

TO: Hugh Curran
Director, Finance

Lanie Thornton
Assistant Director, Finance

FROM: Mark Tudor
Assistant Director, Project Development, North

DATE: May 9, 2016

SUBJECT: RECOMMENDATION TO **AWARD / REJECT BIDS**
Contract No.
FAP Project No.
Project Name:
Date of Bid Opening:

The bids for the above project have been jointly reviewed by NAME and we recommend award to the low bidder, Contractor. The low bid price is \$ amount, which is percent% above/below the Engineer's Estimate of \$ amount. The project bid tabulation had number additional bidders with these bids ranging in price from \$ amount to \$ amount.

The overall project cost is percent% below/above the funded estimate. Additional funding from CMT is not required. (See attached funding analysis.)

Our review of the bid prices that comprise 80% of the engineer's estimate include contract items that deviated from the engineer's estimate and the representative bid by +/- %.

LIST ITEMS HERE

Project Number, Name

Date:

Page 2 of

Discussion of Results:

LIST DETAILED ANALYSIS PER ITEM

(Examples below)

207501 Sheeting and Shoring (L.S.)

- Engineer's Estimate (EE) price: \$44,880.00
- Low Bidder (LB) price: \$180,000.00 (+301%)
- Representative Bid price: \$205,900.00

This is a lump sum item with no chance of overrun. The EE unit price was based on historical data for similar type work and may not have accurately accounted for the difficulties presented by the work area. The LB price was 13% lower than the representative bid.

209006 Borrow, Type F (C.Y.)

- EE price: \$13.00
- LB price: \$20.00 (+54%)
- Representative Bid price: \$19.00

The quantity for this item has been reviewed and found to be representative of the anticipated need. The EE price was based on historical data for similar type of work with a similar quantity. The LB price was also higher than the representative bid but was within the range of historical bid prices. *(It is important to note that a detailed review of the quantity calculation needs to be made for items with low quantity that have a higher than normal bid price)*

Conclusions:

Based on these explanations, we find no mathematically unbalanced bidding or any scenario in which the second bidder could become the low bidder as a result of unbalanced bidding procedures. The quantities for the items listed above were reviewed and found to be representative of the anticipated need. We therefore believe it to be in the best interest of the State to proceed with the award. Please prepare the funding documents and proceed to award the contract to the successful bidder.

Project Number, Name

Date:

Page 3 of

Endorsement #1

Concurring in Recommendation: Yes No Return for Additional Information

Comments: _____

Assistant Director, Project Development North

Date

Endorsement #2

Concurring in Recommendation: Yes No Return for Additional Information

Comments: _____

Director, Transportation Solutions

Date

Endorsement #3

Approval of Chief Engineer Required when:

- All bids are to be rejected; or
- There was only one bidder; or
- Low bid greater than 10% above engineer's estimate; or
- Recommend making award to other than low bidder

Chief Engineer

Date

Project Number, Name

Date:

Page 4 of

Endorsement #4

Approval of FHWA required for all projects with FHWA oversight. (Refer to Stewardship Agreement)

Approval

FHWA Division Administrator

Date

MT:/c-m

Attachment

cc: Robert McCleary, Chief Engineer
Mark Tudor, Assistant Director, North Project Development
Javier Torrijos, Assistant Director, Construction
Robert Kovacs, Competitively Bid Contracts Coordinator
Kimberly Smith, Contract Administration
Jim Hoagland, Contract Services Administrator
Group Engineer
Squad Leader or Project Manager
Tommy Craig, PS&E Coordinator

The following enclosures are required should the low bid exceed the engineers estimate by +/- 10%:

Bid Tabulation
Bid Analysis Report

Project Number, Name

Date:

Page 5 of

Subtotal	\$0.00		
CE***	\$1,000.00	@	#DIV/0!
Traffic			
QA/QC for HMA	\$0.00		
Asphalt Cost Adj	\$0.00		

Total Need:	\$1,000.00
-------------	------------

Difference (above) or below funded amount:*	(\$1,000.00)	* If Difference > \$250,000 then CMT approval required.
---	--------------	---

% (above) or below Funded Amount:**	#DIV/0!	**If % above Funded Amount is >10% then CMT approval required.
-------------------------------------	---------	--

*** Percentage of CE consist of:

Advertisement Costs			\$1,000.00
Construction inspection services	Agreement	@	
Construction engineering services	Agreement	@	
E&S Inspection services	Agreement	@	\$0.00
Pipe Video Inspection Services	Agreement	@	\$0.00
Materials & Research Insp. Services	Agreement	@	

Primavera Estimate Data

Construction	\$0.00
Project Contingency	\$0.00
Construction Eng.	\$1,000.00
Traffic	\$0.00
	\$0.00
	\$0.00
	\$0.00

Project Contingency = Const. Contingency + Asphalt Cost Adjustment + QA/QC for HMA