

2019-20 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 2019-20, covering the period from April 1, 2019 to March 31, 2020. The report provides information on how NYSDOT used Best-Value selection during SFY 19/20 and presents plans for future Best-Value candidate projects. It also includes 5 interim reports and 3 final 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, the PMO Director and the Chief Engineer.

SFY 19/20 - Results of use of Best-Value Contract Selection

Awarded in SFY 19-20

PIN	D#	Project Title	Interim Report	Final Report
X72039	D263821	REHAB OF MDE BETWEEN W.161 ST. & HIGHBRIDGE INT BRONX CO, NY	8/14/2020	10/5/2022
000616	D263845	OP SHARED USE PATH TOBAY TO CAPTREE	8/14/2020	9/24/2021
3M0018	D264050	TOMPKINS COUNTY SUBRESIDENCY AT ITHACA TOMPKINS REGIONAL AIRPORT	100% State	
080997	D264051	BRIDGE DECK REPLACEMENT AND BRIDGE REPAIRS, SUFFOLK COUNTY	8/14/2020	10/23/2021
X73585	D264148	REPLACEMENT OF LIRR ATLANTIC 6 BRIDGE OVER THE VWE	8/14/2020	6/19/2021
004242	D264049	NY25/NY107 BRIDGE REHAB	8/14/2020	8/17/2022

Completed in SFY 19-20

PIN	D#	Project Title	Interim Report	Final Report
022951	D263584	CR83 OVER I495 DECK REPLACEMENT	100% State	
001766	D263406	RMC OVER FI INLET BRIDGE STEEL REPAIRS	5/11/2018	8/14/2020
001143	D263477	NY231 SAFETY IMPVTS @ NSP INTCHNG	5/11/2018	8/14/2020
X73149	D263747	SHERIDAN BOULEVARD	5/10/2019	8/14/2020

The interim reports for the projects awarded in 19-20 are included in this Annual 2019-2020 SEP14 report dated 8/14/2020 (see page 12).

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, 2020** were used in the comparison. This yielded ten (10) 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 – July 13, 2018 and a contract completion date on or before **March 31, 2020** 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 56.0M +/- 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 **seventy-eight (78)** 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)	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	D262595	105502	2/26/2014	12/31/2015	6/17/2015	-197	9,458,003	11,191,970	10,589,003	95%	118%
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	D262718	172151	10/28/2014	5/25/2016	11/6/2015	-201	18,258,083	22,299,497	21,852,583	98%	122%
01	D262025	SABP00	5/24/2012	7/15/2013	7/15/2013	0	24,983,945	29,002,653	28,741,874	99%	116%
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	D263477	001143	8/2/2017	1/15/2019	9/19/2019	247	14,810,908	15,743,708	16,251,742	103%	106%
10	D263406	001766	3/29/2017	9/28/2018	2/22/2019	147	18,517,863	15,765,815	16,375,800	104%	85%
11	D263241	X73143	10/26/2016	6/28/2018	12/11/2018	166	8,000,359	11,376,746	12,171,826	107%	142%
11	D263747	X73149	7/13/2018	12/19/2019	12/31/2019	12	85,577,653	53,911,447	52,354,344	97%	63%
Indicator Averages:						-11.2				101%	107%

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.

FILTERS

Project Delivery Method Value is equal to/is in D-B-B Low

AND Date of letting is between 05/01/2012 and 07/13/2018

AND Current Contract Completion Date is less than or equal to 03/31/2020

AND Contract Award Amount is between 11,000,000 and 56,000,000

(OBIEE subject area = Site Manager & P6)

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%	-19%
19/20	-11.2	136	147	101%	101%	0%	107%	102%	-5%

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 7% 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 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 5% (19%, 19%, 16% & 17% for the four 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 ahead of schedule (11 days). Low Bid projects correspondingly completed on average 4.5 months later than expected (136 days). Computing the delta for this reporting pool of projects shows the Best Value procurement on average finished 5 months (147 days) earlier than corresponding Low Bid projects.

