RESOLUTION NO. 2016- 289

A RESOLUTION REJECTING THE BIDS RECEIVED ON AUGUST 23, 2016 FOR THE LENWOOD COURT MAJOR SUBDIVISION COMPLETION, AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY CLERK TO READVERTISE FOR BIDS TO BE RECEIVED BY THE PURCHASING BOARD ON OCTOBER 12, 2016.

WHEREAS, the City of Vineland has heretofore advertised for bids for the Lenwood Court Major Subdivision Completion, in accordance with specifications on file in the office of the Purchasing Agent; and

WHEREAS, on August 23, 2016, bids were received, duly opened and read aloud, being referred to the Assistant Business Administrator for tabulation, evaluation, report and recommendation; and

WHEREAS, the Assistant Business Administrator has submitted a written report and tabulation of the bids received, said report indicating that the bids submitted to the Purchasing Board on August 23, 2016 for the above, must be rejected because all bids received exceeded the Engineer's estimate; now, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Vineland that:

- The bids received by the Purchasing Board of the City of Vineland on August 23, 2016, for the Lenwood Court Major Subdivision Completion, are and the same are hereby rejected.
- 2. The City Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to immediately return to said bidders any bid bonds, certified checks, or other forms of security submitted by such bidders.
- 3. The City Clerk of the City of Vineland is hereby authorized and directed to readvertise for bids to be received by the Purchasing Board on October 12, 2016, at which time such bids submitted shall be publicly opened and read aloud.

Adopted:	
	President of Council
ATTEST:	
City Clerk	



September 6, 2016

REPORT TO: THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL

RE: Proposals Submitted to the Purchasing Board 8/23/16

Dear Mayor and Members of Council:

Submitted to you herewith for your consideration is our evaluation of the proposals submitted to the Purchasing Board on August 23, 2016.

FOR THE LENWOOD COURT MAJOR SUBDIVISION COMPLETION

It is the recommendation of the City Engineer, which has the concurrence of the Purchasing Agent and Assistant Business Administrator that the bids received for the above should be rejected because all bids received exceeded the Engineer's estimate.

We trust that the above recommendation will receive your favorable consideration and that the recommended resolution will be adopted as presented.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert E. Dickenson, Jr.,

Assistant Business Administrator

RD/wr





BID EVALUATION FORM – REJECTING ALL BIDS

DEPARTME	PW / Engineering	_{Date:} 8/25/16
	ned recommends that all bids be	rejected for the following: ajor Subdivision Completion
	1-13.2 Rejection of bids; reason	
A con	tracting unit may reject all bids	for any of the following reasons (Choose One):
	The lowest bid substan	tially exceeds the cost estimates
Ĺ	The lowest bid substan	tially exceeds the contracting unit's appropriation
	The governing body of	the contracting unit decides to abandon the project
	The contracting unit wa	ants to substantially revise the specifications
	The purposes or provis seq.) are being violated	ions or both of P.L.1971, c.198 (C.40A:11-1 et .
		the contracting unit decides to use the State suant to section 12 of P.L.1971, c.198 (C.40A:11-
3. Comm	nents/Special Instructions:	
4. Evalua	nation Performed by: Pavid	J. Maillet, PE
5. Appro	ved By:	
	Brian My	ers, PE, CME
6. Attach	ed: (Check-Off List)	
Jus	oulation of Bids tification for Recommendation (aluation Data (if applicable)	if applicable)

Send copies to:
Purchasing Department Business Administration

TABULATION OF BIDS LENWOOD COURT MAJOR SUBDIVISION COMPLETION AUGUST 23, 2016

Engineers estimate - \$95,500.00

	South State Inc. PO Box 68 Bridgeton, NJ	Mount Construction Co. Inc. 427 S. White Horse Pikce Berlin, NJ
BB, CAC, CEC	BB 10%	BB 10%
Surety	YES	YES
Stock Discl.	YES	YES
Affir Action	YES	YES
Non-Collusion	YES	YES
Check List	YES	YES
Proposal	YES	YES
Addenda	YES	YES
Iran	YES	YES
BASE BID TOTAL	\$149,321.00	\$445,310.00
ALTERNATE BID A TOTAL	\$27,665.00	\$38,204.00
BASE & ALT. BID A TOTAL	\$176,896.00	\$483,514.00

