

RESOLUTION NO. 2018- 118

A RESOLUTION REJECTING THE PROPOSAL RECEIVED ON NOVEMBER 14, 2017 FOR THE PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FOR HISTORIC BRIDGE REHABILITATION AT BURNT MILL POND.

WHEREAS, the City of Vineland has heretofore advertised for proposals for the Professional Design Services for Historic Bridge Rehabilitation at Burnt Mill Pond, in accordance with specifications on file in the office of the Purchasing Agent; and

WHEREAS, on November 14, 2017, one proposal was received and referred to the Business Administrator for tabulation, evaluation, report and recommendation; and

WHEREAS, the City Engineer has submitted a recommendation indicating that the proposal submitted on November 14, 2017 for the above, must be rejected because the proposal received substantially exceeded the estimated project amount and in addition, the City wishes to substantially revise the specification for new requests for proposals; now, therefore

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

1. The proposal received on November 14, 2017, for the Professional Design Services for Historic Bridge Rehabilitation at Burnt Mill Pond, be and the same are hereby rejected.

Adopted:

President of Council

ATTEST:

City Clerk

**REQUEST FOR RESOLUTION FOR CONTRACT AWARDS
UNDER 40A:11-5 EXCEPTIONS
(PROFESSIONAL SERVICES, EUS, SOFTWARE MAINTENANCE, ETC)**

2/26/18

(DATE)



1. Service (detailed description): Professional Design Services Historic Bridge
Rehabilitation at Burnt Mill Pond

2. Amount to be Awarded: \$ _____

- Encumber Total Award
- Encumber by Supplemental Release

3. Amount Budgeted: \$ _____

4. Budgeted: By Ordinance No. _____
Or Grant: Title & Year _____

5. **Account Number to be Charged: _____

6. Contract Period: _____


7. Date To Be Awarded: _____

8. Recommended Vendor and Address: _____

9. Justification for Vendor Recommendation:(attach additional information for Council review)
REJECT ALL PROPOSALS
Bids too high. City Engineer revising scope of work


- Non-Fair & Open (Pay-to-Play documents required)
- Fair & Open: How was RFP advertised? _____

10. Evaluation Performed by: David J. Maillet, PE

11. Approved by: 
Brian Myers, City Engineer

12. Attachments:

- .Awarding Proposal
- Other: _____

- Send copies to:
Purchasing Division
Business Administration 

** If more than one account #, provide break down