The average planned construction length for Best Value projects was 648 calendar days or 22 months. The planned construction duration for Low Bid projects used in this historical analysis was 817 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
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
11	D263747	X73149	7/13/2018	9/5/2018	12/31/2019	482	16
Average Best Value:						648	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
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
03	D263545	350651	9/7/2017	10/4/2017	10/31/2018	392	13
04	D263249	453107	12/15/2016	5/10/2017	1/31/2019	631	21
05	D262671	541054	9/4/2014	10/10/2014	6/5/2019	1,699	57
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	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
09	D262781	901439	12/3/2015	12/23/2015	5/29/2019	1,253	42
10	D263287	051736	2/16/2017	5/25/2017	11/28/2018	552	18
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	D262962	XM1451	10/8/2015	11/27/2015	12/30/2019	1,494	50
11	D263250	XM1720	10/20/2016	11/23/2016	2/22/2018	456	15
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	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	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
Average Low Bid:						817	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.

Actual Date of Substantial Completion Milestone (SCD-2)	Technical Points
9/20/19 or earlier	50
9/21/19 to 10/21/19	47
10/22/19 to 11/21/19	44
11/22/19 to 12/20/19	40

NYS DOT'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 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.

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 proven helpful to the members of the Evaluation Committee.

Future Best-Value Projects

There is one BV project that is currently in procurement and is expected to be awarded within the next three months.

Project	Region	Brief Description	Letting Date	Anticipated Award Date
X73580	11	VAN WYCK EXPRESSWAY VIADUCT REHABILITATION, QUEENS CO, CO# 1	7/22/20	9/25/20

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

Project	Region	Brief Description	Anticipated Letting Date
X73158	11	THE CONSTRUCTION OF MASPETH PARK IN QUEENS COUNTY, NYC	TBD
022948	10	OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS LIE (I-495) AT CROOKED HILL ROAD	TBD
X72707	11	REHABILITATION OF 6 BRIDGES ON THE CROSS BRONX EXPRESSWAY, BRONX NYC	TBD
889862	08	WURTS STREET/DOCK STREET	TBD

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
X73128	D262963	GOWANUS EXPY STEEL REPAIRS CONT. 1. KINGS, NYC	12/16/2015	4/18/2016	2/28/2021	5/18/2016	6/19/2017	8/27/2021	
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	
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	
X72039	D263821	REHAB OF MDE BETWEEN W.161 ST. & HIGHBRIDGE INT BRONX CO, NY	2/13/2019	5/23/2019	4/8/2022	6/22/2019	8/14/2020	10/5/2022	
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	
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	
004242	D264049	NY25/NY107 BRIDGE REHAB	10/30/2019	2/28/2020	2/17/2022	3/29/2020	8/14/2020	8/17/2022	
3M0018	D264050	TOMPKINS COUNTY SUBRESIDENCY AT ITHACA TOMPKINS REGIONAL AIRPORT	8/14/2019	12/9/2019	10/20/2020	100% State			
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	10/23/2021	
X73585	D264148	REPLACEMENT OF LIRR ATLANTIC 6 BRIDGE OVER THE VWE	12/4/2019	2/27/2020	12/21/2020	3/28/2020	8/14/2020	6/19/2021	

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	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
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	
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	

Interim Report: PIN: X720.39 Contract: D263821

<u>PIN:</u>	720.39
<u>Contract:</u>	D263821
<u>Reporting Stage:</u>	Interim Report
<u>Location:</u>	Major Deegan Expressway (I-87) between W.161 St. and Highbridge Interchange
<u>County:</u>	Bronx
<u>Region:</u>	11
<u>Brief description:</u>	Rehabilitation of the Major Deegan Expressway
<u>(I-87) Awarded to:</u>	Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.
<u>Bid:</u>	\$118,975,000
<u>Key information:</u>	Award Date – 5/23/19
	Anticipated Contract Completion Date – 4/14/22
	Contractor's Proposed Completion Date (Form SCD) – 2/15/22
	Adjusted Contract Completion Date – 4/8/22

EVALUATION CRITERIA

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

- Schedule
 - Form SCD – Table 1: Project Completion Date (25 points)
 - Form SCD – Table 2: Impacts to Traffic (20 points)
 - Gantt Chart & Construction Schedule Narrative (15 points)
- Construction Approach
 - Means & Methods to perform major work (8 points)
 - Issues, Risks, Mitigation (8 points)
 - Innovative construction measures and techniques (4 points)
- Experience & Past Performance
 - Construction performance related to schedule, budget & liquidated damages (10 points)
 - Record of meeting M/WBE/DBE contract goals (10 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 Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc. with a total final score of 94.70.

