



TAPPAN ZEE BRIDGE/ I-287 CORRIDOR PROJECT

**New York State Department of Transportation
Metropolitan Transportation Authority Metro-North Railroad
New York State Thruway Authority**

Meeting Minutes

Finance Stakeholders' Advisory Working Group (SAWG) #5



October 21, 2009

Meeting Title: Finance Stakeholders' Advisory Working Group (SAWG) #5

Meeting Purpose: Exchange of information

Location/Date: Besso Community Room, Palisades Center
West Nyack, NY
6:00 P.M.

Attendees: SAWG Members
Chuck Borgman
Chris Crane Office of Westchester County Legislator Tom Abinanti
Patrick Gerdin Rockland County Planning
Jon Marshall Quay Condominiums
Mary Jane Shimsky Office of N.Y. State Assemblyman Richard Brodsky
Mammen Samuel
Donna Spiegel

Project Team
Michael Anderson NYSDOT
Phil Ferguson NYSDOT
Yvette Hinds NYSDOT
Susan Kugler NYSDOT
Larry Fleischer MTA
Joe Pasanello MTA/MNR
Angel Medina NYSTA
George Paschalis HSH

Phil Ferguson (NYSDOT), Finance Study Project Manager, welcomed the attendees and introduced the agenda: to review in-depth and gain insights from two specific case studies, namely the *San Francisco – Oakland Bay Bridge Project* and the *Transportation Expansion (T-REX) Project* in Denver, Colorado.

Mr. Ferguson then gave the presentation (see attached).

Questions and comments included the following.

- Q: How many years did it take since the DEIS to begin construction of the *San Francisco –Oakland Bay Bridge*?
- A: It took six years from the DEIS until the beginning of construction.
- C: The project team has learned from this and other case studies. In the *San Francisco–Oakland Bay Bridge* project, the aesthetics of the main span drove the process which led to delays and higher costs. Our approach has been to determine the form of the bridge *after* both the function and fit are determined.
- Q: What is the status of the design of the main span of the replacement bridge?
- A: There is no design of the main span at this point. We are focusing on the remaining 80% of the bridge. There are a number of options to consider for the main span. The costs that we've included in our estimates are sufficient for a variety of options (e.g., arch, suspension, single tower cable-stay).
- Q: Was there a provision for dedicated transit on the San Francisco–Oakland Bay Bridge Project?
- A: There was a provision for rail, but rail was also provided for in a tunnel under the bay.
- Q: Was there concern about the fact that only two bids were received on the T-REX Project?
- A: During the time the proposals were solicited, construction was on an upswing both nationally and globally. The size of the project, coupled with the significant financial backing necessary, limited the number of qualified firms that could participate.
- Q: How is the “upset amount” determined?
- A: In the T-REX Project, two studies were conducted that determined the “upset amount,” or maximum price for a best-value solution.
- C: For the East Span portion of the San Francisco–Oakland Bay Bridge Project, there was only one bid, and it came in 67% higher than the estimate.
- Q: Who makes the decision to go with design-build contracts on a ‘best-value’ basis?
- A: It is a public process that begins with authorizing legislation.
- Q: Where is the rolling stock cost in the project budget?
- A: The rolling stock and rail maintenance facilities are included in the \$1.67 billion. The rail portion of the project was \$900 million.

- C: We need to think more about how we can avoid single-bidder scenarios.
- A: In the San Francisco–Oakland Bay Bridge Project, the total project (\$5.5 billion) was originally divided into four large contracts. To encourage more participation, the four large contracts were broken up into thirteen contracts, resulting in most bids coming in under estimate. Another strategy is to pace the capital construction program with the available work force.

The meeting ended at 7:30 p.m.