

## 2018-19 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 three times since then. The latest extension covers projects advertised for bids between April 2019 and March 2021. 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 2018-2019, covering the period from April 1, 2018 to March 31, 2019. The report provides information on how NYSDOT used Best-Value selection during SFY 18/19 and presents plans for future Best-Value candidate projects. It also includes 3 interim reports and a final report.

#### 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, the PMO Director and the Chief Engineer.

### SFY 18/19 - Results of use of Best-Value Contract Selection

#### Awarded in SFY 18-19

PIN	D#	Project Title	Interim Report	Final Report
080959	D263630	BRIDGE REPAIRS	8/7/2018	2/25/2020
X73149	D263747	SHERIDAN BOULEVARD	5/10/2019	7/1/2020
172190	D263788	I87: EXIT 4 ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS, PH.2	5/10/2019	7/15/2020
076135	D263860	WALT WHITMAN RD OVER I495 BRIDGE WIDENING	5/10/2019	4/14/2021

#### Completed in SFY 18-19

PIN	D#	Project Title	Interim Report	Final Report
172252	D263652	ADIRONDACKS/GLENS FALLS WELCOME CENTER	100% State	
X73143	D263241	MITIGATION AND RESTORATION OF SGT. DAUGHERTY PARK KINGS, NYC	6/19/2017	5/10/2019

The interim reports for the projects awarded in 18-19 are included in this Annual 2018-2019 SEP14 report dated 5/10/2019 (see page 12).

There will be no interim or final reports for PIN 172252 since it was funded with 100% State funds. The final report for PIN X73143 is included in this report (see page 18).

## 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, 2019** were used in the comparison. This yielded seven (7) Best Value Projects. To identify a comparative list of Low Bid projects to compare to, a set of criteria was identified in order for comparable set of data points.

1. NYSDOT let projects. Only projects using traditional NYSDOT Design Bid Build-Low Bid practices 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 the purpose of this historical analysis, Low Bid projects having a letting date between May 1, 2012 – October 26, 2016 and a contract completion date on or before March 31, 2019 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 11M +/- and a high value of 55.0M +/- was used (the BV project awarded at \$145M was considered an outlier, therefore this amount was not used as the high value).

The above filtering criteria yielded **fifty-seven (57)** 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 in 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 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)	Contractor's 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	D260025	SABP00	5/24/2012	7/15/2013	7/15/2013	0	24,983,945	29,002,653	28,741,874	99%	116%
01	D262901	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	18,258,003	22,299,497	21,852,583	98%	122%
05	D262652	576080	08/25/2014	6/30/2017	5/12/2017	-49	45,921,169	56,198,817	59,990,215	107%	122%
08	D262004	810628	5/31/2012	6/30/2015	1/16/2015	-165	24,588,406	21,314,000	21,404,167	100%	87%
11	D263241	X73143	10/26/2016	6/28/2018	12/11/2018	166	8,000,359	11,376,746	12,171,826	107%	142%
<b>Indicator Averages</b>						<b>74</b>				<b>101%</b>	<b>117%</b>

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 Value **is equal to / is in D-B-B Low**
- AND** Date of Letting **is between 05/01/2012 and 10/26/2016**
- AND** Current Contract Completion Date **is less than or equal to 03/31/2019**
- AND** Contract Award amount **is between 11000000 and 55000000**

(OBIEE subject area = Site Manager & P6)