Notices sent to:

American Asphalt
Arawak Paving
GWP Enterprises
AE Stone Inc.
Capital Concrete
RE Pierson Construction co.
SJA Construction Co.
Krissana Construction Inc.
Charles Marandino LLC

Specifications also sent to:

Dodge Data & Analytics Kline



CITY OF VINELAND BID TABULATION BID TABULATION

BID OPENING DATE AUGUST 23, 2016

	RUCTION	молит соиз				TE, INC.	ATS HTUOS			at estimate	5,2	ENGINEE			CONTRACT INFORMATION	
S DIFFERENCE S DIFFERENCE S DIFFERENCE	% OF ENG. EST.	JATOT CIB		BID BID	\$ DIFFERENCE (CONTRACTOR - STIMATE)	% OF ENG. EST.	JATOT OIR		DISI BID	ENG. EST. TOTAL		ENG. EST UNIT PRICE	CONTRACT	STINU	DESCRIPTION	TEM NO.
(00.003,5\$)	%00'09	00.002,2	s	00.002,2	(00.000,52)	%00'0Z	00.000,1	\$	00.000,1	00.000,8	s	00.000,2\$	l L	sı	TRAFFIC CONTROL	rı
(00.000, rr\$)	%Z9.74	00,000,01	s	00.000,01 2	(00.000 912)	73.81%	00.000,8	s	00'000'S 1	00.000,15	s	00'000'12\$	ı	\$1	CLEARING SITE (NOT TO EXCEED 5% OF TOTAL CONTRACT AMOUNT)	1,1,5
00.047,6\$	%00'009E	00.028,5	s	00.025 \$	\$220.00	%00,00£	00.055	s	00.08	00.011 \$	\$	\$10.00	i i	YS	REMOVAL OF CONCRETE SIDEWALK, 4"-6"	P.1.6
00.037,6\$	%00.00at	4,000.00	\$	00.005 \$	00.002\$	%00.00£	00.027	s	00.2T 2	00'09Z	s	\$32,00	οι	41	DIRECTED) CONCRETE VERTICAL CURB (IF AND WHERE REMOVAL AND REPLACEMENT OF 6" x 18"	2.2.5
53,504,55	%Y3.281	00.009,7	5	00.08 \$	55,404,5\$	%96°12Z	00.002,6	\$	00.001 2	S4.860,4 \$	5	11.542	96	YS	CONCRETE SIDEWALK, 4" THICK	1.6.6
00.066,6\$	%01.42T	00.009,4	s	00.006,2 \$	(00.012)	%9£.86	00.009	s	00.008 \$	00.019 2	5	00.205\$	z	TINU	PUBLIC SIDEWALK CURB RAMP DELINEATIONS (CAST IRON TRUNCATED DOME CASTINGS)	1.4.5
00.07\$	12.121	400.00	s	\$ 400.00	00.072	%12.1S1	00.004	s	00.00> \$	00.055 \$;	\$330.00	ı	TINU	RESET CASTINGS	1.01.1
01.758,12	%E1.TTE	2,600.00	s	\$ 250.00	(\$412.90)	%17.7E	00.025	s	00.25 \$	06'799 \$;	62'99\$	٥١	TINU	RESET VALVE BOXES	1,11,4
\$249.00	%\$Z'88S	300.00	s	00.01 \$	00.65\$	%74.371	00.08	s	00°E \$	00.18 \$	•	02"1\$	30	41	(AMH) SUTTUOWAS	1.1.8
(00.024\$)	%16.ET	1,275.00	s	00.71 \$	00.275,12	%16'EZ1	00.000,ε	s	00'01 \$	00.257,1 \$:	00.55\$	94	CA	ROADWAY EXCAVATION, UNCLASSIFIED, (IF AND WHERE)	6.2.2
