



**AGENDA FOR AN ORDINARY MEETING OF THE TENDERS SUBCOMMITTEE  
TO BE HELD IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, 6 WAIPAREIRA AVENUE, LINCOLN,  
WAITAKERE CITY, ON FRIDAY, 14 MAY 2004,  
COMMENCING AT 9.00 AM**

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b><u>ITEM</u></b>		<b><u>PAGE NO.</u></b>
1	<b>APOLOGIES</b>	<b>1</b>
2	<b>URGENT BUSINESS</b>	<b>1</b>
3	<b>CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES</b>	<b>1</b>
4	<b>TE ATATU UNDER GROUNDING PROJECT - WATERMAIN RENEWALS</b>	<b>2</b>
5	<b>CONTRACT SD 03012B - HOBSONVILLE MARINE ENTITY OPTIONS ANALYSIS</b>	<b>3</b>
6	<b>CONTRACT TA 03535.B - PAREMUKA BRIDGE PHYSICAL WORKS</b>	<b>6</b>
7	<b>CONTRACT TA03535.B - PAREMUKA BRIDGE PHYSICAL WORKS</b>	<b>13</b>
	<b>PROCEDURAL MOTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC</b>	<b>13</b>

**AGENDA FOR AN ORDINARY MEETING OF THE TENDERS SUBCOMMITTEE  
TO BE HELD IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, 6 WAIPAREIRA AVENUE, LINCOLN,  
WAITAKERE CITY, ON FRIDAY, 14 MAY 2004,  
COMMENCING AT 9.00 AM**

---

**1 APOLOGIES**



**2 URGENT BUSINESS**

Section 46A(7) and (7A) of the Local Government Official Information Act and Meetings Act 1987 provides that where an item of business is not on the agenda, it may only be dealt with at the meeting if:

- (i) the item is a minor matter; and
- (ii) the Chairperson has explained at the beginning of the meeting (when open to the public) that the item will be raised for discussion, why the item is not on the agenda, and why it cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting; and
- (iii) the Committee resolves to deal with the item.

No resolution, decision, or recommendation may be made in respect of the item except to refer the item to a subsequent meeting for further discussion.

**NOTE:** Urgent Business need not be dealt with now and may be delayed until later in the meeting.



**3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

Ordinary - Friday, 16 April 2004

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the Tenders Subcommittee held on Friday, 16 April 2004.



#### 4 **TE ATATU UNDER GROUNDING PROJECT - WATERMAIN RENEWALS**

##### **PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

The purpose of this report is to seek approval from the Tenders Subcommittee to negotiate with Vector Limited for the installation of a number of replacement water mains associated with the power under grounding project in Te Atatu.

##### **BACKGROUND**

Vector Limited is proceeding with their under grounding project in Waitakere City, which involves the removal of the overhead power lines and power poles in Te Atatu, Edmonton and Flanshaw Roads. At the same time the telephone lines will be placed underground and new street lighting works are also proposed.

##### **ISSUES**

There are old asbestos cement water mains in many sections where the under grounding work is proposed and these mains are near the end of their service life. A number of the 50mm asbestos cement and 100mm asbestos cement water mains involved have been identified for replacement in the near future.

There is an opportunity for the contractor working for Vector to carry out the renewal of water mains in conjunction with the under grounding work. This has the advantages of combined traffic management and health and safety arrangements in these heavily trafficked roads.

##### **RESOURCES**

It is proposed to fund the work from the draft 2004/2005 Annual Plan budget for watermain renewals, at an estimated cost of \$500,000.

##### **CONCLUSION**

Implementing appropriate water main renewals in conjunction with the Te Atatu under grounding project will result a number of benefits for both Council and the community. It is recommended that authority be given to negotiate with Vector Limited with the aim of renewing the watermains as part of the under grounding project, subject to final approval by the Tenders Subcommittee.

##### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. That the Te Atatu Under Grounding Project - Watermain Renewals report be received.
2. That the Group Manager: Asset Management be authorised to negotiate with Vector Limited to include the water main renewal work identified with the power under grounding project.
3. That the outcome of the negotiations be reported back to the Tenders Subcommittee for approval.

Report prepared by: Richard Taylor, Assets and Network Manager.



## 5 CONTRACT SD 03012B - HOBSONVILLE MARINE ENTITY OPTIONS ANALYSIS

### PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to inform the Tenders Subcommittee that the tender for Contract SD03012B - Proposed Hobsonville Marine Entity Options Analysis has been awarded to other than the lowest priced tender, because the weighted attributes tender evaluation method requires the tendering authority to enter into a contract only with the tender that scores the highest overall index. The award of this contract is within the delegated authority of the Director: Strategy & Development.