**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	D262266	105157	3/21/2013	12/31/2016	10/14/2016	-78	30,121,118	28,635,847	33,911,591	118%	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	21,905,799	108%	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	22,993,964	103%	111%
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	56,174,873	108%	110%
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	14,365,329	102%	98%
04	D262396	439023	11/21/2013	12/31/2015	4/30/2016	121	14,758,906	13,936,984	13,068,083	94%	94%
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	D262727	500699	12/18/2014	9/30/2016	11/10/2016	41	21,709,974	22,232,686	22,085,635	99%	102%
05	D263103	512632	3/3/2016	12/31/2016	11/29/2017	333	17,636,828	18,274,117	17,970,388	98%	104%
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	D262533	772079	3/6/2014	11/30/2015	5/25/2016	177	18,603,056	19,712,543	17,914,399	91%	106%
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%
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	18,568,482	109%	140%
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	D263018	935800	3/3/2016	2/23/2018	11/30/2017	-85	29,244,052	24,399,140	23,617,238	97%	83%
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	22,922,931	90%	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	D262656	022949	8/21/2014	12/31/2015	12/30/2015	-1	24,865,880	25,243,000	21,177,043	84%	102%
10	D262719	0BOW00	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	0CBOW1	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	19,210,093	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	13,804,136	102%	135%
10	D263126	080963	6/16/2016	12/15/2017	8/30/2018	258	13,203,763	11,647,000	10,748,853	92%	88%
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	D262685	X02505	9/18/2014	11/30/2016	11/18/2016	-12	13,452,345	16,834,670	12,620,140	75%	125%
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	D262804	X10338	2/5/2015	12/31/2016	9/28/2018	636	18,127,396	24,422,969	29,668,617	121%	135%
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%

Indicator Averages:

121

101% 98%

## Analysis of Historical Data

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

**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	111	238	99%	96%	-3%	110%	93%	-17%
16/17	-127	62	189	99%	97%	-2%	110%	94%	-16%
17/18	-114	129	243	100%	102%	2%	112%	93%	-19%
18/19	-74	121	195	101%	101%	0%	117%	98%	-18%

### Schedule Indicator:

This year as well as in the previous year the schedule indicator shows that Best Value projects on an average finished earlier than planned while Low Bid projects on an average finished after the planned completion. The delta of averages between the two procurements is 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 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. 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. Average awarded BV cost is 17% higher than the Engineers Estimate vs. Low Bid projects which on average showed an average awarded cost 2% lower than the engineer's estimate. It is expected that Best Value projects will on average produce a 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.

Consideration is given to the delta for this indicator between the two procurements, the latter being 18% (19%, 16% & 17% for the three 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 produced an average acceleration of over two months (74 days). Low Bid projects correspondingly completed on average four months later than expected (121 days). Computing the delta for this reporting pool of projects shows the Best Value procurement on average finished six (6) months (195 days) earlier than corresponding Low Bid projects.

The average planned construction length for Best Value projects was 672 calendar days or 22 months. The planned construction duration for Low Bid projects used in this historical analysis was 823 days or 27 months.

**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
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
11	D263241	X73143	10/26/2016	3/24/2017	12/11/2018	627	21
Average Best Value:						672	22



**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	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
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
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
04	D262396	439023	11/21/2013	12/18/2013	4/30/2016	864	29
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	D262727	500699	12/18/2014	4/29/2015	11/10/2016	561	19
05	D263103	512632	3/3/2016	8/19/2016	11/29/2017	467	16
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	D262533	772079	3/6/2014	4/18/2014	5/25/2016	768	26
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
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
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	D263018	935800	3/3/2016	5/6/2016	11/30/2017	573	19
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	D262656	022949	8/21/2014	9/12/2014	12/30/2015	474	16
10	D262719	0BOW00	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	0CBOW1	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
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	D262685	X02505	9/18/2014	10/31/2014	11/18/2016	749	25
11	D262696	XM1252	12/18/2014	2/10/2015	12/15/2017	1,039	35
11	D262804	X10338	2/5/2015	4/9/2015	9/28/2018	1,268	42
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
Average Low Bid:						823	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.

Starting with Contract D263241, The Department made a decision to change the number of evaluators participating in the evaluation committee from six (6) to four (4). We had been using a six-member team to emulate a Design Build evaluation process. The evaluation of Design-Bid-Build BV submissions is not as intricate and laborious as the evaluation of Design Build SOQs and Proposals. Given the number of Design Build projects in procurement, the number of subject matter experts to participate in the evaluation committees was getting scarce. In addition, the time between Letting and Award for Best Value projects has been longer than a typical duration of 45 days. With the use of 4 evaluators, the hope is to expedite the evaluation process by reducing scheduling conflicts with 6 people and reduce the time during the team’s consensus meeting.

