



Kent Highway Services

Winter Damage Repairs to Kent Roads 2011

Tender Assessment Report

March 2011



Contents

1. Introduction
2. Tender List
3. Tender Process
4. Tender Submission
5. Scoring
6. Financial Assessment
7. Quality Assessment
8. Contract Award

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

**List of Contractors requesting and returning Pre-
Qualification Questionnaires**

Appendix 2

Final Tender List

Appendix 3

Model quantities for assessment of costs



1.0 Introduction

Background

For the second year running, Kent experienced extreme winter weather conditions for most of December 2010 and this caused high levels of damage to Kent's roads.

Following the successful contracts that were procured in April 2010 for the repair of roads, KCC undertook £600k of interim repairs during February and March 2011 to continue to maintain safe passage for road users.

However, potholes and broken road surfaces are still in evidence and further high quality, responsive repairs need to be undertaken.

Contract Process

Publication of the intention to award contracts was placed on the South East Business Portal 18th January 2011. Contractors were invited to apply for a pre-qualification pack and those that passed the initial assessment of suitability were sent tender documents on 18th February, with an amendment sent on 28th February; the tenders were returned on 4th March.

The tender assessment process was agreed with KCC corporate procurement team and is in line with KCC procurement and finance procedures.

The tender submissions have been scored based on price and quality, with a weighting of 75%/25% being attributed respectively.

The contractors were required to price 16 separate items ranging from a small pothole to a patch up to 20m². Certain quantities of repairs have been applied to these rates in an 'assessment model' in order to give a comparable total price. Once placed in order, the lowest price contractor was given 100 marks and the highest price contract given 0 points, the remainder were given pro-rated scores. This score was then weighted at 75%.

For the quality element, the contractors were asked to answer 3 questions regarding their intended approach to the work, their method of delivering high quality repairs and the number and skills of the gangs they intend to deploy. These were scored by an independent team and were scored with a possible 100 marks. This score was then weighted at 25%.

The weighted scores for price and quality have then been added together to give a combined score for each contract.



How the works will be undertaken

The contractors will work on a “find and fix” basis using up to 5 separate gangs in each district, according to the size of the district. The contractors will be able to work up to 7 days a week between 7am and 7pm. Kent Highway Services officers will deploy the contractors, giving instructions to ensure the highest priority areas are targeted.

The focus will be on repairs to minor roads (including rural and estate roads) which make up 71% of the total (6,100km) and a higher proportion in terms of need. Work will continue in parallel, as appropriate, through the term maintenance contractor, Ringway.

The contract requires the repairs to be permanent, and there is a 3 month defects correction period written into the contract. The contractor will be expected to saw cut a regular edge to the repair, coat the opening with tack coat, and compact the new asphalt with the correct item of plant.

Whilst undertaking the works, gangs will be visited on a regular basis by KHS staff. They will be monitoring progress of the crews and ensuring that they undertake the works to the correct quality and are making the correct decisions about the repairs being undertaken.

Each day the contractor will return details of the repairs that they have undertaken. These records will be used to monitor the rate of spend on a daily basis, and will be reviewed by KHS staff. The contractors will be taking photographs before and after the repairs and providing a schedule of the works undertaken.

Timescales

The works will begin on or before 4th April. The completion date will depend on the rate of repair and ongoing assessment of need.

Public and Member Input

It is important that members, parish/town councils and members of the public can continue to highlight roads that are in need of repair. In order to make this successful and give an understanding of where the high priority areas are, KHS is using internal and external publicity to encourage people to report faults online at www.kent.gov.uk/KHSFaults.



2.0 Tender List

The Prequalification opportunity was advertised in the South East Business Portal on the 13 January 2011, with a closing date for expressions of interest of 4th February 2011.

The prequalification pack was requested by 29 companies, of which 24 companies provided a response. Details of the contractors are shown in appendix 1.

The prequalification submissions were required to demonstrate a sufficiently high level of experience and ability in order to carry out the project successfully. The returned questionnaires were assessed by the following people:-

Health and Safety – Hazel Walter KHS H&S Advisor
Quality Assurance – Julian Cook KHS Engineer
Finance – Anne Swift EHW Finance

22 companies passed the assessment and were invited to tender, these are listed in appendix 2.

