



## Water Services Department Engineering Services Division

### MEMO

DATE: December 9, 2016

TO: Andy Shively, P.E.  
Assistant City Manager

FROM: Rachelle Lowe, P.E.  
Project Manager

SUBJECT: Bid Recommendation  
City-Wide Sewer Infrastructure Rehabilitation within Waterways Design-Build  
Project No. 81000756  
Contract No. 1275

**Bid**

A two-stage selection process was used to determine the lowest and best bid for the above referenced design-build project. The first stage was evaluation and scoring of the technical approach submittals. The second stage was scoring of the price submittal. The combined score of the Technical Approach and the Price submittal was then used to determine the recommended bidder.

Bid Packages were received on November 15, 2016 with five Bidders responding. The Price Submittals were opened on November 29, 2016. A summary of the scores for both the Technical Approach and Price Submittal are referenced below.

Bidder	Total Technical Approach (Total Achievable Points)	Total Price Submittal (Total Achievable Points)	Grand Total Points	48-hour HRD Paperwork
Pyramid/Wilson	77	100	177	Submitted
Kissisk/ CDM Smith	100	55	155	Submitted
ESI/RIC/WRS	99	48	147	Not Submitted
GBA Builders	99	42	141	Submitted
Radmacher/CFS	65	54	119	Not Submitted

**Non-responsive Bids**

Two of the five bidders were deemed non-responsive by WSD Contract Administration for the following reasons:

- Radmacher – failure to submit 48 Hour Paperwork
- ESI/RIC/WRS – failure to submit 48 Hour Paperwork



## Water Services Department Engineering Services Division

### Technical Approach Evaluation

City staff evaluated the technical approaches submitted by all five bidders. Each technical approach submittal was evaluated and scored by the City based on the points system described below, with no reference to cost or price:

- Part I – Organization & Key Personnel – 25 points
- Part II – Project Understanding & Approach – 20 points
- Part III – Project Controls Plan – 10 points
- Part IV – Project Design Submittal – 45 points

The team of Kissick Construction and CDM Smith had the highest points total for the combined technical approach and price submittal. See the summary table above for individual technical approach scores. The Design-Build Bid Tabulation sheet is attached for reference.

### Bid Price

The lowest price submittal was awarded 100 points, and one point was then deducted from each of the other price submittals for each percentage that the price submittal exceed the lowest price submittal. Pyramid and Wilson had the lowest bid at the time of bid opening. The bid prices submitted were approximately \$320,000 higher than the Capital Improvement Projects budget of \$4,000,000 and approximately \$1,938,649 less than the next lowest bid received. See the summary table above for individual price submittal scores. The Design-Build Bid Tabulation sheet is attached for reference.

A summary of the Bid tab is provided below for reference.

<b>Bidder</b>	<b>Base Bid</b>	<b>Allowance</b>	<b>Total Amount of Bid</b>	<b>Total Alternates</b>	<b>Total Base + Alternates</b>
Pyramid/ Wilson	\$1,746,780.00	\$340,000	\$2,086,780.00	\$2,233,220.00	\$4,320,000.00
Kissick/CDM Smith	\$3,348,578.00	\$340,000	\$3,688,578.00	\$2,570,071.00	\$6,258,649.00
Radmacher/ CFS	\$3,372,548.80	\$340,000	\$3,712,548.80	\$2,575,929.60	\$6,288,478.40
ESI/RIC/ WRS	\$3,900,046.95	\$340,000	\$4,240,046.95	\$2,317,404.41	\$6,557,451.36
GBA Builders	\$4,139,211.00	\$340,000	\$4,479,211.00	\$2,327,852.00	\$6,807,063.00

### Recommendation

The team of Pyramid Excavation & Construction, Inc. and Wilson & Company was the apparent lowest and best bid based on technical and price submittal. After the bids were read, Pyramid/Wilson withdrew their bid because they found a substantial calculation error in their bid and the Designer of Record resigned from Wilson & Company.

The second highest score based on the technical and price submittals is the team of Kissick Construction and CDM Smith. The bid documents, qualification, and financial information for Kissick Construction and CDM Smith was evaluated. After the evaluation, Kissick Construction and CDM Smith was recommended as the apparent lowest and best bidder.



## Water Services Department Engineering Services Division

### MBE/WBE Participation

The Fairness in Construction Board (FICB) set the MBE/WBE goals for this project at 11% MBE and 6% WBE. The team of Kissick and CDM Smith submitted 11.03% MBE and 6.27% WBE on their Contractor Utilization Plan. Kissick has no written violations of any MBE/WBE programs, incurred no penalties and complied with all stated participation goals with respect to MBE/WBE on all other comparable projects.

### Experience Reference Form

Kissick submitted the required Evidence of Competency and the Experience Reference Form/Summary for similar projects, which were completed within the last 5 years. Past project references for Kissick appear to be in good standing.

### Financial Statement

A review of the Kissick’s financial standing using the Dun and Bradstreet (D&B) ratings was performed by the OCP team. The review indicated Kissick has a credit rating of 542. The “1R” indicated the company has more than 10 employees. The “3” indicates an overall “fair” credit appraisal.

The 24-month PAYDEX score is 61, which indicates that payments to suppliers averaged 30 days beyond terms. The D&B Viability Rating summary shows a score of 5 which indicates a low risk that the company will go out of business, become dormant/ inactive, or file for bankruptcy/insolvency within the next 12 months. Overall, Kissick appears to be in sound financial standing and has similar risk and financial ratings compared to companies within the industry of similar size.

