



Legislation Text

File #: 22-0383, Version: 1

MOTION TO AWARD IFB # PSPW-22-01 "REPLACEMENT OF WINDOWS AND DOORS TO IMPACT RATED MATERIAL AT PINES POINT SENIOR RESIDENCE " TO THE MOST RESPONSIVE/RESPONSIBLE BIDDER, TECHGROUPONE, INC., IN THE AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$725,964.94, WHICH INCLUDES A 10% OWNER'S CONTINGENCY IN THE AMOUNT OF \$65,996.81.

- Chapter 35 of the City's Code of Ordinances is titled "PROCUREMENT PROCEDURES, PUBLIC FUNDS."

- Section 35.15 defines an Invitation for Bid as "A written solicitation for competitive sealed bids with the title, date and hour of the public bid opening designated therein and specifically defining the commodities or services for which bids are sought. The invitation for bid shall be used when the city is capable of specifically defining the scope of work for which a service is required or when the city is capable of establishing 15 precise specifications defining the actual commodities required. The invitation for bid shall include instructions to bidders, plans, drawings and specifications, if any, bid form and other required forms and documents to be submitted with the bid."

- Section 35.18 of the City's Code of Ordinances is titled "COMPETITIVE BIDDING OR COMPETITIVE PROPOSALS REQUIRED; EXCEPTIONS."

- Section 35.18(A) states, "A purchase of or contracts for commodities or services that is estimated by the Chief Procurement Officer to cost more than \$25,000 shall be based on sealed competitive solicitations as determined by the Chief Procurement Officer, except as specifically provided herein."

- Section 35.19 of the City's Code of Ordinances is titled "SEALED COMPETITIVE BIDDING PROCEDURE."

- Section 35.19(A) states "All sealed competitive solicitations as defined in § 35.18 shall be presented to the City Commission for their consideration prior to advertisement."

- Section 35.21 of the City's Code of Ordinances is titled "AWARD OF CONTRACT."

- Section 35.21(A) of the City's Code of Ordinances is titled "City Commission approval."

- Section 35.21(A)(1) states, "An initial purchase of, or contract for, commodities or services, in excess of \$25,000, shall require the approval of the City Commission, regardless of whether the competitive bidding or competitive proposal procedures were followed."

SUMMARY EXPLANATION AND BACKGROUND:

1. On February 2, 2022, the City Commission authorized to reject all proposals to IFB # PSPW-21-06 "Replacement of Windows and Doors to Impact Rated Material at Pines Point Senior Residence", and to authorize the re-advertisement of this bid as IFB # PSPW-22-01 "Replacement of Windows and Doors to Impact Rated Material at Pines Point Senior Residence ", which was then advertised on February 9, 2022.

2. The purpose of the solicitation was to replace exterior windows and pedestrian doors at Pines Point Senior Residence to impact rated material.

3. On March 22, 2022, the City opened bids from the following five (5) vendors:.

| Vendor | Total Cost with P&P Bonds |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| TechGroupOne, Inc. | \$ 659,968.13 |
| Garabar, Inc. | \$ 977,377.80 |
| Assured Contracting LLC. | \$ 56,445,902.59* |
| RJ Spencer Construction | \$ 6,793,437,608.07* |
| JIJ Construction Corp. | \$ 54,642,308,336,208.00* |

*Please note that it appears that each of the three highest priced bidders submitted their cost for a Payment and Performance Bond as a dollar figure instead of a percent as requested throughout the bid document and bid proposal sheet. In addition, each of those three vendors seemed to have submitted that dollar figure in a different method, one as a unit price, one as a lump sum, and the last submitted the lump sum for the base price and the same lump sum in the "Cost of P&P Bond as a Percent" column. As a result, their total cost with Payment and Performance Bonds looks extremely large since the system calculates their total based on the information being entered in as a percent. Please see attached pricing tabulation for additional notes on each bidder's submission. Since this project is a construction project, the prices were read aloud during the bid opening process, therefore Administration felt that it would be unfair to have all of the firms submit a Best and Final Offer, to clarify their proposals, as all of the firms would have access to the other bidders pricing, including the bidders that submitted their pricing correctly in compliance with the instructions in the bid document and bid proposal sheet.

4. The Public Services Department has reviewed the proposals and has deemed TechGroupOne, Inc. to be the most responsive/responsible bidder.

5. In addition, TechGroupOne, Inc. has also completed the Equal Benefits Certification Form and has stated that the "Contractor currently complies with the requirements of this section."

6. The Public Services Department would like to add a 10% owner's contingency to the project to cover any additional services needed which will increase the total cost from \$659,968.13 to \$725,964.94.

7. Request Commission to award IFB # PSPW-22-01 "Replacement of Windows and Doors to Impact Rated Material at Pines Point Senior Residence" to the most responsive/responsible bidder, Techgroupone, Inc., in the amount not to exceed \$725,964.94, which includes a 10% owner's

contingency in the amount of \$65,996.81.

Reviewed by Commission Auditor.

FINANCIAL IMPACT DETAIL:

- a) **Initial Cost:** \$725,964.94 which includes a 10% owner's contingency in the amount of \$65,996.81.
- b) **Amount budgeted for this item in Account No:** Funds are available in account # 121-554-0600-662054-0000-000-0000-02021 (Building Imprv - Pines Point).
- c) **Source of funding for difference, if not fully budgeted:** Not Applicable.
- d) **5 year projection of the operational cost of the project** Not Applicable.
- e) **Detail of additional staff requirements:** Not Applicable.

FEASIBILITY REVIEW:

A feasibility review is required for the award, renewal and/or expiration of all function sourcing contracts. This analysis is to determine the financial effectiveness of function sourcing services.

- a) **Was a Feasibility Review/Cost Analysis of Out-Sourcing vs. In-House Labor Conducted for this service?** Not Applicable, as you would need a Licensed Contractor to perform this job.
- b) **If Yes, what is the total cost or total savings of utilizing Out-Sourcing vs. In-House Labor for this service?** Not Applicable.