



Dreamland Scenic Railway - General Contractor

Report on Tenders

May 2014

DREAMLAND - MARGATE

SCENIC RAILWAY GENERAL CONTRACTOR TENDER REPORT

TENDER RETURN BACKGROUND & RECOMMENDATION

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report has been prepared to document the tender process and recommend the way forward with regard to appointing a Scenic Railway contractor.

2 TENDER PROCESS

- 2.1 The tender documents were issued on 20 March 2014 by electronic transfer and cd to the following five companies that responded to the notices on the Thanet District Council and South East Business portal websites and were selected following a review of their submitted Pre-Qualification Questionnaires - Coombs, Durtnell, Mackley, Pavohall and Topbond. During the tender period Durtnell withdrew from the process.
- 2.2 Tenders were received from the four remaining contractors on 29 April 2014 and opened by TDC on 1 May 2014. An initial analysis of the tenders is included after this section.

3 TENDER PROGRAMMES

- 3.1 The tender bid is based on the anticipated programme dates including; appointment by May 2014, with start on site commencing in June and a 40 week construction period ending in March 2015. Topbond and Pavohall tendered on this basis; the other contractors, Coombs and Mackley, both require a longer construction period.

4 POST-TENDER COMPARISON

- 4.1 Coombs included a number of Provisional Sums in their bid, in addition to those that were stated in the tender documents, totalling £47,000, plus an adverse weather/ delay contingency of £20,000. Mackley included a risk contingency of £81,200 but excluded the Performance Bond. Topbond excluded the Performance Bond but stated the premium they would require to provide it.
- 4.2 The tenders are assessed on the basis of 40% Price and 60% Quality, as set out in the tender enquiry documents. G&T (QS) and GTMS (PM) reviewed the tenders from Coombs, Mackley, Pavohall and Topbond and marked them against the stated headings for Quality, with weightings identified.
- 4.3 The results of the marking are shown in the Scoring Matrix following this section.
- 4.4 It was noted in the review that Pavohall's declared 15% for overheads and profit was high, whereas their Provisional Sum of £30,000 for the M&E services appears low when compared to the other tenderers.
- 4.5 From the Scoring Matrix, it can be seen that Topbond submitted the lowest Price and also had the best overall Price/Quality score.

5 NON-FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

- 5.1 **Coombs's** Quality score is 34.50% out of 60%. Whilst it is acknowledged they have extensive knowledge of the existing Dreamland site and buildings through the recently completed Urgent Works contract, it was felt that the proposed team had not fully understood the methodology of undertaking these particular works and had limited experience of these engineering type projects.
- 5.2 **Mackley's** Quality score is 42.00 out of 60%. The company and proposed team members have extensive experience of civil engineering projects in a marine environment but less experience of buildings, although it is acknowledged that these are a relatively limited element of this project.
- 5.3 **Pavohall's** Quality score is 37.50 out of 60%. The company has very limited relative experience although the proposed team members have many years of experience, including in listed building projects. They provided a compliant programme but fairly limited details on their approach and methodology.

DREAMLAND - MARGATE
SCENIC RAILWAY GENERAL CONTRACTOR TENDER REPORT
TENDER RETURN BACKGROUND & RECOMMENDATION

5 NON-FINANCIAL ANALYSIS (CONT'D)

- 5.4 **Topbond's** Quality score is 44.00% out of 60%. Their tender was well put together and it was evident that they have a very clear understanding of the project and proposed methodology. They submitted drawings to illustrate their proposed construction sequence.

6 RECOMMENDATION

- 6.1 Based on this analysis, it is recommended that the following is considered:-

- a) Selecting Topbond as the preferred contractor.
- b) Arranging a post-tender interview with Topbond to discuss in detail the technical aspects of their tender, method statement and programme, in the presence of the structural engineer and architect.
- c) Agree an allowance to be retained for Contingencies.



DREAMLAND - MARGATE
SCENIC RAILWAY GENERAL CONTRACTOR TENDER REPORT
INITIAL ANALYSIS OF TENDERS

	Coombs		Mackley		Pavehall		Topbond	
	£		£		£		£	
Preliminaries	439,941.00		1,727,021.00		317,150.00		383,604.00	
Works								
Foundations	Included		200,276.00		0.00		120,423.00	
Demolitions and Site Clearance	54,466.00		199,984.00		22,050.00		63,870.00	
Ride Structure	1,277,222.52		1,150,918.80		989,744.25		654,352.00	
Machine House	45,974.67		70,339.95		129,200.00		40,078.00	
Station and Platform	141,358.05		159,720.56		243,100.00		73,796.00	
Train Shed	125,070.52		180,759.72		260,400.00		88,034.00	
Existing Maintenance Shed	Excluded		10,000.00		Excluded		Excluded	
M&E Services	172,000.00	Provisional Sum	370,980.44	inc £86,500 P Sum	33,000.00	Provisional Sum	319,426.00	
Additional Items (by Contractor)								
Enabling Works and External Works	93,811.21							
Adverse Weather/ Delay Contingency	20,000.00							
Provisional Sums	47,000.00							
Risk			81,200.00					
Overheads and Profit	110,198.90		325,600.04		Included		Included	
Premium for Performance Bond	9,476.41		Excluded		15,000.00		Excluded	Premium £4,375
Form of Tender	£2,536,519.28		£4,476,800.51		£2,009,644.25		£1,743,583.00	
Level of OH&P	5.00%	(Actual 4.69%)	8.00%		15.00%		Not stated	

DREAMLAND - MARGATE

SCENIC RAILWAY GENERAL CONTRACTOR TENDER REPORT

TENDER RETURNS SCORING MATRIX

	Coombs			Mackley			Pavehall			Topbond		
Quality (60%)	Score	Weighting	Weighted Score	Score	Weighting	Weighted Score	Score	Weighting	Weighted Score	Score	Weighting	Weighted Score
	0 - 10		%	0 - 10		%	0 - 10		%	0 - 10		%
Team experience (20%)	6	2.00	12.00	7	2.00	14.00	7	2.00	14.00	7	2.00	14.00
General Company experience (15%)	6	1.50	9.00	7	1.50	10.50	4	1.50	6.00	7	1.50	10.50
Methodology and Programme (20%)	5	2.00	10.00	7	2.00	14.00	7	2.00	14.00	8	2.00	16.00
Company Systems												
- Health & Safety (2.5%)	7	0.25	1.75	7	0.25	1.75	7	0.25	1.75	7	0.25	1.75
- Other Systems (2.5%)	7	0.25	1.75	7	0.25	1.75	7	0.25	1.75	7	0.25	1.75
Total Quality Score			34.50			42.00			37.50			44.00
Price (40%)		£2,536,519.28	21.81		£4,476,800.51	(22.70)		£2,009,644.25	33.90		£1,743,583.00	40.00
Overall Assessment			56.31			19.30			71.40			84.00

Quality - Scoring Principles

0 Rejected - Proposals are unacceptable, or there is a failure to properly address the request

1-3 Poor - The proposal is deficient in certain areas where the details require the reviewer to make assumptions

4-6 Satisfactory - The proposal is acceptable, but with some minor reservations

7-8 Good - The standard of proposals fully meets expectations

9-10 Outstanding - The standards of proposals exceeds expectations. The response demonstrates clear and strong proposals for delivery as part of an integrated team.

Price - Scoring

$100 \times [1 - ((a-b)/b)] \times 40\%$ weighting, where

a = price of tender being evaluated

b = lowest tender price