



6 September 2002

## **EXTRAORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT AN EXTRAORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RANDWICK WILL BE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, 90 AVOCA STREET, RANDWICK, ON TUESDAY, 10TH SEPTEMBER 2002 AT 5.30 PM

- 1 Apologies**
- 2 Minutes**
- 3 Addresses to the Council by the Public**
- 4 Mayoral Minutes**
- 5 Director Assets & Infrastructure Services' Reports**
  - 5.1 DIRECTOR ASSET & INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES' REPORT 2  
103/2002 - TENDER 11/02 - CIVIL MAINTENANCE WORKS
  - 5.2 DIRECTOR ASSET & INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES' REPORT 10  
104/2002 - TENDER 12/02 - CIVIL & LANDSCAPE WORKS FOR  
CLOVELLY COASTAL WALK
- 6 Confidential Reports**
- 7 Committee-of-the-Whole**
- 8 Report of the Committee-of-the-Whole**
- 9 Notice of Rescission Motions**

.....  
GENERAL MANAGER



## ***Director Asset & Infrastructure Services' Report 103/2002***

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| <b>SUBJECT:</b> | TENDER 11/02 - CIVIL MAINTENANCE WORKS |
|-----------------|--|

|              |                   |                 |                       |
|--------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| <b>DATE:</b> | 5 September, 2002 | <b>FILE NO:</b> | 98/S/4655 x 98/S/4723 |
|--------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|

**REPORT BY:** DIRECTOR ASSET & INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

### **INTRODUCTION:**

At the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 27 August 2002 Council considered the attached Director Asset & Infrastructure Services Report 92/2002 and resolved that the matter be deferred.

### **ISSUES:**

In discussing this item Councillors asked a series of questions relating to the ability of each of the recommended contractors to carry out works to the standard expected by Council.

In order to assist Council in this decision the following additional information is provided in relation to the recommended contractors:

**Remediation Environmental Contractors P/L**

- **Stormwater Drainage**
- **Asphalt Minor Works**
- **Concrete Works & Restorations**
- **Landscape Turfing**

Have carried out footpath works for: South Sydney City Council; Tweed Shire Council; Marrickville Council; Ashfield Council; Leighton Contractors (Eastern Distributor traffic control)

Currently completing a minor concrete job for Council on a quotation basis  
Reference checks were satisfactory

### **South West Kerbing Pty Ltd – Kerb & Gutter**

Have a contract with or have carried out kerb & gutter work for : Ryde City Council; Canterbury Council; CanBay; Bankstown City Council; Auburn Council; Sutherland Council.

Currently work for Council providing kerb & gutter on larger projects  
Reference checks were satisfactory.

**K K Civil Engineering – Segmental Paving**

Have carried out works for: Marrickville Council; Sydney Water; Leichhardt Council; Canterbury Council.

Have not previously worked for Randwick

Reference checks were satisfactory.

**Menai Linemarking – Pavement Marking**

Have carried out sign installation and linemarking for: Bankstown City Council; Fairfield City Council; Penrith City Council; Sydney City Council; Campbelltown City Council.

Currently work for Council to provide linemarking.

Reference checks (including Randwick) were satisfactory

**Benpave Limited - Bricklaying**

Have worked extensively for Randwick Council over a number of years.

Have carried out: drainage works, landscaping, paving and concreting works including extensive footpath construction.

Bricklaying carried out for Council has been satisfactory.

**CONCLUSION:**

The above information supports the recommendation contained in the attached Director of Asset Services Report 92/2002 dated 21<sup>st</sup> August 2002.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. That Council accepts the Tenders submitted by the following tenderers for the services as nominated below.

|                     |   |  |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Stormwater Drainage | - | <b>Remediation Environmental Contractors P/L</b> |
| Kerb and Gutter     | - | <b>South West Kerbing Pty Ltd</b>                |
| Asphalt Minor Works | - | <b>Remediation Environmental Contractors P/L</b> |
| Segmental Paving    | - | <b>K K Civil Engineering</b>                     |
| Pavement Marking    | - | <b>Menai Linemarking Services Pty Ltd</b>        |
| Concrete Works      | - | <b>Remediation Environmental Contractors P/L</b> |
| & Restorations      |   |  |
| Landscape Turfing   | - | <b>Remediation Environmental Contractors P/L</b> |
| Bricklaying         | - | <b>Benpave Limited</b>                           |

2. The unsuccessful tenderers are notified of the tender result.
3. The Mayor and General Manager or their delegated representative be authorised to enter into agreements for preferred supplier status with the successful tenderers for a period of 2-years with the option of extending the period of the agreement for a further 1-year.