FINAL COMBINED SCORES

In response to the Best Value Special Note and subsequent Addenda, seven (7) 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	63.09	42.41	40.41	82.82	\$147,223,190.89
Judlau Contracting, Inc.	68.70	46.18	40.31	86.49	\$147,564,850.20
Schiavone Construction Co. LLC	71.26	47.90	38.10	86.00	\$156,120,000.00
Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc.	66.51	44.70	50.00	94.70	\$118,975,000.00
Tully Construction Company	68.25	45.87	40.79	86.66	\$145,849,019.45
Yonkers Contracting Company, Inc.	74.39	50.00	35.30	85.30	\$168,511,848.00
Posillico Civil, Inc.			(Note 1)		

Note 1: Posillico Civil, Inc. was deemed non-responsive due to deviation from contract documents, therefore they were removed from the cost evaluation and total scoring.

SCOPE OF WORK

The scope includes the following:

- Elimination of the existing MDE SB viaduct (BIN 1067451) and MDE NB inactive subway station structure (BIN 1067452)
- Construction of new retaining wall structures to allow for elimination of the existing steel structures by backfilling under the existing SB viaduct and the inactive subway station structure at 161st Street
- The rehabilitation of Depot Place Bridge over MDE.
- Lowering the northern segment of existing MDE SB roadway profile and modifying the median wall that separate the existing MDE NB&SB to meet the new profile.
- Demolition of existing and construction of new retaining wall further east along Sedgwick Avenue for the addition of new MDE NB 4th lane.
- Replacement and relocation of existing utility lines, ITS, sign structures, signage, drainage system, roadway lighting, etc.
- Improvements to Sedgwick Avenue with new roadway pavement, sidewalk and curb; addition of new traffic signal; and a new slip ramp from Sedgwick Avenue to MDE NB.
- Mitigation works as required in MNRR Highbridge Yard.

PROJECT COST

The Original EE was \$173,251,344. The BV winning bid was \$118,975,000. There has been one minor change order approved for -\$227 so far.

CONTRACT TIME

The Contractor's proposed completion date was 2/15/22. It was adjusted in the award letter to 4/8/2022 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 X720.39, the construction contract completion date is 4/8/2022. The final report is due 10/5/2022.

Interim Report: PIN: 0006.16 Contract: D263845

<u>PIN:</u>	0006.16
<u>Contract:</u>	D263845
<u>Reporting Stage:</u>	Interim Report
<u>Location:</u>	Tobay Beach and Captree State Park in the Towns of Oyster Bay, Islip and Babylon
<u>County</u>	Nassau & Suffolk Counties
<u>Region</u>	10
<u>Brief description:</u>	Ocean Parkway Shared use Path
<u>Awarded to:</u>	Peter Scalamandre & Sons Inc
<u>Bid:</u>	\$16,193,713
<u>Key information:</u>	Award Date – 7/12/19
	Anticipated Contract Completion Date – 7/17/21
	Contractor's Proposed Completion Date (Form SCD) – 3/28/21
	Adjusted Contract Completion Date – 3/28/21

EVALUATION CRITERIA

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

- Schedule
 - Form SCD – Table 2: Substantial Completion Milestone Date (40 points)
 - Gantt Chart & Construction Schedule Narrative (20 points)
- Construction Approach
 - Means & Methods to perform major work (12 points)
 - Issues, Risks, Mitigation (8 points)
- Experience & Past Performance
 - Construction performance related to schedule, budget & liquidated damages (12 points)
 - Record of meeting M/WBE/DBE contract goals (8 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 Peter Scalamandre & Sons Inc. with a total final score of 93.09.

