

TA10008A - Te Atatu Road Corridor – Detailed Design**TENDER EVALUATION RESULTS****Technical Skills**

The CPG proposal does not include individuals who can do all the work required; having reviewed all CV's the evaluation team could not identify certain skills such as MX designers.

The CPG proposal shows a team structure that appoints one engineer to be the project manager (or team leader), as well as the traffic and the geometrics designer; in addition, and from his CV he does not appear to have had any prior experience in the traffic engineering design, other than preparing traffic impact assessments.

The only relevant project with the correct experience mentioned in the team leader's CV is that of Whangaparoa Road widening, this project, however, is not listed in the relevant experience section for the team to determine his (or CPG's) extent of involvement in this project.

The CPG proposal lists two civil engineers and no MX designers; the team had to establish whether these engineers were in fact capable of completing a complex detailed design project such as Te Atatu Road corridor.

In reviewing the CV's the team was of the view that the first design engineer is a project manager, most projects listed in his CV start with "project management" and non states whether he has in fact completed any MX design of any road.

The second design engineer has done one project that is similar to Te Atatu Road corridor, all other projects involve parks and car parks, stormwater, some traffic calming devices, etc; there is no evidence in his CV to suggest that he is even capable of completing a complex design.

The team could not identify engineers who could do one important task, pavement design; a detailed review of all CV's did not reveal any experience in this field and no sub-contractors are listed for this task.

Overall the team recommended a mark of 73.

The MWH proposal includes individuals that can do all tasks required; the team reviewed their CV's and identified a number of different projects that members of the MWH team worked on previously.

Unlike the CPG proposal, the MWH proposal includes a very clear organisational chart specifying precisely the roles and individuals, which greatly assisted the team.

The MWH proposal even includes one very experienced engineer who is also a specialist in the field of land take; the project in hand has a very important land take component and this inclusion shows MWH's full understanding of the tasks required.

Overall the team recommended a mark of 80.

Track record

The team relied on internal consultant's performance reports and interviewed a number of Council engineers whose names were listed as referees.

The team reviewed three recent (2009) performance reports for CPG, one of which made a clear recommendation not to employ CPG due to serious problems, the second recommended employing them again for minor jobs and the third did not make any recommendation.

The team notes that the negative report was for a project managed on behalf of CPG by one of the key members of the proposed team.

One comment in particular was quite alarming stating: "quite a bit of input required to get the desired result; many mistakes which resulted in cost increases".

The team also noted that in all three reports while the original methodology was marked between 77 and 86, the recommended mark after completion of work was 50 in all three cases.

One of the three reports was for the detailed design of stormwater devices (an essential part of the Te Atatu Road corridor project); the comments made regarding the performance of CPG were quite negative, such as "the consultant had limited experience for this kind of work", and "the staff had limited experience and skills for projects of this kind".

Two MWH performance reports were available to the evaluation team, of which one recommended employing MWH again and the second made no recommendation.

Both reports either made little negative comments or no comments at all; one report recommended a reduction in the technical and management skills only from 65 to 70, while the other did not recommend any changes.

The team recommended marks of 64 for CPG and 79 for MWH.

Methodology

Overall the CPG methodology does not clearly discuss all tasks required; the main and most important task of geometric design is only described in two paragraphs that still do not describe how CPG intends to do the work or what they will deliver.

The MWH methodology on the other hand provides a step by step process clearly stating the concept, preliminary, and final design stages; also this proposal lists a number of assumptions (stormwater design) that Council will need to cater for or understand before commencement of work; these assumptions are not considered tags

The CPG proposal does not include any statement about understanding the project, while the MWH proposal includes a comprehensive statement; this is not a requirement but it provides the evaluation team with a general idea about the tenderer's understanding of the project and deliverables.

The CPG proposed methodology omits a number of important tasks, such as structural engineering, traffic signals design, street lighting design, public consultation, and landscape.

Description of other tasks is very vague and minimal that that team was not able to determine whether CPG would provide the required service, such as pavement design, and stakeholder consultation; it is noted that all of these tasks were priced by CPG (except the land take plans item).

For other tasks the methodology goes to extreme length in describing the work required, such as topographical survey.

Following review of the MWH methodology the evaluating team was able to identify and understand all tasks required and what the deliverable will be.

The programme provided by CPG is very brief and generic; MWH's programme is comprehensive and detailed; a well presented programme reflects the consultant's understanding of constraints and stages required to complete the project; an example of CPG's lack of understanding of the work required is allowing 50 days to complete the traffic management for utility services investigation.

MWH's proposed methodology omits two tasks, land take plans (although they include a specialist in this field), and street light design; the team decreased their mark for these omissions (both items are priced by MWH).

The team recommended marks of 61 for CPG and 81 for MWH.

A2

Management skills

As far as management skills are concerned the team relied on evaluating the skills of individuals listed as managers using information in the CV's and the company's management systems as described in their proposals.

The major concern the team had with the CPG proposal was the fact that most of the project management was to be handled by one person who did not stand out as a manager of major projects; his CV indicates that he has done many traffic impact assessments, been involved in the design of town centres or private developments, and possibly construction management.

The term "possibly" is used with caution because his CV does not really tell us what his role was in some of the projects listed.

The CPG's management skills section covering the company is very short and is by no means impressive; the evaluating team was unable to establish whether CPG has a management system in place; furthermore CPG's proposed project management is generic and states that they will hold regular meetings with the client.

The MWH's management team is quite impressive; they identify a project director, a project manager and team leaders for each team, and they included all of their CV's in the proposal (except one).

The CV's of the five members of the management team show the ability of four of them (one CV is missing) to manage different part of the project because they have in fact managed similar tasks and these are described in detail in their CV's.

In terms of the company's management system, this is described in details in the proposal; the evaluating team was able to determine that MWH has a good management system (communication, record keeping, invoicing, etc) that can be relied on.

The team recommended marks of 70 for CPG and 87 for MWH.