Another change was also implemented starting with Contract D263406. As a result of many proposers not meeting the minimum Score of 70 Points (70% of 100 potential points) for the technical criteria and thus, being removed from further considerations, the Department made the decision to change the minimum Score to 60 points (or 60% of 100 potential points). The minimum score of 60 or 60% for the technical criteria is also consistent with the minimum score for D-B Best Value projects. This change has taken effect starting with Contract D263406-RMC over Fire Island Inlet-Bridge Steel Repairs, which is currently under construction.

Starting with Contract D263747, the scoring for Form SCD (Schedule of Contract Durations) was modified to assign points based on a date range (see example below). Rather than prorating the submitted completion date and assigning the highest value to the Contractor with the shortest duration, two or more Contractors could end up with the same score because they are only 1 to 29 days apart from each other.

<b>Actual Date of Substantial Completion Milestone (SCD-2)</b>	<b>Technical Points</b>
09/20/19 or earlier	50
09/21/19 to 10/21/19	47
10/22/19 to 1/21/19	44
11/22/19 to 12/20/19	40

NYS DOT’s Contract Management Bureau 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 out of 100 points, 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.

### Future Best-Value Projects

There are three BV projects that are currently in procurement and are expected to be awarded within the next three months.

Project	Region	Brief Description	Letting Date	Anticipated Award Date
X72039	11	Rehab of MDE Between W. 161 St & Highbridge Interchange Bronx County	2/13/2019	5/10/2019
000616	10	OP Shared use path Tobay to Captree	4/17/2019	7/2/2019
3M00018	03	Thompkins County Subresidency at Ithaca Tompkins Regional Airport	4/24/2019	6/6/2019

There are five BV projects planned to be let for the next three years.

Project	Region	Brief Description	Anticipated Letting Date
080997	10	Deck Replacement	10/23/2019
004242	10	NY25/NY107 Bridge Rehab	10/30/2019
X72707	11	Rehabilitation of 6 Bridges on the Cross Bronx Expressway, Bronx NYC	6/3/2021
547022	05	Rt 198; Scajaguada Expressway Corridor Project; Sections 1& 2	6/7/2021
1EST02	01	Empire State Trail in Pattersonville and Rotterdam Junction	12/11/2019

## Past & Future SEP 14 Reports Summary

### NYS DOT Best Value Projects In Construction

PIN	#	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
080959	D263630	BRIDGE REPAIRS	1/24/2018	4/4/2018	8/29/2019	5/4/2018	8/7/2018	2/25/2020	
022951	D263584	CR83 over I495 Deck Replacement	12/13/2017	3/16/2018	7/11/2019	100% State			
001143	D263477	NY231 SAFETY IMPVTS @ NSP INTCHNG	8/2/2017	10/16/2017	6/20/2019	11/15/2017	5/11/2018	12/17/2019	
X72977	D263452	REPL K-BR OVER NEWTOWN CR-CONT 2. KGS & QNS COS, NYC	5/24/2017	7/26/2017	11/8/2019	8/25/2017	5/11/2018	5/6/2020	
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	
X73575	D263208	REPLACE VAN WYCK EXPY VIADUCTS AT KEW GARDEN INTERCHANGE	11/15/2016	4/21/2017	3/20/2020	5/21/2017	6/19/2017	9/16/2020	
X73148	D263007	GOWANUS EXPY STEEL REPAIRS CONT. 2. KINGS, NYC	3/2/2016	7/22/2016	12/5/2018	8/21/2016	6/19/2017	6/3/2019	
X73149	D263747	SHERIDAN BOULEVARD	7/13/2018	9/5/2018	1/1/2020	10/5/2018	5/10/2019	7/1/2020	
X73128	D262963	GOWANUS EXPY STEEL REPAIRS CONT. 1. KINGS, NYC	12/16/2015	4/18/2016	7/31/2019	5/18/2016	6/19/2017	1/27/2020	
172190	D263788	I87: EXIT 4 ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS, PH.2	9/26/2018	11/30/2018	1/17/2020	12/30/2018	5/10/2019	7/15/2020	
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	