### BACKGROUND

With land being secured for the establishment of a marine cluster, Council Officers are progressing work with key stakeholders on specific marine infrastructure requirements (i.e.: on-water infrastructure, road access for boats to deep water, etc). In parallel with this is the development of the implementation mechanism by which a marine cluster entity would seek funding to develop and manage specialist marine infrastructure facilities.

The key stakeholders are:

- Waitakere City Council;
- Enterprise Waitakere;
- Marine Industry Association of New Zealand;
- Sovereign Yachts New Zealand Limited.

It is intended that an entity will be developed that will be able to seek public funding, likely to be through the Auckland Regional Economic Development Strategy (AREDS) - Major Regional Initiative (MRI) fund, to develop and own key marine infrastructure/ facilities required to support a marine industrial cluster. It is intended the entity would be established as a neutral party that would support all marine boat builders that come to establish and use the marine facilities at Hobsonville. This contract is part of the Hobsonville budget approved for 2003/2004 financial year, which included provision for continued support, and facilitation of the marine cluster at Hobsonville.

### SCOPE OF WORK

The purpose of this contract is to assess and report on options for the development, ownership and operation of marine infrastructure facilities required to support the Proposed Hobsonville Marine Industrial Cluster to be developed at Hobsonville. Tenderers were asked to provide a comprehensive breakdown of methodology, costs and associated disbursement costs.

### TENDERS RECEIVED

Tenders were invited from selected tenderers with three sets of documents being uplifted. Three tenders were received by the closing date of 16 March 2004. These are summarised in Table 1 below:

TENDERER	REG OFFICE	TENDER PRICE (EXCL. GST)
Catalyst Management Services Limited	Tauranga	\$19,755.00
Synergine Strategic Limited	Newton, Auckland	\$23,441.25
Deloitte	Auckland City	\$31,500.00

**Table 1 - Summary of Tender Prices**

## TENDER EVALUATION

In accordance with the conditions of tendering, tenders were evaluated in line with the Weighted Attribute Method contained in Transfund New Zealand's "Competitive Pricing Procedures Manual".

A summary of the evaluation results is shown in Table 2:

Tender Evaluation	Attributes	Exper.	Track Record	Tech. Skill	Manag. Skill	Method.	Price	Contract Number SD03012B
	Weights	15	10	15	10	20	30	Total Weights
								100
Tenderer	Tender Sum	Grades					INDEX	
Synergine	\$23,441.25	70	75	75	80	55	56	65
Catalyst Management Services Limited	\$19,755.00	65	70	70	70	65	71	68
Deloitte	\$31,500.00	85	85	85	95	90	23	69
Engineer's Estimate	\$24,898.75							

**Table 2 - Summary of Tender Evaluation**

Deloitte scored well in all attributes scoring exceptionally well under methodology where their tender showed a comprehensive approach by which an experienced team would undertake the contract combining project management skills, financial skills, and facilitation and advocacy skills. What stood out with exception in the reference check were their innovative approach to finding appropriate solutions for the client - solutions that were not always the most obvious to the client in the first instance. It was noted that Deloitte were the most expensive tender to be submitted.

Catalyst Management Services Limited was the lowest priced tenderer but they did not score well in some attributes, particularly with respect to methodology where their tender was not so informative of the proposed methodology (compared to the others submitted) and the proposed staff chosen for the project did not appear to provide the "innovation factor" as others did. This was considered to be important criteria the evaluation team had nominated when evaluating tenders.

Synergine Strategic Limited scored reasonably well against most attributes although their tender specifically omitted a workshop with the wider stakeholder group regarding options to consider for the Marine Entity. This is discussed in more detail in the next section of this report. The methodology outlined by Synergine was not as robust as others for the purposes of this contract, as a comprehensive risk appraisal of various options was omitted.

It was necessary to seek clarification in writing from Synergine Strategic Limited as their tender suggested there were crucial elements considered a necessary part of the methodology that were not included in the tender price submitted. This included workshop with all stakeholders to review options with the consultants, and a comprehensive risk assessment of options evaluated by the consultants. Inclusion of these elements would have substantially increased their tender price submitted.

Catalyst Management Services Limited submitted incorrect information in their original tender document regarding tender price. The revised information would have increased their tender price by approx \$1,000 still making them the lowest tender submitted.