**ATTACHMENT/S:**

DIRECTOR ASSET & INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES REPORT 92/2002

.....  
MICK SAVAGE  
DIRECTOR ASSET &  
INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

## ***Director Asset & Infrastructure Services' Report 92/2002***



|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| <b>SUBJECT:</b> | TENDER 11/02 - CIVIL MAINTENANCE WORKS |
|-----------------|--|

|              |                 |                 |           |
|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------|
| <b>DATE:</b> | 21 August, 2002 | <b>FILE NO:</b> | 98/S/4655 |
|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------|

**REPORT BY:** DIRECTOR ASSET & INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

### **INTRODUCTION:**

In accordance with the General Manager's permission, tenders were called for preferred suppliers of the listed civil maintenance services to supplement the Council's existing internal capacities.

- Stormwater Drainage;
- Kerb and Gutter;
- Asphalt Minor Works;
- Segmental Paving;
- Pavement Marking;
- Concrete works & Restorations;
- Landscape Turfing; and
- Bricklaying.

It was specified that the agreement period would be for 2 years with an optional extension for a further year.

Tenders closed on Tuesday 25<sup>th</sup> June 2002, with twenty one (21) submissions received for various categories within the list. Discussion and evaluation of the Tenders received are set out in this report.

### **ISSUES:**

Presently the Council undertakes a process of individual quoting and/or tendering for each of the nominated services, as they are required. This process is time consuming, repetitive and does not necessarily provide the best value for money required by the Council.

To address this inefficiency it was decided to undertake a tender process for the services and on determination of those suppliers offering the greatest value for money, enter into a "Preferred Suppliers" agreement with them for a defined period of time.

### **Tender Assessment**

The Tender Specification Part A 'Conditions of Tendering' advised that the evaluation, negotiation and selection of Tenders would be in accordance with the requirements of the NSW Local Government (Tendering) Regulation 1999 under the NSW Local Government Act 1993. Tenderers were also given an indication of the selection criteria (see below), which would be used in the evaluation:

- (a) The rates;
- (b) Quality Management;
- (c) Occupational Health and Safety;
- (d) Experience
- (e) Capacity to undertake the works.

The criteria were not listed in any particular order and it was emphasised that they would not be accorded equal weight in the assessment process. It was also pointed out that the criteria were intended to give Tenderers a general indication of the Council's priorities and that Council reserved the right to disregard any of the above-listed criteria or to apply any other criteria.

### **Evaluation Team**

A thorough and detailed evaluation of all tender submissions, was conducted by a panel comprising:

- Mr. Robert Taaffe – Technical Officer, Assets & Infrastructure
- Mr. Gary Stone – Technical Officer, Assets & Infrastructure
- Mr. Shane Cooke – Technical Officer, Assets & Infrastructure

### **Evaluation Process**

The process of Evaluation was:

1. The evaluation committee undertook an objective quantitative assessment of the completed schedules, submitted as part of each tender. In particular Schedule B17 asked a number of specific questions drawn from the Part E "Requirements Specification".
2. The schedule information and the specific questions were listed under the relevant criteria and weighted in order of importance to the overall evaluation. Team members scored the criteria individually with reference to the "Scoring Guideline" structured prior to the tender closing date. Individual scores were then averaged into a final team score and recorded on the "Evaluation Scoring" sheet.
3. The tenderers rates, submitted in Schedule B3 "Tender Submission" were compared in a number of ways depending on their complexity and relevance to determine the best rates submitted for a particular service. In some cases individual rates were compared directly. Where there were a number of relevant rates, an average rate was calculated and where the volume of rates was considered to be too great, critical rates were averaged to arrive at a sensible conclusion.

4. The Final evaluation scores were then transferred to the “Summary Scoring” sheet and where the score was considered acceptable it was further related to the \$ rate submitted or averaged for that service.
5. The results of this assessment are attached.

Based on this assessment the team was able to recognise a single submission for each service that offered the Council the “best value for money”.

### **Discussion of Tenders**

As was the multi-faceted structure of works set out in the tender document, not all tenderers submitted rates for all specified categories. All categories were collated and assessment of rates was structured on an average calculation, which then enabled the committee to assess highest to lowest rate.

Discussed by the evaluation committee was the benefit in rationalization to a singular contractor but this was soon overturned due to the competitive pricing offered by the tenderers. The committee then tabled the separate categories and recommend different contractors for these categories.

Minor Concrete Works had the most tenderers competing and the result in the score was tied between Remediation Environmental Contractors Pty Ltd and Benpave Limited. Since it was clear that both companies could provide a satisfactory service to Council in this category, it was decided that the cheaper price submitted by Remediation Environmental Contractors Pty Ltd should be the determining factor in giving Council the “best value for money.”.