### Finaled

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	07/22/2012	06/06/2013	05/23/2015	06/23/2014
105502	D262595	RT.431: WHITEFACE MOUNTAIN ROAD RECONSTRUCTION	02/26/2014	04/23/2014	07/22/2015	05/23/2014	06/02/2015	01/18/2016	05/05/2017
152868	D262091	I-90 OVER HUDSON RIVER (PATROON ISL) BRIDGE	02/12/2013	04/26/2013	06/24/2016	05/26/2013	06/02/2015	12/21/2016	05/05/2017
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	02/01/2015	06/02/2015	05/14/2016	05/05/2017
576080	D262652	NY GATEWAY CONNECTIONS IMPROVEMENT TO US PEACE BRIDGE PLAZA	08/25/2014	10/24/2014	06/30/2017	11/23/2014	05/05/2017	12/27/2017	05/11/2018
810628	D262044	SPRAIN BROOK PARKWAY OVER ROUTE 119 BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	05/31/2012	07/23/2012	06/30/2015	08/22/2012	06/02/2015	12/17/2015	05/05/2017
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	3/6/2019	5/10/2019

**Interim Report: PIN: X731.49 Contract: D263747**

PIN: ..... X731.49  
Contract: ..... D263747  
Reporting Stage: Interim Report  
Location: ..... From Bruckner Expressway to Cross Bronx Expressway  
County: ..... Bronx  
Region: ..... 11  
Brief description: Enhancement Project on the Arthur Sheridan Expressway (I-895)  
Awarded to: ..... Yonkers Contracting Company, Inc  
Bid: ..... \$53,911,447  
Key information: Award Date – 9/5/2018  
 Anticipated Contract Completion Date – 3/19/2020  
 Contractor’s Proposed Completion Date (Form SCD) – 12/19/2019  
 Adjusted Contract Completion Date – 1/1/2020

**EVALUATION CRITERIA**

The Best Value Special Note technical criteria included the following 3 categories (100 potential points):

- Schedule
  - Form SCD – Table 2: Substantial Completion (50 points)
  - Gantt Chart & Construction Schedule Narrative (20 points)
- Construction Approach
  - Means & Methods to perform major work (8 points)
  - Issues, Risks, Mitigation (6 points)
  - Innovative construction measures and techniques (6 points)
- Experience & Past Performance
  - Construction performance related to schedule, budget & liquidated damages (5 points)
  - Record of meeting M/WBE/DBE contract goals (5 points)

The Cost Bid score was determined by assigning a total of 100 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 Yonkers Contracting Company, Inc with a total final score of 96.32.

**FINAL COMBINED SCORES**

In response to the Best Value Special Note and subsequent Addenda, eleven (11) 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
DeFoe Corp	83.28	46.78	41.61	88.39	\$62,497,432.07
EL SOL CONTRACTING & CONSTRUCTION CORP. 1 ES II Enterprises, J.V.	85.20	47.87	40.35	88.22	\$64,441,497.75
Grace Industries, LLC	85.58	48.08	46.54	94.61	\$55,874,454.45

Halmar International LLC	84.18	47.29	41.57	88.85	\$62,560,683.37
KISKA CONSTRUCTION, INC.	86.98	48.86	40.95	89.81	\$63,500,000.00
Michels Corporation	89.00	50.00	41.03	91.03	\$63,374,024.99
Perfetto Contracting	83.90	47.13	40.84	87.98	\$63,667,713.13
Restani Construction Corp.	71.38	40.10	50.00	90.10	\$52,006,717.50
Schiavone Construction Co. LLC	87.40	49.10	40.15	89.25	\$64,769,000.00
Triumph Construction Company			(Note 1)		
Yonkers Contracting Company, Inc.	85.60	48.09	48.23	96.32	\$53,911,446.55

Note 1: Triumph Construction Company did not meet the minimum technical score threshold of 60 out of 100 points, therefore they were removed from the cost evaluation and total scoring.