## CREDIT CHECK

A credit check on Deloittes was requested and did indicate the company having a high risk of not paying (in the Dun and Bradstreet database). Clarification was sought and received from the Company Directors' as to Deloitte's financial status and their ability to service the Contract SD 03012B -Proposed Hobsonville Marine Entity Options Analysis.

## SUMMARY

The results of the tender evaluation as summarised in Table 2 shows that the tender submitted by Deloittes achieved the highest index of 69. It is noted that the tender was the highest priced tender, however, the tender exceeded the other tenders across all other attributes and particularly demonstrated that an experienced team would be pulled together from the company that would provide strong project management, financial skills as well as excellent facilitation and advocacy skills required for stakeholder engagement and consultation. Deloittes in particular had shown in their track record the ability to deliver innovative solutions for their clients.

## JOB COSTS

	<u>EXCL. GST</u>
Tender sum - Deloittes	\$31,500
	-----
Total Job Cost	\$31,500

## SOURCE OF FUNDING

Budget Description (from Annual Budget line item)	Codes	Budget	Committed to Other Projects	Allocation to This Project	Unallocated Balance
	10-0220-44350	\$216,041	\$182,457.44	\$31,500	\$33,583.56

## RECOMMENDATION

That Contract SD 03012B - Hobsonville Marine Entity Options Analysis report be received.

Report prepared by: Vanita Ranchhod, Project Manager: Strategic Projects Group.



## 6 CONTRACT TA 03535.B - PAREMUKA BRIDGE PHYSICAL WORKS

### PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to seek approval from the Tenders Subcommittee to award Contract TA 03535.B - Paremuka Bridge Physical Works.

### BACKGROUND

The proposed Paremuka Bridge is designed to provide a link between Munroe Road to Summerland Drive.

Paremuka Bridge is an important part and a step forward of the proposed Regional Arterial Route. This part will run through the Braeburn subdivision and directly link two largely residential areas. It is anticipated that the final route will contribute to, a strong road network, providing access to existing and new developments, and consequently increase reduce travel costs in Waitakere City. It will also provide easy and safe travel for residents and by-pass traffic.

Council approved construction of the Paremuka Bridge in the 2003/2004 Annual Plan.

### SCOPE OF WORK

This contract is for the construction of a new bridge linking Munroe Road to Summerland Drive. The scope of work includes embankment construction, road construction, relocation of services, stormwater works, pre-stressed concrete girders (2 spans 30m each), the construction of other bridge components, and installation of infrastructure in accordance with Waitakere City Council standards.

### TENDERS RECEIVED

Tenders were publicly advertised with five sets of documents being uplifted. Three tenders were received by the closing date of 20 January 2004. These are summarised in Table 1 below:

TENDERER	REG OFFICE	TENDER PRICE - Conforming Design (EXCL. GST)	TENDER PRICE - Alternative Design (EXCL. GST)
HEB Contractors Limited	Auckland	1,909,746.98	1,849,746.98
Fulton Hogan Limited	Auckland	1,944,678.66	
Gibbons Contractors Limited	Auckland		2,501,435.2
<b>Pre-tender contract estimate</b>		1,850,000	

**Table 1 - Summary of Tender Prices**

HEB Contractors submitted two tenders, one is a conforming tender and the other is an alternative tender involving changes to the design of the bridge girders arrangement, cross section dimensions and numbers.

Fulton Hogan submitted one conforming tender.

Gibbons Contractors submitted an alternative tender involving changes to the design of bridge girders arrangement, cross section dimensions and length.

## TENDER EVALUATION

In accordance with the conditions of tendering, tenders were evaluated in line with the Weighted Attribute Method contained in Transfund New Zealand's "Competitive Pricing Procedures Manual".

These procedures require that where the tender includes Provisional Sums (work valued by the Principal and placed within the Schedule of Prices) they are deducted from the Tender Sum prior to evaluating each tender.

In this contract the value of Provisional Sums is \$25,000.

The "Two envelope process" as described in Section 2.7 of the above manual was followed. Under this method, only the first tender envelope is opened and the non-price attributes evaluated for all tenders before the second envelope containing the tender price is opened, and the tender prices duly included in the evaluation.

Each of HEB Contractors Limited and Gibbons Contractors Limited submitted an alternative tender, and so they were evaluated in accordance with Section 2.8 of the Transfund Manual. This requires all non-alternative tenders to be evaluated first, with the alternative tender being compared against the best of the non-alternative tenders.

