,360,030.

CONTRACT TIME

The Contractor's proposed completion date was 2/26/2025. It was adjusted in the award letter to 3/3/2025 due to late award. Currently, there is no additional approved Time Extension Change Order to adjust the completion date.

FINAL REPORT DUE DATE

Final Reports for Best Value Projects are due 6 months after completion of project work. For PIN X720.31, the construction contract completion date is 3/3/2025. The final report is due 8/30/2025.

Interim Report: PIN: X731.75 Contract: D264699

PIN: **X731.75**
Contract: D264699
Reporting Stage: Interim Report
Location: Staten Island Expressway over Richmond Ave.
County: Richmond
Region: 11
Brief description: Deck replacement of bridges carrying Staten Island Expressway (I-278) over Richmond Ave.
Awarded to: El Sol Contracting & Construction Corp./ES II Enterprises JV
Bid: \$17,775,995.00
Key information: Award Date – 5/6/2022
 Anticipated Contract Completion Date – 2/17/2025
 Contractor’s Proposed Completion Date (Form SCD) – 11/7/2024
 Adjusted Contract Completion Date – 11/25/2024

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Best Value Special Note technical criteria included the following 3 categories (50 potential points):

- Schedule
 - Form SCD – Table 2: Substantial Completion Date (8 points)
 - Form SCD – Table 3: Interim Milestone Date (7 points)
 - Gantt Chart & Construction Schedule Narrative (5 points)
- Construction Approach
 - Means & Methods to perform major work (5 points)
 - Issues, Risks, Mitigation (5 points)
- Experience & Past Performance
 - Relevant experience with projects of similar scope, size, and complexity (13 points)
 - Managed contracts on time and under budget to minimize delays, claims and LDs (7 points)

The Cost Bid score was determined by assigning a total of 50 points to the Contractor with the lowest total Bid. Remaining bids received points based on the percent that their bid exceeded the low bid (pro-rated).

For the overall Best Value determination, 50% of the weighting was based on the Technical submission and 50% of the weighting was based on the scoring of the Cost Bid submission. The project was awarded to El Sol Contracting & Construction Corp./ES II Enterprises JV with a total final score of 99.89.

FINAL COMBINED SCORES

In response to the Best Value Special Note and subsequent Addenda, eight (8) proposals were received by the deadline date (Letting) and all met the submission requirements. The result of the Evaluation Committee, together with the scoring of the Cost submission, is listed below:

Proposer	Total Technical Score	Perfected Technical Score	Perfected Cost Score	Total Score	Total Cost
El Sol/ES II JV	40.61	49.89	50.00	99.89	\$17,775,995.00
EE Cruz	40.70	50.00	44.76	94.76	\$19,856,660.00

DeFoe Corp	40.56	49.83	39.45	89.28	\$22,527,154.00
J. D'Annunzio & Sons	40.16	49.34	38.77	88.11	\$22,927,000.00
JRCruz	31.98	39.29	44.81	84.10	\$19,833,762.35
Perfetto	39.50	48.53	35.44	83.97	\$25,081,000.00
Beaver-Unicorn JV	36.23	44.51	38.04	82.55	\$23,365,566.00
Union Paving	34.70	42.63	33.18	75.81	\$26,786,387.00

SCOPE OF WORK

The reinforced bridge decks are in a very poor condition, with the metal stay-in-place forms exhibiting significant rust and some isolated locations where the metal SIP forms have eroded to expose the underside of the concrete deck. The approach slabs wearing surface exhibit cracks and spalls and the bridge deck joints are in poor condition. In order to maintain all lanes of traffic during construction on Staten Island Expressway, the bridge decks will be replaced in stages with the use of a temporary bridge installed in the open space between the existing bridges. Work under this contract includes:

- Replacement of the structurally deficient reinforced concrete deck with 9½” thick monolithic reinforced concrete deck with integral wearing surface
- Repair of the deficient abutment stems and backwalls for both bridges
- Elimination of bridge joints at abutments
- Replacement of the existing, non-conforming, steel bridge railing with single slope concrete barrier
- Paint superstructure steel at outside faces of fascia girders and up to 5'-0” from existing abutment joints
- Approach slabs replacement
- Highway lighting and underdeck lighting replacement
- Overhead Sign Structure replacement

PROJECT COST

The Original EE was \$23,656,554.48. The BV winning bid was \$17,775,995.00. Currently, there are no change orders in the contract.