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
Constar Inc.	68.70	43.54	37.48	81.02	\$21,601,335.00
Grace Industries LLC	77.00	48.80	42.31	91.11	\$19,138,430.50
H&L Contracting	66.60	42.21	42.96	85.17	\$18,845,365.00
Peter Scalamandre & Sons Inc.	68.00	43.09	50.00	93.09	\$16,193,713.00
Posillico Civil Inc.	78.90	50.00	42.23	92.23	\$19,174,242.88

SCOPE OF WORK

The purpose of the proposed project is to provide a safe facility for non-motorized traffic to access recreational and employment facilities along Ocean Parkway. The project will also serve to reduce highway congestion

and improve air quality by converting some motorized traffic into non-motorized. This project proposes to construct the 2nd phase of the 14 mile shared-use-path along the north side of the Ocean Parkway. Phase 2 extends between Tobay Beach and Captree State Park in the Towns of Oyster Bay, Islip and Babylon, in Nassau and Suffolk Counties.

PROJECT COST

The Original EE was \$16,055,706. The BV winning bid was \$16,193,713. There have been +\$354,625 in approved change orders to date for added work to correcting miscellaneous field conditions.

CONTRACT TIME

The Contractor's proposed completion date was 3/28/21. 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 0006.16, the construction contract completion date is 3/28/21. The final report is due 9/24/2021.

Interim Report: PIN: 0042.42 Contract: D264049

PIN: 0042.42
Contract: D264049
Reporting Stage: Interim Report
Location: Town of Oyster Bay
County: Nassau County
Region: 10
Brief description: NY25 over NY107 (BIN 1018219) – Bridge Rehabilitation
Awarded to: H & L Contracting LLC
Bid: \$11,986,256.64
Key information: Award Date – 2/28/20
 Anticipated Contract Completion Date – 9/1/22
 Contractor’s Proposed Completion Date (Form SCD) – 12/29/21
 Adjusted Contract Completion Date – 2/17/22

EVALUATION CRITERIA

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

- Schedule
 - Form SCD – Table 2: Construction Duration Milestone (25 points)
 - Gantt Chart & Construction Schedule Narrative (10 points)
- Construction Approach
 - Means & Methods to perform major work (5 points)
- Experience & Past Performance
 - Construction performance related to schedule, budget & liquidated damages (6 points)
 - Record of meeting M/WBE/DBE contract goals (4 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 H & L Contracting LLC with a total final score of 100.

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
H & L Contracting LLC	42.65	50.00	50.00	100.00	\$11,986,256.64
DeFoe Corp	42.40	49.71	46.74	96.45	\$12,823,046.50
Gateway Industries Inc.	39.18	45.93	44.56	90.49	\$13,448,498.18
Grace Industries LLC	39.73	46.58	43.19	89.77	\$13,876,578.00
Triumph Union JV			(Note 1)		

Note 1: Triumph Union JV was deemed non-responsive due to violation of contract submission requirements (the cost bid proposal was included in the technical proposal), therefore they were removed from the cost evaluation and total scoring.

SCOPE OF WORK

This project proposes to improve bridge conditions of the NY25 bridge over NY107. This bridge has many bridge elements in poor condition. The work proposed will bring the bridge into a state of good repair and extend the life of the original deck. The project proposes to rehabilitate the deteriorating bridge. Bridge joints will be eliminated with the use of "link slabs" which will protect the substructure from future deterioration. Bridge railings and barriers will be upgraded to meet new MASH Standards and a new asphalt wearing surface will be installed to provide a smooth riding surface. In addition, substructure and superstructure repairs will be performed to bring the bridge into a state of good repair.

PROJECT COST

The Original EE was \$10,527,271. The BV winning bid was \$11,986,256.64. There are no approved OOCs so far.

CONTRACT TIME

The Contractor's proposed completion date was 12/29/21. It was adjusted in the award letter to 2/17/22 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 0042.42, the construction contract completion date is 2/17/22. The final report is due 8/17/22.