The price of the alternative tender is *not* included in the calculation of the median tender price, although it is evaluated against it.

The Tender Sum of submitted tenders have been adjusted to reflect the costs associated with tags, conditions, methodology or alternative designs. These additional costs are summarised in Table 2 below:

Tenderer	Tender Sum	Additional Costs	Provisional Sum	Total Tender Sum for Tender Evaluation
HEB - Conforming Tender	\$1,909,746.98	\$3,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$1,887,746.98
HEB - Alternative tender	\$1,849,746.98	\$15,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$1,839,746.98
Fulton Hogan	\$1,944,678.66	\$5,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$1,924,678.66
Gibbons	\$2,501,435.20	\$100,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$2,576,435.20
<b>Median Tender Price</b>	\$1,927,212.82			\$1,906,212.82

**Table 2 - Summary of Tender Prices after adjustment**

A summary of the evaluation results is shown in Tables 3A, 3B and 3C:

### Conforming Tender

Tender Evaluation	Attributes	Exper.	Track Record	Tech. Skill	Resour.	Manag. Skill	Method.	Price	Contract Number TA 03535B
									Total Weights
	<b>Weights</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>100</b>
Tenderer	Tender Sum	Grades							INDEX
Fulton Hogan Ltd	\$1,924,678.66	83	87	84	83	82	83	49	59
HEB Contractors Ltd	\$1,887,746.98	72	72	71	74	75	88	51	58
<b>Median Tender Price</b>	\$1,906,212.82								

**Table 3A - Summary of Tender Evaluation – Conforming Design Tender**

**Alternative Tender**

Tender Evaluation	Attributes	Exper.	Track Record	Tech. Skill	Resour.	Manag. Skill	Method.	Price	Contract Number TA 03535B	
									Total Weights	
	<b>Weights</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>100</b>	
Tenderer	Tender Sum	Grades							INDEX	
HEB - Alternative	\$1,839,746.98	<b>72</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>75</b>	53	59	
Gibbons Contractors Ltd	\$2,576,435.20	<b>53</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>58</b>	15	28	
<b>Median Tender Price</b>	\$2,208,091.09									

**Table 3B - Summary of Tender Evaluation - Alternative Design Tender**

**Final Tender Evaluation**

Tender Evaluation	Attributes	Exper.	Track Record	Tech. Skill	Resour.	Manag. Skill	Method.	Price	Contract Number TA 03535B	
									Total Weights	
	<b>Weights</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>100</b>	
Tenderer	Tender Sum	Grades							INDEX	
Fulton Hogan Ltd	\$1,924,678.66	<b>83</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>83</b>	49	59	
HEB - Alternative	\$1,839,746.98	<b>72</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>75</b>	53	59	
<b>Median Tender Price</b>	\$1,906,212.82									

**Table 3C - Summary of Tender Evaluation - Final Tender Evaluation**

When evaluating the conforming-design tenders (Table 3A), Fulton Hogan scored the highest index of 59. HEB scored the highest index of 59, for the alternative-design tender (Table 3B).

Fulton Hogan and HEB scored the same index when evaluated in accordance with Section 2.8 of the Transfund Manual.

A detailed analysis for the tender prices has been undertaken for tenders submitted by Fulton Hogan and the alternative tender submitted by HEB, as they scored the highest index. Tender prices were higher than the Engineer's Estimate especially for Preliminary, General and Establishment items.

**Fulton Hogan Tender compared to HEB Alternative Tender:**

The following summarises the tender comparison between Fulton Hogan and HEB tenders:

1. Both tenderers scored the same index, 59.
2. Fulton Hogan Tender Sum is higher than HEB tender by \$94,931.68 or 5%.
3. Fulton Hogan construction costs for Preliminary, General and Establishment items are higher by \$170, 028.50 or 67%.
4. Fulton Hogan construction costs for Bridge Works are lower by \$140,923.92 or 11%.

5. Fulton Hogan construction costs for Road Works are higher by \$65,827.10 or 18%.
6. Fulton Hogan scored higher in all non-priced attributes.
7. Fulton Hogan tender is a conforming tender. Fulton Hogan proposed to manufacture the bridge girders as per the tender drawings and specifications at their pre-stressed concrete factory in Henderson. Fulton Hogan confirmed that all works will be as specified in the Tender Documents. This will minimise all risks and provide Council with the opportunity to implement any Integrated Artworks to the girders finishing facade.
8. HEB tender is an alternative design tender. They proposed to use an alternative beam shape, using existing moulds, with six instead of five girders and different girder configuration. In their submission, HEB proposed to use Smithbridge Limited for bridge works. Smithbridge Limited is owned by HEB and located in Tauranga.

