Lee County Board Of County Commissioners Agenda Item Summary

Blue Sheet No. 20060232

- 1. ACTION REQUESTED/PURPOSE: Approve award of B-06-05 Matlacha Bridge Rehabilitation, for the Department of Transportation, to the lowest responsive/responsible bidder meeting all bid requirements, Spensieri Painting LLC. for a total not to exceed contract amount of \$464,555.00, with a project completion time of 180 calendar days. Also, authorize Chairwoman to execute contract upon receipt. This project was anticipated and funds are available.
- 2. WHAT ACTION ACCOMPLISHES: Provides a Contractor for the Matlacha Bridge Rehabilitation to include the following: structural steel repair, concrete spall repair, fender repair, mechanical repair, electrical repair, cleaning and coating of concrete surfaces, maintenance of structural steel and bridge balance.
- 3. MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATION: Staff Recommends Approval

4. Departmental Category:	9.	C9C		5. Meeting	Date: 03 -	21-200L
6. Agenda:	7. Requ	irement/Purpos	e: (specify)	8. Request	Initiated:	
X Consent		Statute		Commission	ier	
Administrative		Ordinance		Department	T	ransportation
Appeals	X	Admin. Code	AC-4-4	Division		
Public Public		Other		By: S	cott Gilberts	on, Director
Walk-On						

9. Background:

The Department of Transportation submitted a request to Contracts Management to bid the Matlacha Bridge Rehabilitation. The expected cost of construction required the use of the formal advertised sealed bid procedure.

On the bidding deadline of January 25, 2006 the Contract Office received three (3) bids. The bids have been reviewed by the Department of Transportation and by the County's Consultant, Kisinger Campo & Associates, and it is being recommended award be made to the lowest responsive/responsible bidder, Spensieri Painting LLC., for a total not to exceed contract amount of \$464,555.00, with a project completion time of 180 calendar days

Funds are available in account #40571430700.503190

Attachments: (1) Bid Tabulation

- (2) Department Recommendation
- (3) Consultant Recommendation

-	L								
	10. Review	v for Schedu	uling:						
ō		Purchasing or Contracts	Human Resources	Other	County Attorney	Buds W	get Services		Couuty Manager/P.W. Director
	missin	(1	His de	04 32	\$83/c/06	Analyst Risk	Grants 13 Ccl	3600	3.1.06
	11. Comi	mission Acti	ion:		•	• /	× 1•1	Control of the Contro	A Continue Company
		Approved Deferred	1			CEIVED BY DUNTY ADMIN:		Rec. by C	oAtty
ı		Denied				12-66 -		Date:	3/43
		Other 			CO	OUNTY ADAMN ALERWARDED TO:		Time:	<u> </u>
					· _	315/06 52/h		Commarded Commy. 3/6/06	10:

BID ANALYSIS

B-06-05 MATLACHA BRIDGE REPAIR

	\$497,943.56			\$526,389.00		200	And the second s	\$ 331,860.00 *				TOTAL	
175%	\$137,640.00	\$137,640.00	229%	\$164,568.00	9			\$50,000	\$50,000	LS	_	(Maintenance Painting)	560-1
-9%	\$9,054,00	\$9,054.00	209%	\$30,851.00	\$30,851,00			\$10,000	\$10,000	LS.		(Grounding Inspection Testing & Repair	204-70-8
1640%	\$43,490.00	\$43,490.00	51%	\$4,034.00	\$4,034.00			\$2,500	\$2,500	-S	_		508-70-6
104%	\$20,400.00		102%	\$20,240.00	\$20,240.00			\$10,000	\$10,000	₽	_	460-121-5Counterweight Movable Bridge	460-121
14%	\$11,400.00	\$11,400.00	5%	\$10,450.00	\$10,450.00			\$10,000	\$10,000	Č.	1	Bridge Hydraulics (Remove Recondition, Install Buffer Cylinder	460-101
170%	\$27,000.00		203%	\$30,250.00	\$60.50			\$10,000	\$20	EB D	500	Structural Steel Repair	460-95
114%	\$15,000,00	\$150,00	136%	\$16,500.00	\$165,00			\$7,000	\$70	Ţ.	100	Rivet/High Strength Bolt Replacement	460-81
220%	\$24,000.00	\$48.00	148%	\$18,580.00	\$37.16			\$7,500	\$15	<u>8</u>	500	3 Structural Steel (Fender Hardware)	460-1-13
21%	\$84,600.36	\$542.31	-8% -8%	\$63,648.00	\$408,00g			\$70,200	\$450	C)	156	2 Latex Modified Portland Cement (Type III Cement)	405-70-2
-58%	\$4,410.00	\$0.42	-76%	\$2,520.00	\$0,24			\$10,500	\$1	SF	10500	Cleaning Concrete Surfaces	400-145
-1%	\$24,000.00	\$1.50	11%	\$26,880.00	\$1.68			\$24,160	\$2	SF	16000	Cleaning and Coating Concrete Surfaces	400-143
	\$3,420.00		-55%	\$3,600.00	\$36.00			\$8,000	\$80) (F	100		400-135
	\$1,350.00	\$90.00	-22%	\$1,170.00	\$78.00 H			\$1,500	\$100	GA	151		400-134
	\$3,000.00		188%	\$7,200.00	\$14,40			\$2,500	\$5) [F	500	Turbidity Barrier, Relocate Floating	104-75
20%	\$8,400.00	\$16.80	140%	\$16,800.00	\$39.60			\$7,000	\$14	<u>-</u>	500	Turbidity Barrier, Floating (Special)	104-11-1
169%	\$61,842.00	\$61,842.00	68%	\$38,698,00	\$38,698.00			\$23,000	\$23,000	LS	1	Maintenance of Traffic	102-1
-18%	\$18,937.20	\$18,937.20	206%	\$70,400,00	\$70,400.00			\$23,000	\$23,000	LS	_	Mobilization	101-1
	TOTAL	PRICE		TOTAL				Total	Unit Cost	UNIT	EST. QTY.	DESCRIPTION	NO.
% Difference from Engineer's Estimate		COASTAL MARINE	ONSTENT AN % Difference from TE OF M&J Engineers	ONSTENT AN S	ANCHOR CON AFFILM TE CONS			Estimate	Engineer's Estimate		<u> </u>		