CONTRACT TIME

The Contractor’s proposed completion date was 11/7/2024. It was adjusted in the award letter to 11/25/2024 due to late award. Currently, there is no additional approved Time Extension Change Order to adjust the completion date.

FINAL REPORT DUE DATE

Final Reports for Best Value Projects are due 6 months after completion of project work. For PIN X731.75, the construction contract completion date is 11/25/2024. The final report is due 5/24/2025.

Interim Report: PIN: X731.68 Contract: D264749

PIN: **X731.68**
Contract: D264749
Reporting Stage: Interim Report
Location: Woolley Ave and Bradley Ave bridges over Staten Island Expressway
County: Richmond
Region: 11
Brief description: Rehabilitation of Woolley Ave and Bradley Ave bridges over SIE (I-278)
Awarded to: El Sol Contracting & Construction Corp./ES II Enterprises JV
Bid: \$28,442,856.00
Key information: Award Date – 5/10/2022
 Anticipated Contract Completion Date – 5/2/2024
 Contractor’s Proposed Completion Date (Form SCD) – 3/27/2024
 Adjusted Contract Completion Date – 4/7/2024

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Best Value Special Note technical criteria included the following 3 categories (50 potential points):

- Schedule
 - Form SCD – Table 2: Substantial Completion Date (10 points)
 - Form SCD – Table 3: Impacts to Traffic (5 points)
 - Gantt Chart & Construction Schedule Narrative (5 points)
- Construction Approach
 - Means & Methods to perform major work (8 points)
 - Issues, Risks, Mitigation (7 points)
- Experience & Past Performance
 - Relevant experience with projects of similar scope, size, and complexity (10 points)
 - Managed contracts on time and under budget to minimize delays, claims and LDs (5 points)

The Cost Bid score was determined by assigning a total of 50 points to the Contractor with the lowest total Bid. Remaining bids received points based on the percent that their bid exceeded the low bid (pro-rated).

For the overall Best Value determination, 50% of the weighting was based on the Technical submission and 50% of the weighting was based on the scoring of the Cost Bid submission. The project was awarded to El Sol Contracting & Construction Corp./ES II Enterprises JV with a total final score of 92.15.

FINAL COMBINED SCORES

In response to the Best Value Special Note and subsequent Addenda, seven (7) proposals were received by the deadline date (Letting) and all met the submission requirements. The result of the Evaluation Committee, together with the scoring of the Cost submission, is listed below:

Proposer	Total Technical Score	Perfected Cost Score	Total Score	Total Cost
El Sol Contracting and Construction Corp./ES II Enterprises JV	42.15	50.00	92.15	\$28,442,856.00
DeFoe Corp.	38.71	48.79	87.50	\$29,147,949.50
EE Cruz & Company Inc.	39.56	45.73	85.29	\$31,100,000.00

Beaver Concrete Construction Co. Inc.	36.20	49.06	85.26	\$28,990,313.00
J. D'Annunzio & Sons Inc.	38.71	44.39	83.10	\$32,037,000.00
Perfetto Contracting Co. Inc.	38.72	42.47	81.19	\$33,483,000.00
Grace Industries LLC	34.33	38.90	73.23	\$36,555,218.00

SCOPE OF WORK

The reinforced concrete bridge decks for both bridges are in very poor conditions. The underside of the decks exhibits multiple cracks, efflorescence, scaling and spalling with exposed reinforcement bars. Due to their deteriorated conditions, timber planking has been installed beneath the entire reinforced concrete decks. Also, the reinforced concrete substructures and sidewalks exhibit shallow spalled sections, scaling, and cracks. The bridge decks will be replaced in stages with the use of a detour and one-way directional traffic on both the Woolley Avenue bridge (to only allow Southbound traffic) and Bradley Avenue bridge (to only allow Northbound traffic). Work under this contract includes:

- Replacement of the structurally deficient reinforced concrete decks with 9½” thick monolithic reinforced concrete decks with integral wearing surfaces
- Approach slabs replacement
- Elimination of bridge joints at the abutments and piers using link slabs
- Replacement of all bearings and pedestals
- Substructure structural concrete repairs using PPC
- Replacement of the existing, non-conforming, steel bridge railings with vertical faced concrete parapets
- Painting entire superstructure steel
- Highway lighting and underdeck lighting replacement

PROJECT COST

The Original EE was \$32,611,532. The BV winning bid was \$28,442,856.00. Currently, there are no change orders in the contract.

