

New York State Thruway Authority

Tappan Zee Hudson River Crossing
Blue Ribbon Selection Committee Report

Final | November 30, 2012

Contract D214134
TANY 12-18B
PIN 8TZ1.00



**Thruway
Authority**

Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	i
1. Introduction	i
2. Determination of Best Value	ii
3. Review and Confirmation of Best Value	v
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Purpose	1
1.2 Project Goals	1
1.3 Selection Committee Tasks	1
2 Evaluation and Selection Process	2
2.1 Proposal Evaluation	2
2.2 Technical Evaluation Factors	3
3 Selection Committee Actions	4
3.1 Orientation (September 6-10, 2012)	4
3.2 Meeting 1 (September 11-12, 2012)	4
3.3 Meeting 2 (September 24, 2012)	5
3.4 Meeting 3 (October 9, 2012)	5
3.5 Meeting 4 (November 15, 2012)	5
4 Proposal Technical Rankings	6
5 Proposal Financial Rankings	7
6 Best Value Determination	7
6.1 Selection Committee's Recommendation	7
6.2 Comparison Summary	8
6.3 Conclusion	10
Appendix A: Blue Ribbon Selection Committee Members	11

Executive Summary

1. Introduction

This report summarizes the deliberations and recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Selection Committee (“BRSC” or “Selection Committee”) for the Tappan Zee Hudson River Crossing Project. The BRSC was charged with evaluating and comparing three design-build proposals submitted to the New York State Thruway Authority (“the Authority”) and recommending that proposal which it considered to offer best value to the Authority, the New York State Department of Transportation, and the State of New York.

On October 9, 2012, the BRSC reached an initial consensus determination that, of the three design-build Project proposals submitted to and evaluated by the Authority, the proposal team identified as Niagara represented the best-value offer. The BRSC considered the proposals on a blind basis, as the members were not informed of the identity of the companies constituting this or the other two proposing teams, which were identified to the BRSC as Oneida and Catskills. The BRSC further recommended that the Authority enter into limited negotiations with Niagara with the objective of finalizing a contract for consideration by the Authority’s Board of Directors. The final determination was based on BRSC consensus that:

- Niagara provided the best-value proposal, based on consideration of the original proposal with clarifications made during the Communications and Discussions phases (it was considered that the clarifications offered by Niagara were significant factors in this determination);
- Further, Niagara provided the best-value proposal based on consideration of the original proposal with clarifications and also with the potential enhancements that were offered by all proposers during Discussions; and
- The Authority should enter into limited negotiations with the proposer Niagara.

In accordance with best practice for best-value procurements, the BRSC recommendation:

- Represents the selectors’ rationale and is based on their independent judgment;
- Is based on a comparative analysis of the proposals; and
- Is consistent with the solicitation evaluation factors and sub-factors.

In accordance with the process established for the procurement, as contained in the Request for Proposals (RFP), the recommendation of the BRSC was forwarded to the Selection Executives, consisting of the members of the Major Projects Committee of the Authority Board of Directors. On October 15, 2012, the Selection Executives reviewed and concurred with the findings and recommendations of the BRSC. The Selection Executives also considered the proposals and the recommendation on a blind basis, as the members were not informed of the identity of the companies constituting the proposer teams.

On October 17, 2012, the proposer Niagara was informed that the Authority wished to enter into limited negotiations. The other proposers were simultaneously notified that they would be maintained as part of the competition in the event that negotiations could not be successfully concluded with the selected bidder.

2. Determination of Best Value

To determine the best-value proposal, the BRSC performed a qualitative tradeoff between technical merit and price, which according to the RFP's instructions were weighted approximately equally. This process is consistent with the Federal Highway Administration regulations governing design-build procurement, the best-practice guidance from the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (in NCHRP Report 561, "Best-Value Procurement Methods for Highway Construction Projects"), and the guidelines provided to the BRSC by the Authority's Procurement Management Team.

To support the BRSC deliberations, the following sequence of activities preceded the tradeoff process between technical merit and price:

1. Formation of the Authority's Technical Evaluation Teams, who reviewed each proposal's technical content, presented reports to the BRSC on the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal, and answered the Committee's questions on this material
2. Determination of technical rankings based on these reports from the Technical Evaluation Teams. (These rankings were not subsequently modified and did not address the clarifications received during the subsequent Communications and Discussions with the proposers.) The technical rankings were determined by the BRSC based on assessment of the 16 technical factors and sub-factors noted in the RFP. Pursuant to the Instructions to Proposers, these rankings were completed without knowledge of the price offers.
3. Reporting of the price proposals
4. Request and receipt of written clarifications (through a process referred to as Communications under FHWA regulations) from each of the proposers, with the purpose of addressing perceived deficiencies and weaknesses and confirming the BRSC's interpretation and understanding of the proposals
5. Authorization of the Procurement Management Team to enter into face-to-face Discussions (as this term is used in FHWA regulations) with all three proposers to further clarify and potentially enhance details of each of the three proposals
6. Completion and reporting of the outcome of Discussions with each of the proposers, again with the purpose of addressing perceived weaknesses and confirming the interpretation and understanding of the proposals
7. Reporting of further supporting assessments by the Technical Evaluation Teams

Table A presents a summary of the technical rankings and the financial offers for the three proposals. Although the Communications and Discussions with the proposers substantially altered the BRSC assessment of technical merit, the original technical rankings were not revisited because these subsequent technical clarifications furnished sufficient information for the Committee to reach a best-value decision.