Remediation Environmental Contractors Pty Ltd was also ranked the “best value for money” for the provision of Asphalt Works, Turfing and Stormwater Drainage.

The Segmental Paving evaluation indicated that K.K.Civil Engineering Pty Ltd was the “best value for money” and rated favorably in the evaluation scoring.

Due to the standards requirement set out in AUS-SPEC #2, many potential suppliers for Pavement Marking relinquished the opportunity to tender, thus leaving one only tenderer. This tenderer, Menai Linemarking Pty Ltd, scored reasonably well on all aspects of the evaluation criteria. Council currently uses Menai Linemarking Pty Ltd and their performance is regarded as satisfactory.

The Kerb and Gutter works evaluation rating score was tied between Merko Services P/L and South West Kerbing P/L. After analysing the \$ rates involved it was found that South West Kerbing Pty Ltd was marginally better “value for money”. However, this company currently does the majority of Council’s kerbing and guttering and their performance has always been satisfactory. On this basis it was decided that this company should be recommended as the “Preferred Supplier’ in this category.

The Bricklaying Works evaluation produced a clear result in favour of Benpave Limited for all aspects of the tender criteria.

**CONCLUSION:**

The Selection Committee independently scored the tenders for each category based on the scoring guideline and the “best value for money”.

Based on the above information, the following are the listed categories with the Selection Committee’s recommendations for preferred suppliers:

|                                  |   |  |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| Stormwater Drainage              | - | <b>Remediation Environmental Contractors P/L</b> |
| Kerb and Gutter                  | - | <b>South West Kerbing Pty Ltd</b>                |
| Asphalt Minor Works              | - | <b>Remediation Environmental Contractors P/L</b> |
| Segmental Paving                 | - | <b>K K Civil Engineering</b>                     |
| Pavement Marking                 | - | <b>Menai Linemarking Services Pty Ltd</b>        |
| Concrete Works<br>& Restorations | - | <b>Remediation Environmental Contractors P/L</b> |
| Landscape Turfing                | - | <b>Remediation Environmental Contractors P/L</b> |
| Bricklaying                      | - | <b>Benpave Limited</b>                           |

Council’s Purchasing and Contracts Manager has been involved during the process of tender assessment, has viewed this report and is satisfied with the following recommendation.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. That Council accepts the Tenders submitted by the following tenderers for the services as nominated below.

|                                  |   |  |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| Stormwater Drainage              | - | <b>Remediation Environmental Contractors P/L</b> |
| Kerb and Gutter                  | - | <b>South West Kerbing Pty Ltd</b>                |
| Asphalt Minor Works              | - | <b>Remediation Environmental Contractors P/L</b> |
| Segmental Paving                 | - | <b>K K Civil Engineering</b>                     |
| Pavement Marking                 | - | <b>Menai Linemarking Services Pty Ltd</b>        |
| Concrete Works<br>& Restorations | - | <b>Remediation Environmental Contractors P/L</b> |
| Landscape Turfing                | - | <b>Remediation Environmental Contractors P/L</b> |
| Bricklaying                      | - | <b>Benpave Limited</b>                           |

2. The unsuccessful tenderers are notified of the tender result.
3. The Mayor and General Manager or their delegated representative be authorised to enter into agreements for preferred supplier status with the successful tenderers for a period of 2-years with the option of extending the period of the agreement for a further 1-year.

**ATTACHMENT/S:**

Scoring Guideline, Scoring Summary and Evaluation Scoring Sheets (under separate cover)



.....  
MICK SAVAGE  
DIRECTOR ASSET &  
INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

.....  
SHANE COOKE  
OPERATIONAL RESOURCES  
TECHNICAL SUPPORT OFFICER



## ***Director Asset & Infrastructure Services' Report 104/2002***

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| <b>SUBJECT:</b> | TENDER 12/02 - CIVIL & LANDSCAPE WORKS FOR CLOVELLY COASTAL WALK |
|-----------------|--|

|              |                   |                 |                  |
|--------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| <b>DATE:</b> | 3 September, 2002 | <b>FILE NO:</b> | 98/S/4679 Part 1 |
|--------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|

**REPORT BY:** DIRECTOR ASSET & INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

### **INTRODUCTION:**

Fixed Lump Sum Tenders closing on Tuesday 30<sup>th</sup> July 2002 were called for the Civil and Landscape Works for the Clovelly Coastal Walk. The scope of works for this project comprise site clearing, installation of a concrete walkway, retaining walls, handrails, planting and associated works, and a clean up of the area.

