

## EVALUATION PANEL RECOMMENDATION REPORT

# EVALUATION PANEL RECOMMENDATION REPORT

<b>Title of Request for Tender:</b>	BYRON COMMUNITY HUB REDEVELOPMENT
<b>RFT Number:</b>	2023-1583



# EVALUATION PANEL RECOMMENDATION REPORT

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Background

Byron Shire Council issued a Request for Tender for the Byron Community Hub Redevelopment on 16<sup>th</sup> March 2023

2. Byron Council acquired the hospital site from NSW health and will repurpose the building for community spaces to the northern end. The southern end will be internally developed by the tenant separately for educational use.

### 2.1. Scope

3. To demolish as required, construct and fit out as per the plans and scopes attached to the tender.

The successful respondent will be reporting to Mick Crosbie, project officer to fulfil the requirements of the contract.

### 3.1. Contract Period

The RFT seeks the provision of the required services for the construction and defect liability period commencing July 2023 and completion in April 2024

### 3.2. Budget

The budget estimate for the contract is \$6,200,000

The price is fixed for the term of the contract.

### 3.3. Advertising Details

The Request for Tender was advertised as follows

- Vendor Panel from the 16<sup>th</sup> march to the 28<sup>th</sup> of April 2023
- Council website – for the same period

### 3.4. Briefing Session/Site Inspection

A mandatory site inspection was held at 9am on 20<sup>th</sup>- 22<sup>nd</sup> and the 27<sup>th</sup> – 29<sup>th</sup> at Wordsworth St Byron Bay]. The following organisations attended the briefing/site inspection:

- Blaze Projects
- Alder Constructions
- Apollo Property Group

The purpose of the briefing/site inspection was to understand the requirements of the demolition and reconstruction of the building

### 3.5. Submissions Received

Submissions were received from the following organisations:

## EVALUATION PANEL RECOMMENDATION REPORT

- Alder Constructions
- Apollo Property Group
- Blaze Projects
- Patterson Building Group
- Terra Ferma

### 4. Evaluation

#### 4.1. Evaluation Panel

The Evaluation Panel consisted of the following members:

Name	Position
John Drobec	Member
Jamie Steel	Member
Silvina Medel	Member
Mick Crosbie	Chair

#### 4.2. Initial Compliance Check

An initial compliance check was conducted by the Evaluation Panel to identify submissions that did not comply with the requirements of the RFT.

The Compliance Criteria are:

- Tender lodged on time, in accordance with the Conditions of Tender.
- Respondent has a valid Australian Business Number.
- Respondent substantially complies with the Statement of Requirements.
- Respondent substantially complies with the Conditions of Contract.
- Respondent holds the required insurances or has the ability to obtain the insurances.
- Workers Compensation insurance for all employees
- Respondent has satisfactory work health and safety and environmental compliance practices.
- Financial capacity to undertake the contract
- Commitment to ethical business practice principles.
- Tenderer confirms no ties to Bravus Mining previously Adani Mining
- Respondent can confirm steps to comply with the elimination of Modern Slavery from their supply chain

During the initial compliance check, the evaluation panel identified that the following respondents did not comply with the compliance criteria:

## EVALUATION PANEL RECOMMENDATION REPORT

- Patterson Building Group
- Terra Ferma

The evaluation panel determined that the following respondents would not progress to the next stage of the evaluation due to their non-conformance with the compliance criteria:

- Patterson Building Group
- Terra Ferma

The remaining submissions progressed to the next stage of the evaluation.

### 4.3. Qualitative Criteria Assessment

The qualitative criteria assessment was carried out by the evaluation panel. Each member of the evaluation panel independently reviewed each tender in its entirety and scored each submission on the basis of the following qualitative criteria:

- Profile and relevant experience
- Quality and availability of resources
- Delivery plan
- Sustainable Practices
- Social Procurement
- Local Industry

Each of the criteria was scored out of ten according to the following rating scale:

Score	Rating
0-1	No answer provided or does not meet Council's requirements in any way.
2-3	Poor offer, many deficiencies. High risk to Council.
4-5	Fair offer with some deficiencies. Offer presents moderate-high risk to Council.
6 – 7	Meets Council's basic requirements. Offer is adequate and low risk to Council.
8 – 9	Very good offer that meets Council's requirements. Low risk to Council
10	Excellent offer that is fully substantiated. Completely meets all of Council's requirements. Presents little or no risk to Council.

The results of the qualitative criteria assessment were:

Supplier	Qualitative Assessment Score
Alder Constructions	78.5
Apollo Property Group	78.3

## EVALUATION PANEL RECOMMENDATION REPORT

Blaze Projects	78.0
----------------	------

### 4.4. Price Assessment

The total price for the term of the contract was calculated for each respondent. The results of the price assessment were:

Supplier	Total Contract Price Ex GST
Alder Constructions	\$6,557,718.00
Apollo Property Group	\$8,676,822.69
Blaze Projects	\$6,531,578.78

### 4.5. Value for Money Assessment

Overall value for money for each respondent was calculated using the quality: price ratio. The respondent with the highest quality: price ratio offers the best overall value for money. The results of the value for money assessment were:

Supplier	Value for Money Score	Ranking
Alder Constructions	11.97	1
Apollo Property Group	9.01	3
Blaze Projects	11.94	2

A summary of each tender received is provided below:

- Alder Constructions
- Apollo Property Group
- Blaze Projects

Based on the results of the evaluation, the Evaluation Panel short-listed the following respondents to go through to the final stage of the evaluation:

- Alder Constructions
- Apollo Property Group
- Blaze Projects

### 4.6. Referee Checks

The Evaluation Panel conducted referee checks for two of the short-listed respondents. The results of the referee checks were:

## EVALUATION PANEL RECOMMENDATION REPORT

### *Alder Constructions*

*They have a good line of communication, quality, program, and problem solving are good. No comment on recycling. Good WHS program. Strict contractual obligations adhered to with variations for scope changes required.*

### *Blaze Building Group*

*Spoke highly of the organization and responded well to problem solving and supplying quality subcontractors at short notice. Information, waste management, WHS has good communication and processes. Works willingly to resolve issues and variations if required.*

## 5. Decision

The Evaluation Panel recommends that *Alder Constructions* be selected as the preferred respondent at a total price of \$6,557,718.00 Ex GST. Due to the closeness of the tender with Blaze Projects, and both respondents over budget we also recommend that they both be engaged in any negotiations on scope and pricing.

## 6. Endorsement by Evaluation Panel

	(Signature)	(Date)
John Drobec	Unavailable	
Jamie Steel	Unavailable	
Silvina Medel		

## EVALUATION PANEL RECOMMENDATION REPORT

Mick Crosbie

26/05/2023