As required by the best-value tradeoff process, the BRSC considered whether the two higher-priced proposals offered sufficient quality advantages over the lower-priced proposal to justify the price difference. This deliberation was based upon the original proposals, modified solely by the subsequent clarifications received, and did not take into account any potential improvements or enhancements that were presented by the proposers during the Discussion phase, or that might otherwise be considered.

The BRSC took the following steps in its best-value assessment:

- Conducted an in-depth trade-off of technical quality and price, comparing the relative technical and cost advantages of the original proposals as explained by clarifications received in Communications and Discussions with the proposers;
- Determined whether the higher-priced proposal offered sufficient quality advantages over lower-priced proposals to justify the price difference;
- Reached a decision on which proposal provides the best value;
- Documented a justification of the selection; and
- In addition, the BRSC separately considered whether the potential enhancements identified by each proposer during Discussions might affect the best-value decision. Considering both the value added to each proposal based upon the potential changes and the financial impact (if any) of such changes, Niagara was still also considered to be the best-value proposer.

Table A: Technical Rankings and Price Proposals

		Catskills	Oneida	Niagara
Technical Ranking *		2	1	3
Proposal Prices (millions)	Contract Amount	\$4,059	\$3,990	\$3,142
	Difference above Low Bid	\$917	\$848	-
	Net Present Value **	\$3,837	\$3,705	\$2,959
	Difference above Low NPV	\$878	\$746	-
Best-Value Proposal				✓

* Rankings shown were determined prior to extensive Communications and Discussions with the three proposers.

** In accordance with the RFP, the price evaluation is based on Net Present Value (NPV) of each proposer’s bid amount distributed over the duration of the contract.

Oneida Proposal

The Oneida proposal was initially qualified by the BRSC as an acceptable proposal and given a technical ranking of “best” of the three proposals. A number of strengths and weaknesses were identified by the BRSC through the rating process. The proposer provided additional information during Communications and Discussions which built upon the proposal’s strengths and generally mitigated the BRSC’s concerns with the perceived weaknesses of the proposal.

Through Discussions, the Oneida team noted it would potentially be able to reduce the overall construction schedule and bring forward key delivery dates, thereby potentially reducing price to a limited degree. As discussed below, even with this potential price reduction, the gap between the Oneida and Niagara prices would not have been appreciably diminished.

Catskills Proposal

The Catskills proposal was initially qualified by the BRSC as an acceptable proposal and was given a technical ranking of “second best” of the three proposals. A number of strengths and weaknesses were identified by the BRSC through the rating process. The proposer provided additional information during the Communication and Discussion phases which built upon the proposal’s strengths and generally mitigated the BRSC’s concerns with the perceived weaknesses of the proposal.

The BRSC recognized that the Catskills proposal had the highest cost of all three proposals and was not ranked best technically. During Communications and Discussions, Catskills clarified certain matters that helped mitigate some of the BRSC’s concerns in terms of service life and construction approach and offered potential enhancements toward addressing these concerns. However, based on the proposal and the proposer’s responses to questions, the clarifications provided during Communications, and the supplementary materials received from the proposer in Discussions, the BRSC did not consider the Catskills proposal as offering better value in comparison to Oneida’s proposal, which had a higher technical ranking and a lower proposed price. At this point, the consensus of the BRSC was to proceed to compare the Oneida proposal with the Niagara proposal.

Niagara Proposal

The Niagara proposal was initially qualified by the BRSC as an acceptable proposal and was given a technical ranking of “third best” of the three proposals. A number of strengths and weaknesses were identified by the BRSC through the rating process. The proposer provided additional information during Communications and Discussions which built upon the proposal’s strengths and generally mitigated the BRSC’s concerns with the perceived weaknesses of the proposal.

Primary clarifications provided by Niagara that materially alleviated the BRSC’s initial concerns regarding the Niagara proposal included the following:

- Confirmed viability of a highly specialized marine derrick capable of lifting loads well in excess of standard derricks, thus substantially reducing the number of lifts required and

the corresponding duration of construction activities; this clarification was considered to be highly material

- Ability of the specialized marine derrick to fit and maneuver within the dredged channel
- Feasibility of the proposed reduction in the volume of dredged material to approximately half of the amount identified in the Final Environmental Impact Statement
- Ability to incorporate measures in proposed construction sequence to avoid potential traffic delays at the toll plaza during construction
- Potential refinements to the main span towers that could be implemented within the firm fixed price to address aesthetic issues
- Confirmation that demolition of the existing Tappan Zee Bridge would be conducted using environmentally sensitive methods
- Clarification that the structure could support an increased deck thickness to allow for future replacement of an overlay layer for deck protection
- Expanded pile testing program to confirm proposed foundation solutions
- Clarification of sacrificial steel thickness for durability of steel piles

These clarifications substantially improved the BRSC's view of the Niagara proposal.