**SCOPE OF WORK**

The purpose of the project is to provide improved pedestrian accommodations throughout the corridor, while enhancing the compatibility of the corridor with current and future adjacent land uses. The scope includes new signalized pedestrian crossings at Jennings St., East 172nd St. and East 173rd St. and connections from northbound Edgewater Road to the Southbound Sheridan at Jennings and 172nd St. A new Pedestrian Bridge is proposed in Starlight Park over the Bronx River. There will be a new 2-way bikeway along Edgewater Road leading to Starlight Park. The new roadway is a conversion of an interstate to a boulevard layout with wide planted medians and a new speed limit of 30 mph. Both Edgewater Road and W. Farms Road will be converted to one way roadways.

**PROJECT COST**

The Original EE was \$85,577,653. The BV winning bid was \$53,911,447. There has been \$26,510 in approved change orders so far.

**CONTRACT TIME**

The Contractor’s proposed completion date was 12/19/2019. It was adjusted in the award letter to 1/1/2020 due to late award. At this time, 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 X731.49, the construction contract completion date is 1/1/2020. The final report is due 7/1/2020.

**Interim Report: PIN: 1721.90 Contract: D263788**

PIN: ..... 1721.90  
Contract: ..... D263788  
Reporting Stage: Interim Report  
Location: ..... Town of Colonie  
County: ..... Albany County  
Region: ..... 01  
Brief description: I-87: Exit 4, Airport Connector Part 2  
Awarded to: ..... Lancaster Development Inc.  
Bid: ..... \$31,077,048  
Key information: Award Date – 11/29/2018  
 Anticipated Contract Completion Date – 10/30/2020  
 Contractor’s Proposed Completion Date (Form SCD) – 12/11/2019  
 Adjusted Contract Completion Date – 1/17/2020

**EVALUATION CRITERIA**

The Best Value Special Note technical criteria included the following 2 categories (100 potential points):

- Schedule
  - Form SCD – Table 1: Project Completion (30 points)
  - Gantt Chart & Construction Schedule Narrative (50 points)
- Experience & Past Performance
  - Construction performance related to schedule, budget & liquidated damages (15 points)
  - Record of meeting M/WBE/DBE contract goals (5 points)

The Cost Bid score was determined by assigning a total of 100 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 Lancaster Development and Tully Construction Co., LLC - dba L&T Construction with a total final score of 100.

**FINAL COMBINED SCORES**

In response to the Best Value Special Note and subsequent Addenda, three (3) 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
Kubricky Construction Corp.	76.75	46.52	47.69	94.21	\$32,580,829.40
Lancaster Development and Tully Construction Co., LLC - dba L&T Construction	82.50	50.00	50.00	100.00	\$31,077,048.27
Rifenburg Construction, Inc.	81.25	49.24	48.90	98.14	\$31,774,450.00

## **SCOPE OF WORK**

The purpose of the proposed project is to provide improved access between I-87 and the Albany International Airport and between I-87 and Wolf Road; improved safety and traffic operations at Exit 4; and to improve system connectivity between the existing pedestrian/bicycle facilities on Wolf Road and the facilities constructed as part of the Albany/Watervliet-Shaker Road project. The proposed project would include constructing new I-87 Exit 4 ramps to replace and/or complement the existing I-87 Exit 4 interchange ramps. This would include:

- Construction of new flyover ramp to connect I-87 northbound to Albany Shaker Road. This includes the construction of a new bridge to carry flyover ramp over I-87 northbound and southbound.
- Construction of a new ramp to connect I-87 southbound to Albany Shaker Road.
- Construction of new ramp to connect Albany Shaker Road to I-87 southbound.
- Construction of a new intersection on Albany Shaker Road at the flyover ramp.
- Construction of a new auxiliary lane along I-87 northbound between the Exit 4 on-ramp and the Exit 5 off-ramp.
- Pavement widening for additional turn lanes and medians on Albany Shaker Road.
- Modifying the existing I-87 Exit 4 northbound off-ramp to create a one-lane ramp allowing right-turns only onto Wolf Road and removal of the existing traffic signal at the intersection with Wolf Road.
- Removal of the existing I-87 Exit 4 southbound off-ramp and I-87 Exit 5 southbound on-ramp.
- Removal of the C-D road between the existing I-87 Exit 5 southbound on-ramp and I-87 Exit 4 southbound off-ramp.
- Replacement of the existing I-87 Exit 5 southbound on-ramp with a new direct ramp connection from Watervliet Shaker Road to I-87 southbound.
- Replacement/installation of traffic signals at the following intersections:
  - Albany Shaker Road / flyover ramp
  - Albany Shaker Road / Old Wolf Road
  - Albany Shaker Road / Wolf Road
- Removal of traffic signals at the following intersections:
  - Wolf Road / I-87 Exit 4 northbound off-ramp
  - Old Wolf Road / existing I-87 Exit 4 southbound off-ramp
- Pedestrian facility system connectivity by providing sidewalks on the south side of Albany Shaker Road between the flyover ramp connector road and Wolf Road as well as a shared-use path between the Albany International Airport and the flyover ramp connector road.
- Installation of noise wall along I-87 northbound between Exit 4 and Exit 5.
- Construction of a wetland mitigation site near the project.

## **PROJECT COST**

The Original EE was \$36,213,888. The BV winning bid was \$31,077,048. There have been \$26,653 in approved change orders to date.

## **CONTRACT TIME**

The Contractor's proposed completion date was 12/11/2019. It was adjusted in the award letter to 1/17/2020. At this time, 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 1721.90, the construction contract completion date is 1/17/2020. The final report is due 7/15/2020.



**Interim Report: PIN: 0761.35 Contract: D263860**

PIN: ..... 0761.35  
Contract: ..... D263860  
Reporting Stage: Interim Report  
Location: ..... Towns of Huntington  
County: ..... Suffolk County  
Region: ..... 10  
Brief description: Walt Whitman Road over LIE (I-495) - Bridge Replacement  
Awarded to: ..... Grace Industries Inc.  
Bid: ..... \$28,208,661  
Key information: Award Date – 3/1/2019  
 Anticipated Contract Completion Date – 5/15/2021  
 Contractor’s Proposed Completion Date (Form SCD) – 10/16/2020  
 Adjusted Contract Completion Date – 10/16/2020

**EVALUATION CRITERIA**

The Best Value Special Note technical criteria included the following 3 categories (100 potential points):

- Schedule
  - Form SCD – Table 2: Substantial Completion (40 points)
  - Gantt Chart & Construction Schedule Narrative (20 points)
- Construction Approach
  - Means & Methods to perform major work (10 points)
  - Issues, Risks, Mitigation (6 points)
  - Innovative construction measures and techniques (4 points)
- Experience & Past Performance
  - Construction performance related to schedule, budget & liquidated damages (14 points)
  - Record of meeting M/WBE/DBE contract goals (6 points)

The Cost Bid score was determined by assigning a total of 100 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 Grace Industries Inc. with a total final score of 100.

**FINAL COMBINED SCORES**

In response to the Best Value Special Note and subsequent Addenda, three (3) 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
Grace Industries, LLC	78.90	50.00	50.00	100.00	\$28,208,661.45
Posillico Civil, Inc.	71.05	45.03	49.86	94.89	\$28,285,972.00
Michels Corporation			(Note 1)		

(Note 1): Michels Corporation did not meet the contract requirements (contractor's proposal was based on closure of the Walt Whitman bridge for 17 weeks), therefore they were removed from the cost evaluation and total scoring.