3.0 Tender Process

Tender documents for an NEC3 Engineering and Construction Short Contract, were sent to 22 contractors on 18th February 2011 with a Tender return date of the 4th March 2011.

Following a number of questions about banding of repair depths, a tender amendment was issued on 28th February 2011 which clarified the issue to all contractors.



4.0 Tender Submissions

The tenderers were required to submit their tenders to County Hall in unmarked envelopes. The tenders included finance and quality elements.

Tenders were opened by the Environment, Highway & Waste Finance Team at Invicta House on 4th March 2011.

Of the 22 tenderers, 5 withdrew during the 2 weeks tender period or failed to submit documents. 2 contractors returned tenders that were not in accordance with the documents sent out and could not be assessed therefore 17 tenders were submitted. A list of the contractors is shown in appendix 2. .

5.0 Scoring

An accepted scoring rationale was employed to ensure a comparable assessment was made across the tenders for both quality and price

For the price element, the lowest priced contractor was awarded 100 points and the highest prices contractor was awarded 0 points; the remaining contractors prices were proportioned accordingly.

For the quality element, a model set of answers were produced that could secure a maximum of 100 points, and the lowest 4 priced contractors from each district were assessed on this basis and given individual scores 'out of 100'.

The financial score was weighted by 75% and the quality score was weighted by 25%

The combined total of the weighted scores for cost and quality resulted in the selection of a contractor for each district.

6.0 Financial Assessment

The contract required the tenderers to price for 16 items of repair. They were given the opportunity to tender different rates for the 12 different district council areas.

Prior to the tenders being returned, an assessment of the quantities for the 10 bill items were made against 'model quantities'. This model was based on an assessment of the type of repairs undertaken in the external contracts in 2010.



Rates gained from the 2010 external contracts were used to undertake an initial assessment of these quantities, which were intended to give a cost per district of £300k; this ensured that the model was justifiable. This is shown in appendix 3.

After the tenders were returned, the rates from each contractor for each district were multiplied by the model quantities and the lowest priced contractor for each district was assessed.

7.0 Quality Assessment

The contractors were requested to provide answers to 3 quality based questions, these were :-

- i) A description of the approach to this contract, including what you think the risks are and how you will go about managing/mitigating them. It must include what innovative ideas you have to improve the speed, productivity, quality and cost effectiveness of the works. It must also include an explanation of your approach to incentivising the workforce on this project (maximum 1 side of A4);
- ii) A description of your method of delivering a high quality, reliable pothole/patch in the existing carriageway, including how you plan to undertake the works safely both for your crews and the travelling public. (maximum 1 side of A4)
- iii) Details of your proposed site management/supervisor(s), their names and CVs. The experience of this type of work of the crew members you intend to use, if they are employees of your company (and if so their names) or if you plan to use subcontracted labour the number of operatives. Emphasis should be placed on practical experience rather than qualifications; (maximum 4 sides of A4);

The quality scores were assessed based on a predetermined set of answers which could attract a maximum score of 100 marks.

The assessment panel met on 9th March 2011 to score the replies, the panel consisted of David Thomas, Graham Cox and Julian Cook.



8.0 Contract Award

The rationale and approach to this contract and the award criteria has been agreed with Kent County Council's Corporate Procurement team.

Based on the financial and quality scoring, and risk assessment of delivery of service, it is recommended that the following contracts should be awarded :-

		Contractor
1	Ashford	Ringway Group Ltd
2	Canterbury	AR Cook
3	Dartford	Kenson Construction
4	Dover	Walker Construction (UK) Ltd
5	Gravesham	Gary Mason (Civil Engineering) Ltd
6	Maidstone	Gary Mason (Civil Engineering) Ltd
7	Sevenoaks	Gary Mason (Civil Engineering) Ltd
8	Shepway	Ringway Group Ltd
9	Swale	FM Conway
10	Thanet	Walker Construction (UK) Ltd
11	Tunbridge & Malling	Ringway Group Ltd
12	Tunbridge Wells	Ringway Group Ltd



Appendix 1 – List of Contractors requesting and returning Pre-Qualification Questionnaires.

