



**BRIEFING PAPERS
FOR ELECTED MEMBERS'
BRIEFING SESSION**

**Supplementary Agenda
Draft Only**

to be held at
the Council Chambers, Civic Centre, Dundobar Road, Wanneroo
on 18 July, 2017 commencing at 6.00PM



City of Wanneroo

Briefing Papers for Tuesday 18 July, 2017

CONTENTS

<u>ITEM 5</u>	<u>LATE REPORTS</u>	<u>1</u>
5.1	TENDER NO 16231 - FITOUT OF THE WANNEROO CIVIC CENTRE EXTENSION AND REFURBISHMENT OF THE WANNEROO CIVIC CENTRE BUILDINGS	1

S U P P L E M E N T A R Y A G E N D A

Item 5 Late Reports

5.1 Tender No 16231 - Fitout of the Wanneroo Civic Centre Extension and Refurbishment of the Wanneroo Civic Centre Buildings

File Ref: 22683V02 – 17/211400
Responsible Officer: Director Assets
Disclosure of Interest: Nil
Attachments: 2

Issue

To consider Tender No. 16231 for the Fitout of the Wanneroo Civic Centre Extension and Refurbishment of the Wanneroo Civic Centre Buildings.

Background

The Wanneroo Civic Centre Extension building (WCCE) is currently being constructed by Pindan under Contract No 01609. As part of these works, Pindan is undertaking a forward works component necessary for the fitout of the WCCE Level 1 and works related to building services within the Civic Centre.

Following practical completion and certification of the works by Pindan the fitout works to Level 1 of the Civic Centre Extension can commence.

Spatial design consultant, MKDC, has produced the design for the internal fitout of the Extension building and for refurbishment of the Civic Centre. These works were tendered as a separate contract and consist of the following:

- Extension building first floor fitout;
- Relocation of existing workstations and furniture from the Civic Centre first floor into Extension building ground floor (temporary fitout);
- Modification and refurbishment of the Civic Centre ground and first floor administration areas;
- Modification and refurbishment of the Civic Centre Banksia Room, Lobby and CRC administration area and Lechenaultia room; and
- Removal of temporary fitout in Extension building ground floor;

Council considered a report at its meeting on 4 March 2014 and endorsed a project budget of \$27M for the Wanneroo Civic Centre Extension project.

At its meeting of 24 May 2016, Council considered Item AS09-05/16, and resolved to:

1. *ACCEPTS the tender submitted by Pindan Pty Ltd for Tender No. 01609 for the Provision of Services for the Construction of the Wanneroo Civic Centre Extension Building located at 23 Dundobar Road, Wanneroo for the fixed lump sum price of \$15,990,642.41 in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in the tender document; and*
2. *NOTES that \$12.0M has been listed in the draft 2016/17 Capital Works Program and \$11.328M will be listed in the 2017/18 (\$10.0M) and 2018/19 (\$1.328M) Capital Works*

Program to fully complete the works for the construction of Wanneroo Civic Centre Extension and Refurbishment located at 23 Dundobar Road, Wanneroo.

Detail

Tender No. 16231 for the Fitout of the Wanneroo Civic Centre Extension and Refurbishment of the Wanneroo Civic Centre Buildings was advertised on 8 April 2017 and closed on Tuesday 9 May 2017.

Due to the size of the tender documentation, a CD is available in the Elected Members Room for review.

Essential details of the proposed contract are as follows:

Item	Detail
Contract Form	AS4000-1997 Major Construction
Contract Type	Lump Sum
Contract Duration	10 Months
Commencement Date	31 July 2017
Site Possession Date	Tentatively October 2017 Actual date to be negotiated with the appointed tenderer
Expiry Date	Practical Completion 9 May 2018
Extension Permitted	No
Rise and Fall	Does not apply

Tender submissions were received from the following companies:

Legal Entity Tendering Name	Short Name
Aurora Project Group Pty Ltd	Aurora
Broad Construction Services (QLD) Pty Ltd	Broad
Broad Construction Services (QLD) Pty Ltd	Broad (Alternative Tender)
Candor Contractors	Candor
Construct360 Pty Ltd	Construct360
Hoskins Contracting Pty Ltd	Hoskins
Byte Construct Pty Ltd t/as Northerly Commercial	Northerly
Pindan Constructions Pty Ltd	Pindan
RHG Contractors Pty Ltd	RHG
Scope Interiors (1997) Pty Ltd	Scope
Shape Australia Pty Ltd	Shape
Shelford Constructions Pty Ltd	Shelford
Stylecraft Australia Pty Ltd	Stylecraft

Probity Oversight

Given the size and complexity of the project; the City appointed an external probity advisor, William Buck Consulting (WA) Pty Ltd to oversee the procurement evaluation process and to ensure fairness, equity and compliance with the Tender Evaluation Plan.