Interim Report: PIN: 0809.97 Contract: D264051

PIN: 0809.97
Contract: D264051
Reporting Stage: Interim 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 – 2/21/20
 Anticipated Contract Completion Date – 12/31/21
 Contractor’s Proposed Completion Date (Form SCD) – 3/11/21
 Adjusted Contract Completion Date – 4/23/21

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 (15 points)
 - Gantt Chart & Construction Schedule Narrative (5 points)
- Construction Approach
 - Means & Methods to perform major work (10 points)
 - Issues, Risks, Mitigation (5 points)
- Experience & Past Performance
 - Construction performance related to schedule, budget & liquidated damages (10 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 DeFoe Corporation with a total final score of 100.

FINAL COMBINED SCORES

In response to the Best Value Special Note and subsequent Addenda, four (4) 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
Bove Industries, Inc.	38.67	45.87	42.51	88.38	\$16,930,000.00
DeFoe Corporation	42.25	50.00	50.00	100.00	\$14,395,053.80
Gateway Industries Inc.	36.01	42.62	32.52	75.14	\$22,135,831.38
Peter Scalamandre & Sons, Inc	36.38	43.05	34.28	77.33	\$20,997,000.91

SCOPE OF WORK

Project objectives are to replace the deteriorated bridge decks and perform a 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

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

PROJECT COST

The Original EE was \$20,349,852.42. The BV winning bid was \$14,395,053.80. At the conclusion of the technical evaluation, a review of the cost proposal of the apparent BV designee revealed that a minus 15% below EE analysis was required. Such analysis was required as the recommended BV designee's bid of \$14,395,053.80 was 29% below the EE. NYSDOT Office of Construction's review concluded that the bid was a reasonable one. There are no approved OOCs so far.

CONTRACT TIME

The Contractor's proposed completion date was 3/11/21. It was adjusted in the award letter to 4/23/21 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 0042.42, the construction contract completion date is 4/23/21. The final report is due 10/23/21.

Interim Report: PIN: X735.85 Contract: D264148

<u>PIN:</u>	735.85
<u>Contract:</u>	D264148
<u>Reporting Stage:</u>	Interim Report
<u>Location:</u>	Van Wyck Expressway between Hillside Avenue and Liberty Avenue
<u>County:</u>	Queens County
<u>Region:</u>	11
<u>Brief description:</u>	Replacement of the LIRR Atlantic 6 Bridge over Van Wyck Expressway
<u>Awarded to:</u>	Halmar International LLC
<u>Bid:</u>	\$30,769,311.29
<u>Key information:</u>	Award Date – 2/27/20
	Anticipated Contract Completion Date – 12/31/20
	Contractor’s Proposed Completion Date (Form SCD) – 11/25/20
	Adjusted Contract Completion Date – 12/21/20

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Best Value Special Note technical criteria included the following 2 categories (50 potential points):

- Schedule
 - Form SCD – Table 2: Substantial Completion Milestone (25 points)
 - Gantt Chart & Construction Schedule Narrative (15 points)
- Experience & Past Performance
 - Managed and constructed projects of similar scope and complexity (7 points)
 - Construction performance related to schedule, budget & liquidated damages (3 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 Halmar International, LLC with a total final score of 100.

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
Halmar International, LLC	45.20	50.00	49.23	99.23	\$30,769,311.29
Perfetto Contracting Co. Inc.	32.40	35.84	50.00	85.84	\$30,298,000.00
Posillico Civil, Inc	35.03	38.75	42.77	81.52	\$35,419,348.12
Granite Construction Northeast, Inc.	34.74	38.43	23.09	61.52	\$65,600,000.00
Tully Construction Co. Inc.			(Note 1)		

Note 1: Tully Construction Co. Inc. was removed from consideration for scoring lower than the minimum threshold combined technical score of 30 points (60% of 50 potential points) as specified in the Best Value Submission Note, therefore they were removed from the cost evaluation and total scoring.