The BRSC discussions considered whether the remaining technical advantages of Oneida's original proposal, as clarified, were sufficiently compelling to justify the price differential with Niagara and concluded that they were not. The Committee determined that the benefits of selecting Oneida over Niagara did not justify a potential NPV difference of \$746 million, based on the NPVs of the original proposals. The Committee was advised that additional project costs of this magnitude would likely have a significant adverse effect on bridge tolls that might be required in the future.

The Committee also concluded that taking account of the potential enhancements presented by both proposers in the Discussion phase would not alter the best value determination. Even with a price reduction potentially available from Oneida based on an improved schedule, the gap between the Oneida and Niagara prices would not have been appreciably diminished, and the advantages offered by Oneida's technical proposal did not justify accepting Oneida's still considerably higher-priced proposal. The Committee then concluded, based on the significant price differential between the proposals and other factors, that it would not be in the Authority's best interests to request revised proposals (best and final offers), but rather that it should proceed directly to limited negotiations with Niagara.

3. Review and Confirmation of Best Value

After concurring that Niagara's proposal offered the best value, the BRSC recommended the Authority engage in limited negotiations with Niagara with the goal of developing a final contract for execution. The Committee also requested an opportunity to reconvene and review the outcome of these negotiations to confirm that its best-value determination remained appropriate.

The BRSC further asked that specific items be taken forward into the negotiations and project planning:

- The Authority should explore potential enhancements to maximize service life.
- The Authority should better define issues that it would like to discuss with the proposer concerning bridge aesthetics and the range of design modifications expected (to the extent possible) within the firm fixed price and, as necessary, that might be available for future consideration as an addition to the firm fixed price.
- The Authority should consider whether the proposer's geotechnical/foundation/pile testing protocols are sufficient and should negotiate changes, if any, based upon this analysis.
- The Authority should consider contractual mechanisms for addressing community-based issues that cannot be predicted at the Proposal and Negotiations phases, e.g. specific noise or traffic problems.
- The Authority should consider allowance amounts that might be utilized to help address local issues.
- The Authority should maintain a risk register going forward to understand the cumulative impacts of these risks.

Following conclusion of the Authority's negotiations with Niagara, the outcome was presented to the BRSC on November 15, 2012 for review. The Committee was advised that limited negotiations had been successfully concluded on November 14, 2012, subject to confirmation by drafting of the resolution of matters discussed. There were no changes in Niagara's proposed price or its completion schedule for its base proposal, and all other issues that were negotiated resulted in changes in the Authority's favor. The Committee was further advised that there were no concessions to Niagara of any nature that that might even arguably affect the Committee's prior best-value determination.

Among the items discussed at this meeting were clarifications of Niagara's pile-testing protocol, dredging and spoil-disposal plans, construction schedule, environmental-mitigation approach, permitting responsibility and key personnel. Improvements in community and public participation were also presented, including traffic, staging, and public-information approach.

The BRSC also reviewed a list of potential technical enhancements, for which Niagara furnished not-to-exceed price and schedule proposals during the negotiations, for possible inclusion in the contract as options which the Authority could exercise in the future at its discretion. While Niagara's original proposal, as clarified, had been determined to meet RFP requirements and to be an acceptable proposal, these enhancements offered potential improvements and/or alternate approaches in the areas of 100-year service life, traffic operations and toll collection, potential future loading, and aesthetic variations. The Committee was advised that in considering reconfirmation of best value, it should not assume that any of the options for these potential enhancements would in fact be elected by the Authority.

The BRSC deliberated whether Niagara's proposal, considering these clarifications and potential enhancements from the negotiations, continued to reflect its previous best-value determination.

The Committee reconfirmed its previous determination as follows:

- Niagara provided the best-value proposal, based on consideration of the original proposal with clarifications made during the communications, discussions, and negotiations phases; and
- Further, Niagara provided the best-value proposal based on consideration of the original proposal with clarifications, with the potential enhancements offered by all proposers during discussions, and also with the additional potential enhancements offered by Niagara during negotiations

With this confirmation of the BRSC's best-value determination, the Committee authorized Authority staff to complete negotiations with Niagara, so that a contract consistent with the terms described to the Committee could be presented to the Authority's Board for its consideration.

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose

This report outlines the procurement structure and process of the Tappan Zee Hudson River Crossing Project and summarizes the deliberations and recommendations of the project's Blue Ribbon Selection Committee ("BRSC" or "Selection Committee"). The BRSC was charged with evaluating and comparing three design-build proposals submitted to the New York State Thruway Authority ("the Authority") and recommending a selected proposer for the Project based on best value to the Authority, the New York State Department of Transportation, and the State of New York.