There is a higher risk associated with accepting an alternative design tender. Some of the risks involved are:

- delays in providing the design for the new bridge girders;
- delays in checking and analysing the bridge structures;
- delays in preparing, submitting, checking and approving the revised contract drawings;
- the risk regarding the accountability of the design of the whole structure. In the new structure, some parts have been designed by Connell Wagner and other parts would be designed by HEB's Consultant;
- the risk in accepting an alternative design tender, as the design will be carried out after awarding the Contract.

Therefore, it is recommended that Contract TA 03535.B - Paremuka Bridge Physical Works be awarded to Fulton Hogan Limited.

## **TAGS, ERRORS OR OMISSIONS**

### **Fulton Hogan Tender:**

1. The tender from Fulton Hogan Limited contained seven tags/conditions.
2. Fulton Hogan was requested to provide additional information on the following issues:
  - more information about their methodology;
  - details on their subcontractors;
  - clarification on one paragraph in the methodology;
  - confirmation on materials, methodology and compliance with the tender specification and drawings.
3. Fulton Hogan responded with a letter providing the required information and details, clarifying the item in question and confirming their compliance to the tender specification and drawings. Fulton Hogan stated in their letter that the first three tags/conditions would not be withdrawn. An amount of \$5,000 has been added to Fulton Hogan tender sum to accommodate the costs associated with these conditions.
4. There were no errors or omissions in Fulton Hogan tender.

### **HEB Contractors Conforming Tender**

1. There were no tags, errors or omissions in HEB Contractors Limited tender.
2. Some issues in HEB submission have been raised by the tender evaluation team including the following:
  - confirmation or receiving Notice to Tenderers number 2 and 4;
  - more information about their methodology;
  - confirmation on materials, methodology and compliance with the tender specification and drawings.
3. HEB Contractors responded with a letter providing the required information, confirmation on receiving of Notice to Tenderers number 2 and 4 and confirming the compliance with the tender specification and drawings.
4. HEB proposed to use their pre-stressed casting plant located in Tauranga. An amount of \$3,000 has been added to HEB conforming tender sum to accommodate the costs associated with travelling of Council staff, Quality Assurance Officer and the Consultant, from Auckland to Tauranga during the construction period, in order to inspect the plant, material used and the casting of pre-stress girders.

### **HEB Contractors Alternative Tender:**

In addition to the issues mentioned above regarding HEB Conforming Tender, an additional amount of \$12,000 has been added to HEB alternative tender sum to accommodate the cost associated with checking and approving the alternative design.

### **Gibbons Contractors Tender:**

1. The tender from Gibbons Contractors Limited contained five tags/conditions. Gibbons was advised that all tags and conditions will be checked and an additional estimated cost will be added to the Tender Sum.
2. The following issues have been raised by the tender evaluation team when evaluating Gibbons tender:
  - the information submitted for the alternative design is insufficient. Gibbons was requested to submit detailed methodology and assurance that the alternative design will conform in all regards to TNZ Bridge Manual. Gibbons was asked to advise on the accountability of the alternative design, peer review and associated costs;
  - Gibbons was requested to provide more information about their methodology;
  - Gibbons was requested to provide clarification on some tags and confirmation on some construction materials.
3. There were no errors or omissions in Gibbons tender.
4. Gibbons responded with a letter addressing the above issues, providing the required information and details and, clarifying the items in question and confirming the compliance with the tender specification.
5. Gibbons stated in their letter that they accept Transport Assets advice regarding the costs associated with some of the tags. Gibbons withdrew one tag. An estimated amount of \$100,000 has been added to Gibbons Contractors Limited Tender Sum to accommodate:
  - the costs associated with the outstanding tags;
  - the costs associated with checking and approving of the alternative design.

## CREDIT CHECK

A credit check dated 21 January 2004 revealed Fulton Hogan Limited has a “high” risk of paying in a severely delinquent manner (90+ days past terms). This slowness of payment can be the result of disputes over invoices, merchandise etc and does not imply a cash-flow problem. The credit check reveals no other adverse information and in view of the low risk of exposure to Council in awarding this Contract (the cost to Council in re-tendering this Contract in the event of Fulton Hogan Limited being dissolved is offset by the Contractor’s bond that is lodged at the start of the Contract), is considered to be of no concern.