MEMORANDUM FROM

DATE: 02/10/2006

TO: Contracts Management FROM: Ehab Guirguis

RE: RECOMMENDATION OF BID AWARD

PROJECT NAME: Matlacha Bridge Rehabilitation # 120050

BID NO: **B-06-05** PROJECT MANAGER **Ehab Guirguis, P.E.**

A review by this office of the experience, qualifications and capabilities of **Spensieri Painting** the apparent low bidder indicates that said bidder, is qualified to construct this project and it is recommended that the Contract be awarded to the above said bidder for:

The total <u>lump sum price/not-to-exceed</u> price of \$464,555.00

If the total awarded Contract Price is to include alternate bid items indicate which "alternate bid items" are recommended to be included in the award and amounts.

<u>Alternate</u> <u>Amount</u>

<u>N/A</u>

Funds are <u>available/will be made available</u> in account string number: <u>Master Bridge Project Account#</u> 205714

Account Narrative: Master Bridge Project Account# 205714

Any additional required information to be included on the Blue Sheet for award (ie; transfer of funds, budget amendment, etc.): **N/A**

CMO:039 9/25/01



KISINGER CAMPO & ASSOCIATES CORP.

engineering · inspection · planning

Allen Kisinge

February 22, 2006

Mr. Ehab Guirguis, P.E. Lee County Department of Transportation 5560 Zip Drive Ft. Myers, Florida 33905

Re: Matlacha Bridge Repair

Bid Analysis

Dear Mr. Guirguis,

Kisinger Campo & Associates Corp. (KCA) has received the bid tabulation that you e-mailed to our office on Tuesday, February 21, 2006, and each of the three bid packages with summary sent via regular mail. KCA has developed a comparison of the Engineer's Estimate versus the data from the bid tabulation (attached). In analyzing the unit prices and total bids submitted by the contractors (with special emphasis on the apparent low bidder), we noted the following:

- 1) Spensieri Painting is the apparent low bidder at \$464,555. The next lowest bidder is Coastal Marine Construction at \$497,943.56.
- 2) The price provided by Spensieri Painting for Floating Turbidity Barrier, Epoxy Material, Structural Steel Repair, and Painting Structural Steel is well above the Engineer's Estimate and that of the other bidders.
- 3) The price provided by Spensieri Painting for Maintenance of Traffic and Latex Modified Portland Cement is well below the Engineer's estimate and that of the other bidders.

In general, the proposed unit costs varied over a fairly broad range. All bids are at least 40% above the Engineer's Estimate of \$331,860. The largest single variation in unit price from the Engineer's Estimate is by Spensieri Painting, with a total price for Painting Structural Steel of \$200,000 versus the Engineer's Estimate of \$50,000. This item comprises 43% of Spensieri Painting's total bid. The other bidders exceeded the Engineer's estimate on this item as well, but to a lesser extent. The cost differential may be attributed to the contractors' uncertainty of the extent of the limited "spot" painting required in the Technical Special Provision (due to a remaining bridge service life of only 5 years).



Mr. Guirguis February 22, 2006 Page 2 of 2

The broad range of other unit bid prices may be attributed to such variables as contractor's location and related mobilization costs, availability, understanding of the project, and subcontractors planned for use. In addition, some contractors adjust certain unit costs based on the estimated quantity, versus what they anticipate will be the final required quantity. For example, if a contractor felt that a particular pay item would not be used, they may bid the item at a low price (for the benefit of a low total bid) without the obligation to carry out any additional work at a non-profitable price. Conversely, a pay item that may be perceived as having a low estimated quantity could be bid at a high price, generating additional profit with each additional unit of work required. This practice can be detrimental to the bridge owner in both cases. Should additional quantities of work be necessary, a high unit cost can create undue burden to the County. A low cost can create the same burden for a contractor, potentially resulting in his not being able to complete the work.

Should the low bidder meet all other County evaluation criteria for a contract such as bonding, licensing, and work references and proceed onto the negotiation phase, these bid values should be verified to ensure that entries were not in error and that the contractor has a clear understanding of the scope.

We are pleased to provide the above analysis to Lee County. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call. The attached spreadsheet is for your use in your final evaluation.

Sincerely,

David B. Thompson, P.E.

DIB.Th

Project Manager

cc: TJS, file 1200421.05