1.2 Project Goals

In March 2012, the Authority issued a request for design-build proposals for the new Tappan Zee Hudson River Crossing. The Authority's primary goals for the project were as follows:

1. To ensure the long-term vitality of the Hudson River crossing at Tappan Zee;
2. To improve transportation operations and safety at the crossing;
3. To maximize the value of the public investment in a new Hudson River crossing;
4. To deliver the Project safely, on schedule, and within budget; and
5. To provide best value to the Authority.

The fifth goal, best value, represents "the greatest overall benefit, under the specified selection criteria, obtained through the tradeoff between price and technical benefits." Accordingly, the project's evaluation criteria gave approximately equal weighting to technical merit and price, enabling the selection of the proposal which provides the best value.

This best-value determination placed the emphasis on meeting the State's and the Authority's needs, which might or might not involve selecting the proposal with the lowest price. In this process, a trade-off procedure was employed which evaluated a combination of technical factors and pricing. The Authority could select the proposal which provides other than the lowest price, if the perceived technical benefits merit such a choice.

1.3 Selection Committee Tasks

To provide this assessment of technical factors and price, the Authority appointed a 12-member Blue Ribbon Selection Committee to perform the following primary tasks:

- Conduct an in-depth trade-off of technical quality and price, comparing the proposals' relative technical and cost advantages;
- Determine whether the higher-priced proposal offered sufficient quality advantages over lower-priced proposals to justify the price difference;

- Reach a decision on which proposal provides the best value; and
- Document a justification of the selection.

Determining best value by a qualitative tradeoff between technical merit and price is consistent with the Federal Highway Administration regulations governing design-build procurement, the best-practice guidance from the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (in NCHRP Report 561, “Best-Value Procurement Methods for Highway Construction Projects”), and the guidelines provided to the BRSC by the Authority’s Procurement Management Team.

In accordance with the NCHRP 561 best-practice guidelines, selectors employing a qualitative best-value tradeoff “must analyze the differences between the competing proposals and make a rational decision based on the facts and circumstances of the specific acquisition [procurement].” Even though different selectors may not reach the same conclusions based on the same set of facts, a best-value determination is considered valid if it:

- Represents the selectors’ rationale and is based on their independent judgment;
- Is based on a comparative analysis of the proposals; and
- Is consistent with the solicitation evaluation factors and sub-factors.

2 Evaluation and Selection Process

The Request for Proposals (RFP), which was issued on March 9, 2012 and amended by various addenda, contained the contract requirements and the guidelines by which the proposals were to be evaluated. In response to the RFP, three bidding teams submitted proposals (consisting of separate technical and financial packages) by the July 27, 2012 deadline.

2.1 Proposal Evaluation

Upon receipt of the three proposals, the Authority conducted preliminary pass/fail reviews and determined that all proposals met the minimum requirements. Concurrent technical reviews were conducted by a nationally-recognized team of subject-matter experts, who identified strengths and weaknesses of each proposal in the following ten categories:

1. Construction Approach
2. Structures
3. Geotechnical
4. Roadway Design
5. Visual Quality
6. Operations
7. Security
8. Management Approach
9. Environmental Compliance
10. Public Outreach

The Authority’s Value Assessment Team, which represented the leaders of the technical review teams, summarized these strengths and weaknesses for presentation to the Selection Committee. In order to maintain a blind selection process, all identifying material which could reveal a

proposer’s identity was removed. The three proposers were assigned code names of Catskills, Oneida, and Niagara, and all materials presented to the Committee referenced these names.

2.2 Technical Evaluation Factors

As shown in Table 1, the RFP defined five technical-quality factors (shaded in blue) by which the technical aspects of the proposals would be evaluated. The first three factors are further divided into sub-factors (shaded in yellow).

Table 1: Evaluation Factors and Sub-Factors

FACTOR	SUB-FACTOR
Design and Construction Solution	Construction Approach
	Service Life of the Crossing
	Maximizing the Public Investment
	Bridge, Structures and Aesthetic Design Concepts
	Geotechnical
	Roadway Design Concepts
	NYSTA Operations and Security
Management Approach	Schedule
	Organization and General Management
	Design Management
	Construction Management
Key Personnel and Experience	Key Personnel
	Experience of the Firms
	Past Performance
Environmental Compliance	
Public Outreach and Coordination with Stakeholders	

After considering the technical strengths and weaknesses of each proposal, the Selection Committee concurred on qualitative adjectival ratings for each factor and sub-factor of that proposal. Ten levels of rating options were possible, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Adjectival Rating Options

Exceptional -		Good -		Acceptable -		Unacceptable
Exceptional		Good		Acceptable		
Exceptional +		Good +		Acceptable +		

Proposals receiving an “Unacceptable” technical rating for any evaluation factor would not be considered for award, though an “Unacceptable” rating for a sub-factor would not eliminate a proposal from consideration.