A statement confirming the Tenderer’s financial status and their ability in meeting the financial terms and conditions of this Contract have been supplied by the Chief Financial Officer of Fulton Hogan Limited.

## SUMMARY

The results of the tender evaluation as summarised in Table 3C shows that the tender submitted by Fulton Hogan Limited achieved the highest index of 59. This tender is also the second lowest conforming-design priced tender and the third lowest submitted tender.

As part of City Services vision “Quality and Health and Safety is not negotiable” all contractors have had this focus clearly reinforced through the contract documents and this will be strongly reiterated at the subsequent pre-start meeting and imposed during the contract period.

## JOB COSTS

Tender sum - Fulton Hogan Limited	\$1,944,678.66
Contingency	\$ 250,000.00
Engineering & Supervision	\$ 150,000.00
Services Relocation	\$ 50,000.00
Art Works and Other Expenditure	\$ 154,721.34
	-----
Total Job Cost (excl. GST)	\$2,549,400.00

## Transfund Submission

Council submitted a funding application in February 2004 to Transfund New Zealand. It is expected to get Transfund respond / approval early March 2004.

Therefore, it is recommended that the Tender award be subject to receiving Transfund confirmation of funding.

## SOURCE OF FUNDING

Sources of funding for this project are as follows:

Budget Description (from Annual Budget line item)	Codes	Budget	Committed to Other Projects	Allocation to This Project	Unallocated Balance
Capital Works Subsidised / Munroe Bridge	75-9810-43360-280	1,709,000	Nil	1,709,000	0
150mm New Watermain	85-9821-43360-280	102,400	Nil	102,400	0
300mm New Watermain	85-9821-31310-280	138,000	Nil	138,000	0
Funding in Draft 2004/2005 Annual Plan		600,000	Nil	600,000	0
Total		2,549,400		2,549,400	

As the Paremuka Bridge project will be run through two financial years, i.e. 2003/2004 and 2004/2005, a resolution will be required to this effect.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Contract TA 03535.B - Paremuka Bridge Physical Works report be received.
2. That the tender from Fulton Hogan Limited for Contract TA 03535.B - Paremuka Bridge Physical Works in the sum of \$1,944,678.66 plus \$243,084.83 GST, totalling \$2,187,763.49 be accepted, subject to Transfund New Zealand funding approval.
3. That the tender for Contract TA 03535.B - Paremuka Bridge Physical Works be awarded to other than the lowest priced tender, because the weighted attributes tender evaluation method requires the tendering authority to enter into a contract only with the tender that scores the highest overall index.
4. That it be a recommendation to the Finance and Operational Performance Committee that the 2003/2004 allocated budget for Contract TA 03535.B - Paremuka Bridge Physical Works totalling \$1,709,000.00 plus GST be carried forward to 2004/2005 financial year.
5. That it be a recommendation to the Finance and Operational Performance Committee that the water supply 2003/2004 allocated budget for Contract TA 03535.B - Paremuka Bridge Physical Works totalling \$240,400.00 plus GST be carried forward to 2004/2005 financial year.
6. That the commitment to the 2004/2005 financial year for Contract TA 03535.B - Paremuka Bridge Physical Works totalling \$600,000.00 plus GST be approved, \$541,000.00 plus GST will be subsidised by Transfund and \$59,000.00 plus GST will be funded by Council only.
7. That authority to enter into Contract TA 03535.B - Paremuka Bridge Physical works on behalf of Council be delegated to the Director: City Services.

Report prepared by: Nabeel Hammad, Principal Transport Engineer, Information.



**7 CONTRACT TA03535.B - PAREMUKA BRIDGE PHYSICAL WORKS**

This item will be considered in the Confidential Supplement of the agenda, and has been circulated to members separately with this agenda.

**PROCEDURAL MOTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC**

That the public be excluded from the following part of the proceedings of this meeting, namely, Contract TA03535.B - Paremuka Bridge Physical Works.

The general subject of the matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation of the matter, and the specific grounds under Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of the matter to be considered.	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to the matter.	Ground(s) under Section 48(1)(a) for the passing of this resolution.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Contract TA03535.B - Paremuka Bridge Physical Works</li></ul>	<p>The withholding of information is necessary in order to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>maintain legal professional privilege.</li></ul>	<p>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist.</p>

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 7(2)(g) of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public as follows:

- The report contains information which is subject to legal advice upon issues which have arisen in relation to the tender for this contract.