### Claims and Lawsuits

Kissick provided a statement that no litigation or arbitration involving Kissick has occurred in the last five years.

### OSHA Safety Record and Experience Modification Ratio

Kissick has no OSHA violations that resulted in fines within the last three years.

### List of Subcontractors and Suppliers

Kissick submitted an acceptable List of Subcontractors to be utilized in this project.

### Summary

It is recommended that the City move forward to contract with the team of Kissick and CDM Smith in the amount of **\$6,258,649.00** plus authorization for **\$625,865** (approximately 10% contingency) for a maximum authorization of **\$6,884,514** (Base Bid + Alternates + 10% contingency). This Project is in the **2017 FY budget** and is to be funded from Water Department funds.

Approved

**KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI**

By:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Andy Shively, P.E.  
Assistant City Manager

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Attachments:

1. Bid Tab
2. Dun and Bradstreet (D&B) Report

cc. Contract File #1275



**DESIGN-BUILD BID TABULATION**

Department: Water Services Department		Contract No. 1275/Project No. 81000756 - City-Wide Sewer Infrastructure Rehabilitation within Waterways Design-Build							
Project Manager: Rachelle Lowe		Technical Approach Due: 11/15/2016 Public Bid Opening: 11/29/2016							
FIRM	ESI Contracting Corp/Renaissance/Water Resources Solutions	Kissick/CDM Smith	Pyramid/Wilson	Radmacher/CFS Engineers	GBA				
ADDRESS	3001 East 83rd Street, KC, MO 64132	8131 Indiana Ave, KC, MO 64132	11102 Hickman Mills Dr, KCMO 64134	2201 N State Route 7 Hwy Suite B, Pleasant Hill, MO 64080	9801 Renner Boulevard, Lenexa, KS 66219				
CONTACT	Alan Wolfe	Dennis Rchardson/Michael Odrowski	Hank Cunningham	Ed Andres	Joshua Reeves				
PHONE NUMBER/FAX NUMBER	816-523-5081	816-363-5530	816-765-4464	816-540-3614	913-577-8804				
EMAIL	<a href="mailto:aewesi@esi-cc.com">aewesi@esi-cc.com</a>	-	-	-	-				
TECHNICAL APPROACH PART I Organization & Key Personnel (25 POINTS )	24	23	17	15	23				
TECHNICAL APPROACH PART II Project Understanding & Approach (20 POINTS)	19	18	14	10	18				
TECHNICAL APPROACH PART III Project Controls Plan (10 POINTS )	7	8	5	6	7				
TECHNICAL APPROACH PART IV Project Design Submittal (45 POINTS )	40	42	32	25	42				
<b>TOTAL TECHNICAL APPROACH (Total Achievable Points - 100)</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>99</b>	
<b>Total Base+Alternate Bid</b>	\$ 6,557,451.36	\$ 6,258,649.00	\$ 4,320,000.00	\$ 6,288,478.40	\$ 6,807,063.00	\$ 2,487,063.00	\$ 2,237,451.36	\$ 1,938,649.00	
<b>Difference from Low Bid</b>		\$ 2,237,451.36	\$ 1,938,649.00	\$ -	\$ 1,968,478.40	\$ 2,487,063.00	\$ 52.00	\$ 45.00	
<b>Percent Greater than Low Bid</b>		52.00	45.00	0.00	46.00	58.00			
<b>TOTAL BASE PRICE SUBMITTAL POINTS<sup>1</sup> (100 POINTS)</b>		<b>48</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>42</b>			
<b>GRAND TOTAL POINTS - 200</b>		<b>147</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>141</b>			

The Highest Technical Approach will receive 100 points - Points will be added to each of the other TA Submittals corresponding to the 100 points and original points earned by that Submittal.

**Lowest Bid** \$ 4,320,000.00  
**Lowest Base Bid** \$ 2,086,780.00

The Lowest Price Submittal will receive 100 points. One (1) point will be deducted from each of the other Price Submittals for each percentage that the Price Submittal exceeds the lowest Price Submittal, with each percentage rounded up to the next whole number prior to its deduction from the points earned by that Price Submittal.

<b>Design Services</b>	\$ 658,111.90	\$ 291,700.00	\$ 275,000.00	\$ 346,400.00	\$ 396,200.00
<b>Construction Services</b>	\$ 3,241,935.05	\$ 3,056,878.00	\$ 1,471,780.00	\$ 3,026,148.80	\$ 3,743,011.00
<b>Total Base</b>	\$ 3,900,046.95	\$ 3,348,578.00	\$ 1,746,780.00	\$ 3,372,548.80	\$ 4,139,211.00
<b>Allowance</b>	\$ 340,000.00	\$ 340,000.00	\$ 340,000.00	\$ 340,000.00	\$ 340,000.00
<b>Total Bid</b>	\$ 4,240,046.95	\$ 3,688,578.00	\$ 2,086,780.00	\$ 3,712,548.80	\$ 4,479,211.00
<b>Total Alternates</b>	\$ 2,317,404.41	\$ 2,570,071.00	\$ 2,233,220.00	\$ 2,575,929.60	\$ 2,327,852.00
<b>Total Base + Alternates</b>	\$ 6,557,451.36	\$ 6,258,649.00	\$ 4,320,000.00	\$ 6,288,478.40	\$ 6,807,063.00