CONTRACT TIME

The Contractor’s proposed completion date was 3/27/2024. It was adjusted in the award letter to 4/7/2024 due to late award. Currently, there is no additional approved Time Extension Change Order to adjust the completion date.

FINAL REPORT DUE DATE

Final Reports for Best Value Projects are due 6 months after completion of project work. For PIN X731.68, the construction contract completion date is 4/7/2024. The final report is due 10/4/2024.

Final Report: PIN: 0006.16 Contract: D263845

PIN: **0006.16**
Contract: D263845
Reporting Stage: Final Report
Location: Tobay Beach and Captree State Park in the Towns of Oyster Bay, Islip and Babylon
County: Nassau & Suffolk Counties
Region: 10
Brief description: Ocean Parkway Shared use Path
Awarded to: Peter Scalamandre & Sons Inc
Bid: \$16,193,713.00
Key information: Award Date – 7/12/2019
 Anticipated Contract Completion Date – 7/17/2021
 Contractor’s Proposed Completion Date (Form SCD) – 3/28/2021
 Adjusted Contract Completion Date – 3/28/2021

EVALUATION CRITERIA & FINAL COMBINED SCORES

Initial Interim report for this contract was included in the 2019-2020 Annual Report. Below are excerpts from that report.

The contract involved the construction of the second phase of the 14-mile shared-use path along the north side of the Ocean Parkway. Phase 2 extended between Tobay Beach and Captree State Park in the Towns of Oyster Bay, Islip and Babylon, in Nassau and Suffolk Counties.

The overall selection was based on 50% weighting of the cost score and 50% of the technical criteria score.

In response to the Best Value Special Note and subsequent addenda for PIN 0006.16, five (5) proposals were received by the deadline date (Letting) and all met the submission requirements. The proposals were distributed to an Evaluation Committee consisting of four NYSDOT subject matter experts from Regional and Main Office Construction, Landscape Architecture, and Design program areas.

On July 12, 2019, the contract was awarded to Peter Scalamandre & Sons Inc.

Proposer	Perfected Technical Score	Perfected Cost Score	Total Score	Total Cost
Constar Inc.	43.54	37.48	81.02	\$21,601,335.00
Grace Industries LLC	48.80	42.31	91.11	\$19,138,430.50
H&L Contracting	42.21	42.96	85.17	\$18,845,365.00
Peter Scalamandre & Sons Inc.	43.09	50.00	93.09	\$16,193,713.00
Posillico Civil Inc.	50.00	42.23	92.23	\$19,174,242.88

The contract completion date was never adjusted throughout the duration of the contract. The contractor’s proposed completion date of 3/28/2021 was met.

Total dollar value of all OOCs over the term of the contract is approximately +\$847,648. There were two significant change orders for added work. The final contract cost is \$17,041,361 (vs initial bid cost of \$16,193,713).

Final Report: PIN: 0809.97 Contract: D264051

PIN: **0809.97**
Contract: D264051
Reporting Stage: Final Report
Location: Town of Riverhead and Town of Islip
County: Suffolk County
Region: 10
Brief description: Bridge Deck Replacement and Bridge Repairs – various locations
Awarded to: DeFoe Corporation
Bid: \$14,395,053.80
Key information: Award Date – 2/21/2020
 Anticipated Contract Completion Date – 12/31/2021
 Contractor’s Proposed Completion Date (Form SCD) – 3/11/2021
 Adjusted Contract Completion Date – 4/23/2021

EVALUATION CRITERIA & FINAL COMBINED SCORES

Initial Interim report for this contract was included in the 2019-2020 Annual Report. Below are excerpts from that report.

The objective of the contract was to replace the deteriorated bridge decks and perform Red Flag repairs at the following locations:

- Deck replacement at I-495 over River Road (BIN's 1056191 / 1056192), Town of Riverhead
- Deck replacement at NY25 w/b over CR58 (BIN 1056230), Town of Riverhead
- Red Flag repair (partial deck repl.) at Lincoln Ave. over NY27 (BIN 1073300), Town of Islip

Work included the replacement of three (3) deteriorated bridge decks with new 9.5” monolithic concrete decks. The tall rocker bearings were also replaced with new elastomeric bearings and bridge railings and barriers were upgraded to meet new MASH Standards. The bridge repair at Lincoln Ave. over NY27 removed and replaced a portion of the original deck in order to replace a portion of the severely damaged fascia girder and restored traffic to the full bridge width – bringing this bridge back to a state of good repair.