SCOPE OF WORK

Work under this contract includes complete replacement of the LIRR Atlantic 6 bridge. In order to accommodate future widening of the Van Wyck Expressway, three of the existing piers need to be eliminated (Pier 13, Pier 14 and Pier 16). The following work will be performed:

- Relocation of the utilities that are currently carried on the South side of the existing bridge, to the North fascia of the proposed bridge
- Replacement (at the same location) of the East and West abutments with new cantilever concrete abutments supported on drilled shafts;
- Replacement (at the same location) of the center pier (Pier 15) with a new solid wall pier supported on drilled shafts;
- Superstructure replacement with a metalized steel multi-girder of similar depth as the existing girders with new steel diaphragms, steel ballast deck plate, and steel walkways

PROJECT COST

The Original EE was \$34,713,528.74. The BV winning bid was \$30,769,311.29. There are no approved OOCs so far.

CONTRACT TIME

The Contractor's proposed completion date was 11/25/20. It was adjusted in the award letter to 12/21/20 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 X735.85, the construction contract completion date is 12/21/20. The final report is due 6/19/21.

Final Report: PIN: X731.43 Contract: D263747

PIN: 731.49
Contract: D263747
Reporting Stage: Final 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 & FINAL COMBINED SCORES

Initial Interim report for this contract was included in the 2018-2019 Annual Report. Below are excerpts from that report.

This contract involved improvements to pedestrian accommodations throughout the corridor, while enhancing the compatibility of the corridor with current and future adjacent land uses. The scope included 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 Street; a new Pedestrian Bridge in Starlight Park over the Bronx River; and 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 were converted to one-way roadways.

The conversion of the interstate into a boulevard within the proposed schedule, required an experienced Contractor that has had a proven record of successfully completing similar projects.

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

Eleven (11) proposals were received by the deadline date (Letting). One proposal (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. Ten proposals were distributed to an Evaluation Committee consisting of four NYSDOT subject matter experts from Regional and Main Office Construction and Design program areas. On September 5, 2018, the contract was awarded to Yonkers Contracting Company, Inc.

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.

The contract completion date was adjusted 2 times throughout the duration of the contract. The first extension was due to late award and the second one was due to administrative reasons. The contract completion date was extended from 1/1/20 to 1/16/20.

Total dollar value of all OOCs over the term of the contract is approximately \$23,605. There was one significant change order in the contract for +\$26,605 due to miscellaneous overrun/underrun materials and added & removed work. The final contract cost is \$53,935,051. (vs initial bid cost of \$53,911,447).

Final Report: PIN: 0017.66 Contract: D263406

PIN: 0017.66
Contract: D263406
Reporting Stage: Final Report
Location: Town of Islip
County: Suffolk County
Region: 10
Brief description: Robert Moses Causeway (908J) over Fire Island Inlet Bridge Steel Repairs
Awarded to: Skanska Koch, Inc.
Bid: \$15,765,815
Key information: Award Date – 7/11/17
 Anticipated Contract Completion Date – 9/28/18
 Contractor's Proposed Completion Date (Form SCD) – 9/28/18
 Adjusted Contract Completion Date – 11/25/18

EVALUATION CRITERIA & FINAL COMBINED SCORES

Initial Interim report for this contract was submitted on May 11, 2018. Below are excerpts from that report.

This contract involved steel repairs to eliminate the 20-ton weight restriction and extend the life of this fracture critical structure. This project addressed severely deteriorated floor beams in the approach spans of the bridge. In addition, the following repairs were performed in the truss spans to extend the life of the bridge.

- Pin and hanger replacement
- Rivet/bolts replacement at critical locations
- Gusset plate repairs

The Fire Island Inlet Bridge is a vital link connecting Fire Island to the Long Island mainland. Obtaining a Contractor with the expertise to perform the challenging repairs necessary to keep this bridge in a state of good repair while maintaining a construction schedule that prohibits lane restrictions during the busy summer season was imperative. The bridge steel repairs within the proposed schedule, required an experienced Contractor that has had a proven record of successfully completing similar projects.

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

Six (6) proposals were received by the deadline date (Letting). Two proposals (Ahern painting Contractors and Gramercy) 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. Ten proposals were distributed to an Evaluation Committee consisting of four NYSDOT subject matter experts from Regional and Main Office Construction and Structures program areas. On July 11, 2017, the contract was awarded to Skanska Koch, Inc.