Returned PQQ	
Oatmor-Harris Ltd	DB Construction (herts) Ltd
Clancy Docwra Limited	Kenson Contractors
Sunville Rail Limited	Henderson & Taylor (Public Works) Limited
Skelton Contractors Limited	GARY MASON(CIVIL ENGINEERING) LTD
VolkerHighways Ltd	Colas Limited
Marshall Surfacing Contracts Ltd	Ringway Infrastructure Services Limited
g.langthorne building & decorating ltd	Bardon Contracting (a division of Aggregate Industries UK Ltd)
owen mullen contractors	A R Cook & Son (Plant Hire) Ltd
sturgeons	Steadline Limited
Ferns Surfacing Ltd	Duke Contractors Ltd
FM Conway Ltd	Concrete Construction United Ltd
Walker Construction (UK) Limited	Inten ltd

Did not return PQQ
Valley Landscape Management
Gatwick Construction Ltd
Lakehouse Contracts Ltd
Assured Building Specialist Ltd
G.M.Briton (Public Works) Ltd



Appendix 2 – Final Tender List

Winter Damage 2011 Tender List			Sent Contract Documents	Comments
TOTALS			22	15 (tenders assessed)
Tender List				
Company	Town	County		
Oatmor-Harris Ltd	Deal	Kent		
Clancy Docwra Limited	Harefield	Middlesex		
Sunville Rail Limited	Crawley	West Sussex		Did not submit offer
Skelton Contractors Limited	Canterbury	Kent		
VolkerHighways Ltd	London	Middlesex		
Marshall Surfacing Contracts Ltd	Whyteleafe	Surrey		Did not submit offer
Owen Mullen contractors	Maidstone	Kent		
Sturgeons	Tunbridge wells	Kent		
Ferns Surfacing Ltd	Maidstone	Kent		
FM Conway Ltd	Dartford	Kent		
Walker Construction (UK) Limited	Folkestone	Kent		
DB Construction (herts) Ltd	Clavering	Essex		Did not submit offer
Kenson Contractors	Rainham	Essex		
Gary Mason	Gillingham	Kent		
Colas Limited	Crawley	West Sussex		Did not submit offer
Ringway Infrastructure Services Ltd	Horsham	West Sussex		
Bardon Contracting	Croft	Leicestershire		Did not submit offer
A R Cook & Son (Plant Hire) Ltd	Maidstone	Kent		
Steadline Limited	Maidstone	Kent		
Duke Contractors Ltd	Horsmonden	Kent		
Concrete Construction United Ltd	Rochester	Kent		Qualified tender
Inten ltd	Sittingbourne	Kent		Qualified tender



Appendix 3 – Model quantities for tender assessment of costs

	Repair Type	Depth	Lowest Rates 2010	Model Quantities 2011	Model Cost
1	Pothole Small	<50mm	£2.89	200	£578.00
2	Pothole Small	50 - 100	£5.21	1000	£5,210.00
3	Pothole Small	>100mm	£10.00	100	£1,000.00
4	Pothole Med.	<50mm	£10.86	200	£2,172.00
5	Pothole Med.	50 - 100	£19.55	1000	£19,550.00
6	Pothole Med.	>100mm	£25.00	100	£2,500.00
7	Pothole Large	<50mm	£31.02	200	£6,204.00
8	Pothole Large	50 - 100	£55.84	1000	£55,840.00
9	Pothole Large	>100mm	£65.00	100	£6,500.00
11	Patching 0 -10 sq.m	<50mm	£27.15	1500	£40,725.00
12	Patching 0 -10 sq.m	50 - 100	£41.26	1500	£61,890.00
13	Patching 0 -10 sq.m	>100mm	£50.00	200	£10,000.00
14	Patching 10 -20 sq.m	<50mm	£24.43	1500	£36,645.00
15	Patching 10 -20 sq.m	50 - 100	£37.14	1500	£55,710.00
16	Patching 10 -20 sq.m	>100mm	£45.00	200	£9,000.00

Model Total £304,524.00