\$10,380.00	%06.113	12,900.00	s	\$ 215.00	(00.020,12)	%Z\$'6\$	00.002,1	s	\$ 25.00	\$ 2,620.00	-	\$45,00	09	CA	DENSE GRADED AGGREGATE BASE COURSE (RECYCLED CONCRETE), IF AND WHERE	1,1,8
00.097,2\$	%76.962	00.288,8	s	00.561 \$	00.270,3\$	%69.70£	00.000,6	s	00.002 \$	00.826,S		\$62.00	57	NOT	HOT MIX ASPHALT 19M64 BASE COURSE, 2" THICK	1.1.7
00.265,51\$	%98.6£1	00.000,74	s	00.46 \$	00.396.118	%16.EE1	00.000,24	s	00.06 \$	00.808,60	1	12.78	009	NOT	HOT MIX ASPHALT 9.5M64 SURFACE COURSE. 2" THICK	P.1.7
00,628,6\$	%90°926	4,300.00	s	\$ 43.00	00'698\$	%14,181	00,008	s	00.8 \$	00.144 \$	1	19.62	100	YS	TOPSOILING, 4" THICK	1.1.8
\$124.00	563.16%	200.00	s	\$ 2.00	\$24.00	131,58%	100.00	s	00.1 \$	00'94 \$	1	92'0\$	100	YS	FERTILIZING AND SEEDING, TYPE A	1.2.8
\$158.00	%61°92\$	S00.00	s	00°Z \$	(00.148)	2.38%	00.1	s	10.0 \$	\$ 45.00		\$0.42	100	YS	эмилсние маята	1.6.8
00.000,652	%00.27£	00.000,25	+	\$ 45,000.00	(00.000.012)	%L9.91	2,000.00	s	\$ 2,000.00	00.000,21\$		\$12,000.00	ı	S1	Basin Fence Repair	1.1.21
2580,000,000	%00'006Z	00'000'06Z	+	00.000,062\$	00'000'09\$	%00.007	00.000,07	s	00.000,07 \$	\$10,000.00	1	00.000,01\$	ı	\$1	Basin Regrading & Scarifying	S.f.8f
		00.015,344 3		$\geq \leq$			00.125,641	S.	><	SE.EAA,28		\$	\geq		AL ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS (BASE BID)	ATOT
			1					_			1					
00.096,618	182,40%	00'019'6Z	5	\$ 456,00	00,878,48	%00.0E1	00 521 12	١,	00 528 \$	00 092 91 3	ı	00 0525	33	241111	ORNAMENTAL TREE, WHITE PINE (PINUS	

\$ 483,614.00				7	THE PROPERTY.	COLUMN TO SERVICE	00.386,311	00.986,971 \$			96,649,81	11 5				DIAL ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS (BASE BID PLUS ALTERNATE)		
00.027,12	%EE.EE1	00.000,7	-	200.00	s	(00.027,13)	%49.99	00.002,8	months	100.00	_	6,250.00	acauty.	00'051\$	35	TINU	LANDSCAPE SHRUB, MOUNTAIN LAUREL (KALMIA LATIFOLIA), 18°-24°	6.2.8
(\$436.00)	%0Z.87	00,498,1	\$	391,00	s	00,040,12	152.00%	3,040.00	s	00.097	s	2,000.00	s	\$200.00	Þ	тии	SHADE TREES, WHITE OAK (QUERCUS ALBA).	5.2.8
00.006.618	182,40%	00.048,eS	s	456.00	s	00,278,4\$	%00.0£1	21,125,00	\$	325.00	s	00.082,81	s	00.02\$	59	TINU	ORNAMENTAL TREE, WHITE PINE (PINUS STROBUS), 1°-1 1/2° CAL.	2,2,8