**SCOPE OF WORK**

This project proposes to replace the narrow bridge carrying Walt Whitman Road over I-495 with a wider bridge that will reduced delays and accommodate future traffic demands. The intersections with the I-495 service roads will also be reconfigured to improve the level of service during the morning and evening rush hour periods. The proposed work will also enhance pedestrian and bicycle travel in the project area by filling gaps in the sidewalk network along the Walt Whitman Road corridor and providing standard shoulders for bicyclists. The intersection improvements and the wider bridge cross section will enhance the level of service within the project area, reducing delays and improving mobility. The new bridge will increase the number of useable lanes on the bridge from three lanes to six lanes and eliminate the existing non-standard features along the Walt Whitman road corridor.

**PROJECT COST**

The Original EE was \$26,897,896. The BV winning bid was \$28,208,661. There are no approved OOCs so far.

**CONTRACT TIME**

The Contractor's proposed completion date is 10/16/2020. At this time, there is no 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 0761.35, the construction contract completion date is 10/16/2020. The final report is due 4/14/2021.

**Final Report: PIN: X73143 Contract: D263241**

PIN: ..... X731.43  
Contract: ..... D263241  
 Reporting Stage: Final Report  
Location: ..... Sgt. Daugherty Park, Brooklyn NY  
County: ..... Kings  
Region: ..... 11  
Brief description: Mitigation and Restoration of Sgt. Daugherty Park  
Awarded to: ..... Defoe Corporation  
Bid: ..... \$11.377 M  
Key information: Award Date – 3/24/2017  
 Anticipated Contract Completion Date – 12/28/2018  
 Contractor’s Proposed Completion Date (Form SCD) – 6/28/2018  
 Adjusted Contract Completion Date – 12/28/2018

**EVLUATION CRITERIA & FINAL COMBINED SCORES**

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

PIN X731.43 did not have similar characteristics to previous D-B-B projects that utilized Best-Value selection. This project involved the construction of a park including a comfort station, basketball court, skate park, handball court, playground and water spray area.

This project is a park reconstruction contract of the existing Sergeant William Dougherty Playground in Brooklyn, NY. The project objective was to mitigate the impacts to the park due to the realignment of Cherry Street associated with the replacement of the Kosciuszko Bridge. Portions of the existing Sargent Dougherty Playground property were taken to construct the Kosciuszko Bridge. Due to these park impacts a newly designed Sargent Dougherty Park has been constructed. The park is NYCDPR jurisdiction and the surrounding sidewalks, curbs and driveways are NYCDOT jurisdiction.

The contract required an experienced contractor that has a proven record of successfully completing similar recreational facility projects. The overall selection was based on 50% weighting of the cost score and 50% of the technical criteria score.

Eight (8) proposals were received by the deadline date (Letting). Three proposals (Gazebo, Coppolla, and Paul Scariano) were deemed non-responsive based on not meeting the Best Value Note requirements and were removed from further consideration in the evaluation process. Five 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 March 24, 2017, the contract was awarded to Defoe Corporation.

Proposer	Raw Technical Score	Perfected Technical Score	Perfected Cost Score	Total Score	Total Cost
UTB-United Technology, Inc.	60.70	* Note 1	N/A	N/A	\$11,562,450.00
PCC Perfetto Contracting Co., Inc.	59.53	*Note 1	N/A	N/A	\$8,800,736.09
DeFoe Corp	89.66	50	50	100	\$11,376,746.07
Gramercy Wrecking and Environmental Contractors	67.28	*Note 1	N/A	N/A	\$9,683,000.00
ConStar Inc.	53.66	*Note 1	N/A	N/A	\$10,444,444.00

\*Note 1: Four of the five proposers were removed from further consideration for scoring lower than the minimum acceptable combined Score of 70 Points (70% of 100 potential points) for the three technical criteria as specified in the Best Value Special Note.

The contract completion date was adjusted 4 times throughout the duration of the contract. The first extension was due to late award and the other three were due to unanticipated field conditions, third party delays and administrative reasons.

Total dollar value of all OOCs over the term of the contract is approx. \$795,000. The final contract cost is \$12,171,826. (vs initial bid cost of \$11,376,746). During the last construction months, there were no positive OOC. There were only a few small negative OOCs for that brought the final cost to \$12,171,826.