The overall selection was based on 50% weighting of the cost score and 50% of the technical criteria score.

In response to the Best Value Special Note and subsequent addenda for PIN 0809.97, four (4) proposals were received by the deadline date (Letting), and all met the submission requirements. The proposals were distributed to an Evaluation Committee consisting of four NYSDOT subject matter experts from Regional and Main Office Construction, Structures and Design program areas.

On February 21, 2020, the contract was awarded to DeFoe Corporation.

Proposer	Perfected Technical Score	Perfected Cost Score	Total Score	Total Cost
Bove Industries, Inc.	45.87	42.25	88.38	\$16,930,000.00
DeFoe Corporation	50.00	50.00	100.00	\$14,395,053.80
Gateway Industries Inc.	42.62	32.52	75.14	\$22,135,831.38
Peter Scalamandre & Sons, Inc.	43.05	34.28	77.33	\$20,997,000.91

The contract completion date was never adjusted throughout the duration of the contract. The contractor's proposed completion date of 4/23/2021 was met.

Total dollar value of all OOCs over the term of the contract is approximately +\$98,608. There were two minor cleanup change orders. The final contract cost is \$14,493,662 (vs initial bid cost of \$14,395,054).

Final Report: PIN: X731.28 Contract: D262963

PIN: **X731.28**
Contract: D262963
Reporting Stage: Final Report
Location: Gowanus Expressway
County: Kings
Region: 11
Brief description: Gowanus Expy Steel Repairs, Co # 1, Kings County, NYC
Awarded to: El Sol Contracting
Bid: \$52,841,785
Key information: Award Date – 4/18/2016
 Anticipated Contract Completion Date – 6/18/2018
 Contractor’s Proposed Completion Date (Form SCD) – 3/31/2018
 Adjusted Contract Completion Date – 5/31/2021

EVALUATION CRITERIA & FINAL COMBINED SCORES

Initial Interim report for this contract was included in the 2016-2017 Annual Report. Below are excerpts from that report.

The scope of work included the structural steel repairs of stringers ends, curb girders, floor beams, columns; bridge bearing replacement, deck expansion joints resealing from Bent 0, near 6th Avenue and 65th Street, to Bent 117, near 48th Street on Third Avenue. In addition, the Contract also included the daily operation and maintenance of the am HOV lane from 92nd Street to the Hugh Carey Tunnel.

The overall selection was based on 50% weighting of the cost score and 50% of the technical criteria score.

In response to the Best Value Special Note and subsequent addenda, eight (8) proposals were received by the deadline date (Letting) and all met the submission requirements. The proposals were distributed to an Evaluation Committee consisting of four NYSDOT subject matter experts from Regional and Main Office Construction, Structures and Design program areas.

On April 18, 2016, the contract was awarded to El Sol Contracting.

Proposer	Technical Score	Cost Score	Total Score	Total Cost
El Sol Contracting	79.00	100.00	179.00	\$52,841,785
DeFoe Corp.	69.15	97.03	166.18	\$54,457,537
Halmar International	84.30	84.85	169.15	\$62,273,453
Judlau Contracting	72.42	79.94	152.36	\$66,100,000
Kiewit Infrastructure	78.35	67.29	145.63	\$78,533,000
Skanska Koch	81.77	77.88	159.65	\$67,850,000
Tully Construction	53.34	61.16	114.50	\$86,397,700
Yonkers Contracting	65.79	78.39	144.18	\$67,411,710

The contract completion date was adjusted 7 times throughout the duration of the contract. The first extension was due to late award, the completion date was adjusted to 5/10/2018. The work for the steel repairs were completed by the original contract completion date. The remaining time extensions were due mostly for added work to extend the operation and maintenance of the HOV lane. The contract completion date was last extended to 5/31/2021.

Total dollar value of all OOCs over the term of the contract was \$28,302,545. Approximately, \$17,385,000 in change orders were added for the operation and maintenance of the HOV lane until a new NYCDOT contract was in place. There was an agreement in place between TBTA, NYCDOT and NYSDOT to fund the operation of the HOV lane until a NYCDOT contract was executed, but due to COVID and other issues, the contract was not executed as expected. NYSDOT decided to award a new fast track contract (D264456) to continue the operation and maintenance of the HOV lane and close contract D262963. The final cost of contract D262963 was \$81,144,330 (vs initial bid cost of \$52,841,785).