3 Selection Committee Actions

The Selection Committee was appointed in the first week of September 2012 and consisted of the members identified in Appendix A. The panel included local community leaders, state and authority representatives, and experienced design, construction, and planning professionals.

A separate panel of visual-quality advisors, which met on September 25, 2012, was appointed to provide advisory perspectives to the Selection Committee on the proposals’ aesthetic features.

3.1 Orientation (September 6-10, 2012)

The Selection Committee convened at the Tappan Zee Bridge project office in Tarrytown, New York on September 6, 7, and 10 for orientation and information sessions which included the following topics:

- Project background and objectives
- Design-build delivery
- Environmental issues
- Procurement process
- Evaluation and selection process
- Site tour by boat

3.2 Meeting 1 (September 11-12, 2012)

Following the orientation sessions, the Committee received technical presentations from a core team of subject-matter experts who had examined the proposals in depth. The technical strengths and weaknesses of each proposal were highlighted, after which the Committee deliberated and assigned adjectival ratings and technical rankings.

After the technical rankings were complete and recorded, the contents of the three teams' price proposals were revealed together with brief supplemental material for context on the proposals' risk characteristics and life-cycle cost assessments. Upon reviewing the financial elements of the proposals, the Committee asked that additional material be requested from the three teams to provide clarifications prior to determination of best value.

3.3 Meeting 2 (September 24, 2012)

The Committee reviewed the proposers' clarifications in a conference-call meeting and determined that each bidding team should be invited to discussions to address perceived deficiencies and weaknesses and to explore further opportunities by which its proposal could provide best value to the Authority. The Authority conducted these discussions in a face-to-face meeting with each proposer on October 1-3.

3.4 Meeting 3 (October 9, 2012)

At its third session, the Selection Committee received and reviewed the findings of the discussion meetings with the proposers. Following deliberations, which are further detailed in Part 6 of this report, the Committee identified Niagara as the apparent best-value proposer, recommended that the Selection Executives concur in this finding, and further recommended that the Authority proceed to limited negotiations with this proposer. The selection and recommendation were conditioned upon the Committee's subsequent review and concurrence that the post-negotiation technical and financial outcome continued to represent best value.

The Selection Executives met on October 15, 2012 and ratified the Selection Committee's recommendation. Accordingly, the Procurement Management Team notified Niagara on October 17 of its invitation to limited negotiations. Catskills and Oneida were simultaneously advised that another team had been selected for negotiations, but that the Authority could still engage in limited negotiations with another team or take such other action as might be warranted if it could not successfully conclude limited negotiations with the selected proposer.

3.5 Meeting 4 (November 15, 2012)

Limited negotiations were conducted with Niagara on October 29-31 and November 12-14, 2012. Following conclusion of the negotiations, the Selection Committee reconvened on November 15 to assess the proposed contract with the selected proposer and reconfirm, as appropriate, that it continued to represent best value.

At this meeting, the Authority presented additional clarifications and potential technical enhancements which had resulted from the negotiations. For the potential enhancements, as options to be exercised at the Authority's future discretion, Niagara submitted not-to-exceed costs and identified maximum schedule impacts. These binding not-to-exceed estimates accounted for both direct costs and (in some cases) schedule-extension costs of certain enhancements. In the case of scope reductions, the estimates were structured as not-less-than credits. In either case, the actual cost or credit to the Authority if the option were exercised would be based on the Design-Builder's

detailed cost justification to be prepared in accordance with contract requirements for the pricing of changes, subject to the not-to-exceed estimates.

Following deliberations, the BRSC agreed by consensus that Niagara's post-negotiation offer continued to represent best value, both in consideration of clarifications only, and also in consideration of the clarifications plus any or all of the optional technical enhancements (including an alternative technical concept presented by another proposer and under review by Niagara). In reaching this determination, the Committee was advised that it should not assume that any of the enhancement options would in fact be elected by the Authority, but only to consider that if any or all options were elected at the not-to-exceed prices and schedule impacts, then Niagara's proposal would continue to represent best value.

In regard to the potential approval of the contract and any options by the Authority's Board, the Committee also concurred on the following recommendations:

- The options (including the alternative technical concept described to the Committee) have the potential to further improve the project and are worthy of serious consideration by the Authority within the timeframe necessary permitted for such consideration in the contract; and
- The Authority's decisions should be informed by actual cost and schedule impacts, rather than the not-to-exceed estimates.

4 Proposal Technical Rankings

In its assignment of adjectival ratings for the technical evaluation factors, the Committee found all of the proposals to be responsive (i.e., acceptable) and concurred that based only on their technical proposals (without the benefit of clarifications or knowledge of price), the proposals would be ranked as follows:

Best technical proposal:	Oneida
Second best technical proposal:	Catskills
Third best technical proposal:	Niagara

5 Proposal Financial Rankings

The real and net present values of the base proposal prices were as shown in Table 3. These prices were exclusive of any additional-scope options which the Authority might exercise.