Prospective tenderers collected twelve (12) sets of tender documents. At the close of tenders, eleven (11) tenders had been received. Selection and discussion of the conforming Tenders are contained in the following report.

### **BACKGROUND**

The aim of the constructing of the coastal walk is to provide better facilities for the community and to improve the overall access to the walk. A future outcome of the process is to provide continuous access for tourists and residents along the coastline with only minor detours where avoidable into Council's street system.

### **ISSUES:**

#### **Project Funding**

This project is part of the Coastal Walkway Construction Project for which Council allocated \$360,000 (including carryovers) in the current budget. It is intended that a report will be forwarded to Council in the near future outlining Coastal Walkway priorities for the balance of the funds after this project is completed.

#### **Tender Assessment**

The Tender Specification Part A 'Conditions of Tendering' advised that the evaluation, negotiation and selection of Tenders would be in accordance with the requirements of the

NSW Local Government (Tendering) Regulation 1999 under the NSW Local Government Act 1993. Tenderer were also given an indication of the selection criteria.

The criteria were not listed in any particular order and it was emphasised that they would not be accorded equal weight in the assessment process. It was also pointed out that the criteria were intended to give Tenderers a general indication of the Council's priorities and that Council reserved the right to disregard any of the above-listed criteria or to apply any other criteria.

### **Evaluation Team**

A thorough and detailed evaluation of all tender submissions, was conducted by a panel comprising, Jana Stojanov - Senior Landscape Architect, Gigliola Lombardi – Landscape Design Coordinator and Adrian O'Leary- Manager Contracts and Purchasing. The Manager of Contracts and Purchasing has been involved in the preparation of this report and is satisfied with the process.

### **Evaluation Process**

The process of Evaluation was:

1. The evaluation committee undertook an objective quantitative assessment of the completed schedules, (but not pricing information) submitted as part of each tender.
2. The information was listed under the relevant criteria and weighted in order of importance to the overall evaluation. Team members' scored the criteria individually with reference to the "Evaluation Scoring Guideline", see **Attachment A**. Individual scores were then averaged into a final team score and recorded on the "Final Evaluation Score" sheet, see **Attachment B**.
3. The Final Evaluation Scores for the 5 highest scoring tenderers were then transferred to the "Cost / Needs Analysis" sheet and related to the Fixed Lump Sum Tendered Price submitted in Schedule B3 of the tender, see **Attachment C**.
4. The results of this assessment are attached.

Tenders were received from the following companies:

### **Conforming Tenders:**

Tenderers and Tenderer's Lump Sum Amounts (excluding 10% GST):

|    | <b>Tenderer</b>      | <b>Total</b>  |
|----|----------------------|---------------|
| 1. | KK Civil Engineering | \$ 135,120.00 |
| 2. | Glascott Group       | \$ 160,935.70 |
| 3. | JA Bradshaw          | \$ 178,205.00 |

|     |                          |               |
|-----|--------------------------|---------------|
| 4.  | Sydney Civil             | \$ 186,878.00 |
| 5.  | Universal Landscapes     | \$ 204,000.00 |
| 6.  | Athassel Excavations     | \$ 209,501.00 |
| 7.  | Pan Civil Sport Services | \$ 236,986.00 |
| 8.  | Civil Systems            | \$ 240,000.00 |
| 9.  | Trimcoll P/L             | \$ 242,630.00 |
| 10. | Osbuild (Aus) P/L        | \$ 274,785.00 |
| 11. | Subground Technology     | \$ 300,048.00 |

**CONCLUSION:**

Following from a thorough evaluation both KK Civil Engineering and Sydney Civil (the highest scorers) registered the same final score on the selection criteria, which evaluated their capability of completing the project in a satisfactory manner for Council. Since the tender prices for the project from these two companies are \$135,120 and \$178,205 respectively, it was agreed by the evaluation team that KK Civil Engineering with a lump sum tender price of \$135,120 (which was also the lowest tender price) provided Council with the 'best value for money' on this project.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That

- a) Council accept the tender submitted by KK Civil Engineering, for the total amount of \$135,120.
- b) Council authorize the Mayor and General Manager to sign contract documents as necessary to enter into this contract.
- c) That authority be granted for the Council's Common Seal to be fixed to Contract 12/02 between Council and KK Civil Engineering.

**ATTACHMENT/S:**

UNDER SEPARATE COVER -

Attachment A - Evaluation Scoring Guide

Attachment B - Final Evaluation

Attachment C - Cost / Needs Analysis

Attachment D - Plan Indicating Extent of Works

.....  
MICK SAVAGE  
DIRECTOR ASSET &  
INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

.....  
GIGLIOLA LOMBARDI  
LANDSCAPE DESIGN CO-  
ORDINATOR