Proposer	Total Technical Score	Perfected Technical Score	Perfected Cost Score	Total Score	Total Cost
Ahern Painting Contractors	48.39*		*Note 1		
Gramercy	56.80*		*Note 1		
H&L Contracting	63.99	39.15	46.23	85.38	\$17,050,553.69
Halmar International	62.77	38.40	44.26	82.66	\$17,812,125.00
Posillico Civil Inc.	63.05	38.57	39.50	78.07	\$19,995,435.00
Skanska Koch, Inc.	81.73	50.00	50.00	100.00	\$15,765,815.00

*Note 1: Ahern's and Gramercy's total of technical proposal and construction schedule points were below the 60 points threshold, therefore they were removed from the cost evaluation and total scoring.

The contract completion date was adjusted 3 times throughout the duration of the contract. The first extension was due to matching the BV submission date/adjusted date for late award and the other 2 were due to unanticipated field conditions and administrative reasons. Time was extended to 1/17/19 for removal of cable supported platforms in adverse weather conditions. The contract completion was last extended to 4/5/19 for administrative reasons.

There were some change orders in the contract due to added work, unanticipated field conditions and miscellaneous under/over runs. Total dollar value of all OOCs over the term of the contract is approximately \$609,985. The final contract cost is \$16,375,800. (vs initial bid cost of \$15,765,815).

Final Report: PIN: 0011.43 Contract: D263477

PIN: 0011.43
Contract: D263477
Reporting Stage: Interim Report
Location: NYS Route 231 @ Northern State Parkway (NSP) Interchange
County: Suffolk County
Towns: Town of Huntington
Region: 10
Brief description: NYS Route 231 Safety and Operational Improvements at Northern State Parkway Interchange
Awarded to: Grace Industries
Bid: \$15,743,707.50
Key information: Award Date – October 16, 2017
 Anticipated Contract Completion Date – January 11, 2019.
 Contractor’s Proposed Completion Date - December 20, 2018
 Adjusted Contract Completion Date – January 15, 2019

EVALUATION CRITERIA & FINAL COMBINED SCORES

Initial Interim report for this contract was submitted on May 11, 2018. Below are excerpts from that report.

This contract involved the installation of a new ramp for southbound Route 231 to eastbound Northern State Parkway movement; realigning of existing eastbound NSP to southbound NYS Route 231 ramp south of the original ramp location; repositioning of the eastbound NSP to northbound NYS Route 231 ramp with a longer deceleration lane and dedicated signalized phase at the intersection with northbound NYS Route 231; extensions of auxiliary lanes along NSP; and reconstruction of part of westbound to northbound ramp. The project also included drainage installations, utility relocations, tree cutting with restricted time frame and traffic signal and overhead sign installations.

The contract required an experienced Contractor that has had a proven record of successfully completing similar projects in a timely manner, with limited closures and minimized construction duration.

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

Four (4) proposals were received by the deadline date (Letting). The proposals were distributed to an Evaluation Committee consisting of four NYSDOT subject matter experts from Regional and Main Office Construction and Design program areas. On October 16, 2017, the contract was awarded to Grace Industries LLC.

Proposer	Total Technical Score	Perfected Technical Score	Perfected Cost Score	Total Score	Total Cost
Grace Industries LLC	40.14	49.29	50.00	99.29	\$15,743,707.50
H&L Contracting and Divad Concrete	32.74	40.19	47.17	87.36	\$16,689,876.53
Peter Scalamandre & Sons, Inc.	33.05	40.58	47.49	88.06	\$16,577,000.00
Posillico Civil, Inc.	40.73	50.00	41.60	91.60	\$18,923,157.76

The contract completion date was adjusted 3 times throughout the duration of the contract. The first extension was due adjusted date for late award, the second due to third party issues, and the third due to administrative reasons. The contract completion was last extended to 10/20/19 for administrative reasons.

There were some change orders in the contract due to miscellaneous overrun/underrun materials and added and removed work. Total dollar value of all OOCs over the term of the contract is approximately \$508,035. The final contract cost is \$16,251,742 (vs initial bid cost of \$15,743,708).