Table 3: Price-Proposal Summary

Bid Costs (millions)	Catskills	Oneida	Niagara
Contract Amount	\$4,059	\$3,990	\$3,142
<i>Difference from Low Bid</i>	\$917	\$848	-
Net Present Value	\$3,837	\$3,705	\$2,959
<i>Difference from Low Bid</i>	\$878	\$746	-

Per the RFP, price evaluation was based on Net Present Value (NPV) of each proposer’s bid amount distributed over the duration of the contract. Accordingly, the financial rankings were as follows:

- Best price proposal: Niagara
- Second best price proposal: Oneida
- Third best price proposal: Catskills

6 Best Value Determination

6.1 Selection Committee’s Recommendation

Because the RFP instructions directed that technical merit and price be weighted approximately equally, the results of the technical and price rankings indicated no uniformly superior proposal. Hence the Selection Committee requested additional material from each of the proposers through formal communications and discussions (as defined by FHWA regulations), which yielded both clarifications and potential enhancements of the original proposals.

At its October 9, 2012 meeting, the Selection Committee considered whether the Authority should proceed to limited negotiations with a best-value proposer, or alternately request revised proposals from all three proposers (i.e., proceed to a best and final offer, or BAFO).

Authority staff reported many of the Selection Committee’s initial technical concerns had been further explained and addressed via the clarifications. This additional information was presented for the Committee’s consideration. Staff also shared the estimated costs, based on discussions

and subsequent correspondence with the proposers, for providing potential enhancements which might be desirable to potentially optimize the technical solution offered in each proposal.

The Selection Committee concurred that Niagara’s perceived weaknesses had been adequately addressed through the clarification process. The Committee deliberated whether the technical merits of Oneida’s proposal were sufficient to outweigh Niagara’s price advantage. They ultimately concluded that Niagara’s combination of low price and its acceptable technical proposal were sufficient to make Niagara a viable candidate for the best-value proposer.

At its November 15, 2012 meeting, the Selection Committee re-affirmed its previous best-value determination in light of the final outcome of negotiations with Niagara.

6.2 Comparison Summary

For the best-value tradeoff decision between Niagara and Oneida, a summary of the superior elements of each proposal reviewed by the Committee is shown in Tables 4a and 4b below.

Table 4a: Superior Elements of Oneida’s Proposal over Niagara’s Proposal

Element	Aspects of Superior Solution
SERVICE LIFE	Overall service life is potentially superior: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integral deck design for the approach spans gives more confidence in achieving service-life target • Higher quality protective coating for structural steel at main span • Extensive use of pre-cast concrete elements • Stiffer structure provides better deflection performance • Additional deck thickness/increase in concrete cover at approach and main span
MAXIMIZING PUBLIC INVESTMENT	Features of Potential Future Loading options on the main span: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relatively simple addition of cable strands • Continuation of gap between structures into Rockland • Lower future main-span costs • Highway deck supports LRT; provides more flexibility
BRIDGE AESTHETICS	Oneida has proposed larger belvederes
GEOTECHNICAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More robust foundations and towers for initial construction • Foundation solution is preferable and more conservative

ROADWAY DESIGN	Overall geometry of Shared Use Path and in Westchester is superior
OPERATIONS	Plan for Facilities and Westchester work zone is superior
MANAGEMENT	Commitment to contractor-controlled insurance plan
PUBLIC OUTREACH	Plan is more creative, innovative and comprehensive

Table 4b: Superior Elements of Niagara’s Proposal over Oneida’s Proposal

Element	Aspects of Superior Solution
CONSTRUCTION APPROACH	Construction schedule is more favorable
MAXIMIZING PUBLIC INVESTMENT	Extra piles for Potential Future Loading in approach spans are better positioned
BRIDGE DESIGN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main span deck has a redundant load path (longitudinal trusses) for resiliency under extreme events • Approach span decks are more readily replaceable
BRIDGE AESTHETICS	<p>The aesthetic approach has potential for greater flexibility to respond to stakeholder input on visual-quality issues. This approach is a good solution that can be improved upon as the design is further developed, within the firm fixed price. Additional improvements would be possible at additional cost as an enhancement option.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The designer has treated the whole crossing as a continuous element, with a consistent aesthetic concept throughout the approach and main spans • The structure is all steel end to end, has a 10” full deck, open and airy aesthetics, and a lower approach on the Rockland side
OPERATIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bridge inspection and maintenance access plan is better • Plan for temporary facilities is superior
ENVIRONMENTAL	Dredging plan significantly reduces size of dredge prism, amount of spoils for disposal, and impact on riverbed habitats
EXPERIENCE OF THE FIRM	Past project experience is more directly relevant to this type of construction

6.3 Conclusion

The Selection Committee reached consensus on recommending Niagara as providing the best value based on its original proposal, as clarified in the Communication and Discussion phases. The Committee also separately considered the potential technical enhancements that had been discussed with each proposer and, based on the assumption that such enhancements could be included at the Authority's option, determined that Niagara also offered best value on this basis. It concluded by recommending that the Authority enter limited negotiations with Niagara as the apparent best-value proposer.

