



Date: February 18, 1999

TO: Board Members - Parks and Recreation

FROM: General Manager - Parks and Recreation

SUBJECT: T99-1 Kitsilano Community Centre Renovations

RECOMMENDATION

- A) *THAT the Board award the contract for the renovations to Kitsilano Community Centre to Bynett Construction Services Ltd., for a cost of \$ 1,757,230, not including GST .*
- B) *THAT no legal rights shall arise hereby, and none shall arise until execution of the contemplated contract. The Board may rescind this resolution at any time up to the execution of the contemplated contract.*

POLICY

The Board approves all contracts for projects over \$ 200,000.

BACKGROUND

Planning Division staff have been working on this project with a building committee made up of members of the Kitsilano War Memorial Community Association, recreation and planning staff members and the architects, Walter Francl Architect. The design has been approved by the building committee and includes:

renovations to 6,400 sf of existing space including the offices, lobby, fitness centre, fitness centre change rooms, sauna, whirlpool and seniors' lounge.
an addition of 5,760 sf which includes an enlarged lobby, enlarged fitness centre, enlarged change rooms , a new youth lounge, a neighbourhood police office and a new elevator .
seismic upgrades to the gymnasium and the completion of the installation of a fire sprinkler system.

DISCUSSION

Tenders for this project were publicly advertised and closed on February 4, 1999 at 3:00 PM. Nine bids were received, as follows:

| Item | Bidder | Base Bid | Alternate prices | Base Bid & Alternates |
|------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| 1 | Key Engineering Ltd. | \$ 1,786,700 | 4. \$ <33,500> 9. \$ <2,000> 10. \$ <u>7,500</u> \$ <28,000> | \$ 1,758,700 |
| 2 | Bynett Construction Services Ltd. | \$ 1,789,830 | 4. \$ <33,500> 9. \$ <4,100> 10. \$ <u>5,000</u> \$ <32,600> | \$ 1,757,230 |
| 3 | Mar-Wil Construction Ltd. | \$ 1,797,000 | 4. \$ <24,000 9. \$ <3,500> 10. \$ <u>5,900</u> \$ <21,600> | \$ 1,775,400 |
| 4 | Vanbots Construction Ltd. | \$ 1,810,000 | 4. \$ no price 9. \$ no price 10. \$ <u>13,000</u> \$ 13,000 | \$ 1,823,000 |
| 5 | TMG Contracting Ltd. | \$ 1,902,500 | 4. \$ <33,500> 9. \$ <3,253> 10. \$ <u>no price</u> \$ <21,953> | \$ 1,880,547 |
| 6 | Tricom Construction Ltd. | \$ 1,910,000 | 4. \$ <15,000> 9. \$ <2,000> 10. \$ <u>10,700</u> \$ <6,300> | \$ 1,903,700 |
| 7 | Tri Power Construction Ltd. | \$ 2,010,887 | 4. \$ <6,000> 9. \$ <1,000> 10. \$ <u>6,000</u> \$ 1,000 | \$ 2,011,887 |
| 8 | Southbend Construction Co. Ltd | \$ 2,053,700 | 4. \$ <11,000> 9. \$ <2,000> 10. \$ <u>9,709</u> \$ <3,291> | \$ 2,050,409 |
| 9 | Paladin Construction Ltd. | \$ 2,168,000 | 4. \$ <33,000> 9. \$ <2,500> 10. \$ <u>10,000</u> \$ <25,500> | \$ 2,142,500 |

The tender required the submission of twelve alternate prices, some as credits, some as extras.

We have decided to accept alternate prices 4 & 9, which are credits, and 10 which is an extra.

Alternate price 4 is for the substitution of 8 inch high concrete block for the specified 4 inch high concrete block. Alternate price 9 is for the reuse of some existing light fixtures. We are taking these credits to reduce the cost of the project without appreciably affecting the quality or appearance.

Alternate price 10 is for a new fire alarm control panel and two new annunciator panels. We are including this work to improve public safety.

All of the firms that bid on the project are open shops, ie. they may employ union or non-union trades.

Tender Form

The tender form includes a section detailing the qualifications that the general contractors and their electrical, HVAC/plumbing, masonry, glazing and structural steel subcontractors are required to have. Where the qualification is stated as “must have”, it is a mandatory requirement. Where the qualification is stated as “should have”, it is strongly preferred that the bidders meet the qualification. The tender form also states that if, acting reasonably, the owner has reason to believe that a bidder does not meet any one of the mandatory requirements, that will be grounds for disqualification prior to award.

Our architect has informed us that the electrical subcontractor for Key Engineering Ltd., based on the list of references that were supplied, has not substantiated their conformance to mandatory requirement 14.4.b on the tender form. Staff have also contacted the references that could be located, which were provided by the electrical subcontractor. Based on the information that our architect has provided and our own research, staff recommend that the tender from Key Engineering be disqualified, because their electrical subcontractor does not meet the mandatory requirements in the tender form.

Several tender forms had minor irregularities, including those from Key Engineering Ltd. and Bynett Construction Services Ltd. The tender documents allow the waiving of irregularities in the completion of the tender form. Both the architect and staff find that the minor irregularities in the tender forms of Key Engineering Ltd. and Bynett Construction Services Ltd. have no detrimental effect on the bidding process.

Architect's Recommendation

The architect, Walter Francl Architect, recommends that the bid from Bynett Construction Services Ltd. be accepted, including alternate prices 4, 9 & 10. The architect's recommendation is based on their review of the tenders and of the information and references provided by the bidders.

Law Department Review

The contents of this report have been discussed with staff of the Law Department.

Project Funding

A total project budget of \$2,282,500 has been approved for the project. The budget is broken down as follows:

| | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|
| Equipment and furniture | \$ 42,500 |
| Consultants fees | \$ 197,500 |
| Construction | \$ 1,757,230 |
| Staff time and misc. costs | \$ 82,770 |
| Asbestos removal | \$ 50,000 |
| Unallocated | <u>\$ 152,500</u> |
| | \$ 2,282,500 |

SUMMARY

Bynett Construction Services Ltd. submitted the lowest qualified bid for the project. The budget contains sufficient funds for this contract.

Prepared by:
Planning Division
Board of Parks & Recreation
Vancouver, BC

/ef