The Committee further requested the opportunity to review the final combination of technical scope and price as achieved in the limited negotiations and to reconfirm, as appropriate, its determination of best value at that point. The Authority's presentation of the post-negotiation outcome described additional clarifications and potential technical enhancements, as options to be exercised at the Authority's future discretion. Based on consideration of these elements, the Committee re-affirmed its previous determination of Niagara's proposal providing the best value.

The overall ranking of the proposers was accordingly formalized as follows:

Best-value proposer:	Niagara
Second best-value proposer:	Oneida
Third best-value proposer:	Catskills

Appendix A: Blue Ribbon Selection Committee Members

Name	Affiliation
David Aukland	Tarrytown Planning Board Member
Allen Biehler	Transportation Professor and former DOT Secretary
Keith Brownlie	Independent Bridge Architect
Edward Buroughs	Westchester County Planning Commissioner
Nuria Fernandez	Chief Operating Officer, Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Richard Kohlhausen	South Nyack Civic Leader
Joan McDonald	Commissioner, NYS Department Of Transportation
Gene McGovern	Construction Executive, McGovern Management
Karen Rae	Deputy Secretary for Transportation
Brandon Sall, BRSC Chairman	New York State Thruway Authority Board Member
Thomas Vanderbeek	Rockland Planning and Public Transportation Commissioner
Robert Yaro	President, Regional Plan Association

David Aukland

Mayor Drew Fixell designated David Aukland to represent the Village of Tarrytown on the Selection panel. Aukland is a member of the Village's five-person Planning Board, to which he was appointed in 2006. His work for the Village has included reviews of the implications of various Tappan Zee Bridge replacement proposals with the Mayor and other Officials, as well as other activities relating to the future development of the Village. Prior to his formal association with the Village of Tarrytown, Aukland worked for IBM. After early work in the United Kingdom, he spent fifteen years at the company's European headquarters in Paris, France.

Allen Biehler

Al Biehler is a Distinguished Service Professor of Transportation Systems and Policy at the H. John Heinz III College at Carnegie Mellon University, Executive Director of the University Transportation Center, and an adjunct professor in the Civil and Environmental Engineering Department in the Engineering College at Carnegie Mellon. He previously served for eight years as Secretary of the Pennsylvania DOT, leading an organization that operated the nation's fifth largest state highway system and administered one of the country's largest grant programs for mass transit, rail freight, and aviation. In 2009, Biehler was elected President of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, where he helped to create the State

Smart Transportation Initiative to assist state transportation agencies wishing to accelerate sustainable practices.

Prior to his post at the DOT, he was a Vice President with the international transportation consulting firm DMJM-Harris, where he was project manager for preliminary engineering of the North Shore LRT Connector project in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania and Director of Planning and Preliminary Engineering for extension of the Tren Urbano rail system in San Juan, Puerto Rico. Earlier, Biehler was Director of Planning, Engineering and Construction at Port Authority of Allegheny County, in charge of the agency's \$500 million capital improvement program. He received a B.S. in Civil Engineering from the University of Pittsburgh, and a masters-equivalent Certificate in Highway Transportation from Yale University. He is a registered professional engineer in Pennsylvania.

Keith Brownlie

Keith Brownlie, an independent UK-based architect with over 20 years of experience, has shaped numerous landmark structures around the world and bases his work on the concept that "bridges should be particular to their place." His achievements include the Tipping Bridge in Newcastle upon Tyne; the Sail Bridge in Swansea; the Living Bridge in Limerick; and the Gateshead Millennium Bridge, which won the Stirling Prize for excellence in architecture. Before starting his own firm, he was director of an internationally recognized architectural consultancy. Brownlie was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society of the Arts for his artistic contributions to society.

Edward Buroughs

County Executive Rob Astorino designated County Department of Planning Commissioner Edward Buroughs to represent Westchester County on the Selection panel. Buroughs's career has since 1980 focused on municipal planning in Westchester, Putnam and Dutchess counties, following earlier experience in county and town governments in Pennsylvania. Prior to joining the county staff in 1994, he served as Director of Planning for the towns of Somers and Lewisboro in Westchester and as consulting town planner for the town of Carmel in Putnam County. He earned a Masters of City and Regional Planning from Rutgers University and a B.A. from the University of Delaware.

Nuria Fernandez

Nuria Fernandez is Chief Operating Officer of the Metropolitan Transportation Authority. She previously served as Senior Vice President of CH2M Hill, a firm that provides engineering, construction, and operations services for businesses and governments throughout the world. Prior to that, Fernandez served as Commissioner for the Chicago Airport System, where she directed all airport operations, planning, engineering, and management services for O'Hare and Midway International Airports, the second busiest airport system in the world. She has also served in executive positions at the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, and the Chicago Transit Authority. Fernandez holds a MBA from Roosevelt University in Chicago and a BS degree in Civil Engineering from Bradley University.

Richard Kohlhausen

Mayor Tish Dubow designated Richard L. Kohlhausen to represent the Village of South Nyack on the Selection panel. Kohlhausen was appointed to the SUNY Rockland Community College Board of Trustees by Governor Pataki and was reappointed by Governor David Paterson. He also serves as President of the Board of Nyack Hospital, and formerly served as President of the Nyack School Board and as a Member of the Board of the Edwin Gould Academy in Ramapo. A West Virginia native, Kohlhausen moved to Rockland more than 30 years ago and currently resides in South Nyack. He has worked as a chemical engineer in the pharmaceutical industry, and now works in the insurance industry for Capitol Risk Management Services, Ltd. in Nanuet. He earned a bachelor's degree in chemical engineering from New York University and an MBA from Iona College, New York.

Joan McDonald

Joan McDonald is Commissioner of the New York State Department of Transportation. Commissioner McDonald previously served as commissioner of the Department of Economic and Community Development for the State of Connecticut, as Senior Vice President of Transportation for the New York City Economic Development Corporation, and as the Vice President in charge of New York and New Jersey at Jacobs Engineering. She began her transportation career as Deputy Commissioner for Planning and Traffic Operations for the New York City DOT and as the Director of Capital and Long Range Planning for the MTA Metro-North Railroad. McDonald received her Bachelor of Arts from LeMoyne College and her Masters of Public Administration from the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University.

Gene McGovern

Gene McGovern is widely known and respected as a manager of large construction projects. In 1979, he co-founded Lehrer McGovern Inc., which ultimately became a part of the construction industry leader now known as Bovis Lend Lease. Lehrer McGovern was the construction manager for the mid-1980s restoration of the Statue of Liberty, and worked on other high-profile projects including renovations of Grand Central Station and Ellis Island and the construction of Euro Disney and London's Canary Wharf business district.

Karen Rae

Karen Rae is Deputy Secretary for Transportation in the Executive Chamber. Prior to joining the Cuomo Administration, she served as Deputy Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration in the Obama Administration, where she managed the federal high speed rail initiative and developed national freight and passenger rail policy. She also served as Director of the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation, including negotiating and executing the multi-billion dollar public-private partnership contract for the Dulles rail project. She was previously General Manager of transit systems in Austin, Texas, Glens Falls and Buffalo. Rae was also Deputy Commissioner of Policy and Planning at the New York State DOT, where she was

responsible for finance, planning and policy, and Deputy Secretary of the Pennsylvania DOT, where she led the creation of a streamlined, performance-based funding program for transit.

Brandon Sall

Brandon Sall is chairman and a non-voting member of the Blue Ribbon Selection Committee. He is a member of the Thruway Board of Directors and a partner at Sall & Geist and Gellert & Rodner, located in White Plains. Sall has vast experience with real estate law and knowledge of the process involved with land transactions. He is admitted to the Bar in New York, New Jersey, Connecticut and Florida and is a member of the New York State Bar Association. Sall received his B.B.A from the University of Miami and attended the Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law in New York City. He resides in Harrison.

Thomas Vanderbeek

County Executive C. Scott Vanderhoef designated County Commissioner of Planning Thomas B. Vanderbeek, P.E., to represent Rockland County on the Selection panel. Vanderbeek has a wealth of experience with respect to facilities and water supply planning, having successfully worked with major governmental agencies including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, as well as Rockland County's towns and villages. He is a licensed professional engineer specializing in civil and environmental engineering as well as water resources planning. For eight years, he was a member of the Rockland County Planning Board. Vanderbeek also served as Stony Point Town Engineer and was project manager and engineer in the development of sewer systems in western Ramapo, overseeing environmental impact study, survey and design. Vanderbeek has a B.S. in Civil Engineering from Princeton University and is a member of the state Fire Prevention and Building Codes Council, the Rockland County Parks Commission and the National Society of Professional Engineers.

Robert Yaro

Robert Yaro is President of Regional Plan Association (RPA), the nation's oldest independent metropolitan policy, research, and advocacy group. He led development of and co-authored RPA's Third Regional Plan, *A Region at Risk*, and has authored and co-authored numerous papers and articles on planning and infrastructure for the five boroughs of New York City and the metropolitan region. He founded and co-chairs America 2050, RPA's initiative to create a national development and infrastructure plan. He is co-chair of the Empire State Transportation Alliance, on the board of the Forum for Urban Design, and an honorary member of the Royal Town Planning Institute. Yaro holds a Masters in City and Regional Planning from Harvard University and a B.A. in Urban Studies from Wesleyan University. In addition to leading RPA, Yaro is a professor of practice at the University of Pennsylvania and has consulted on city and regional planning issues across the United States and in Europe, China, Japan, Turkey, and North Africa.