Tender Assessment

The Tender Evaluation panel comprised of:

Evaluation Panel Member	Function
Project Manager Major Buildings	Undertake the technical assessment and qualitative scoring of all tender submissions
Manager Infrastructure Capital Works	Provide input and oversight to the qualitative (technical) assessment
Coordinator Building Projects	Provide input and oversight to the qualitative (technical) assessment
Senior Occupational Safety & Health (OSH) Officer	Oversee the OSH qualitative (technical) assessment
Director MKDC (Spatial Design Consultant)	Provide input and oversight to the qualitative (technical) assessment
Associate Director Ralph Beattie Bosworth (Cost Consultant)	Oversee the Cost qualitative (technical) assessment

A Contracts Officer provided an oversight to the process for statutory compliance and verify the value for money assessment (price versus non-price ratings).

Tender submissions were evaluated in accordance with the Tender Evaluation Plan (**TEP**), which included the following selection criteria:

Item No	Category	Score
1	Price for the Works offered	40%
2	Demonstrated Experience	15%
3	Methodology	15%
4	Resources & Capacity	10%
5	Occupational Health & Safety Management	20%
Total Weighted Score		100%

Twelve submissions were received, plus an (Alternative Tender) submission from Broad Construction.

After initial assessments for administrative compliance; the tenders from *Candor* and *Stylecraft* were found to be non-conforming, and were subsequently excluded from further evaluation:

- *Candor* failed to submit its tender form and any signed schedules; and
- *Stylecraft* submitted a price schedule for the loose furniture only.

During the tender evaluation process; further clarifications were sought from *Pindan* regarding their priced specification and provider of workstations. *Pindan* clarified that they had not allowed for the conforming Schiavello workstation system and instead had proposed an (Alternative Tender) workstation from the outset.

Pindan's submission was ruled to be non-conforming as *Pindan* had proposed to supply an alternative system. *Pindan* was excluded from the tender evaluation.

Evaluation Criteria 1 - Pricing for the Goods/Services/Works Offered (40%)

An assessment was made to determine the tenderer ranking based on the lump sum pricing/schedule of rates provided with the tender documentation.

A schedule of lump sum pricing has been prepared (**Attachment 1** refers) which resulted in the following ranking under this criterion:

Tenderer	Ranking
Broad (ALTERNATIVE TENDER)	1
Construct360	2
Aurora	3
Shelford	4
RHG	5
Hoskins	6
Scope	7
Shape	8
Broad	9
Northerly	10

Evaluation Criteria 2 - Tenderer's relevant experience with achievement of meeting client expectations (15%)

The tenderer's relevant experience in demonstrating the achievement of meeting client expectations as presented in their tender submission were assessed in order to evaluate their capability to meet the requirements of the contract. Assessment of this criterion considered the tendering entity's credentials to fulfil the requirements of the contract.

Shape specialises in fitout projects, and their submission demonstrated excellent examples of completed fitout projects with similar scope and size. Their experience included a range of projects for the Australian Tax Office, Department of Education and Network Ten studios. The panel considered *Shape's* submission very convincing and met the requirements of this criterion.

Broad's submission provided relevant examples of fitout projects with similar value and complexity, undertaken for Department of Finance, Department of Child Protection and Lotterywest. Their experience also included the recently completed Quinns Mindarie Community Centre project; which demonstrated working on a small complex refurbishment project with minimal disturbance to occupants and its surroundings. Their submission met the requirements of this criterion.

Aurora's submission provided good examples of completed fitout projects with similar scope and size. Their experience included a range of office fitout projects for the private developers, Mainroads, local government agencies in Karratha, the City of Perth and Murdoch University. The Panel considered this submission provided relevant examples, which met the requirements of this criterion.

Hoskins submission provided good examples of completed fitout projects with similar scope and whilst some were slightly smaller value; they included a range of complexity including Audio Visual. Projects included were Edith Cowan and Curtin Universities, offices and retail for private developers and Department of Human Services.

Northerly's submission provided examples of fitout that were relevant in size and scope. They provided a good standard of experience within office fitouts for South32, Wesfarmers, HBF, Arup, CERI/The Bass Group, and MRA.

RHG provided an adequate submission however examples presented lacked office fitout

experience. Their experience included apartments in Chermside QLD and Fremantle, Mixed-Use/medical/retail developments in Secret Harbour, Berrigan Drive and Bunbury,

Scope demonstrated experience in fitout projects listing projects for DSC Armadale, WA Police, Kelmscott Library, Curtin University, and Department of Child Protection, upto a value of \$2M. No images were provided.

Shelford's submission demonstrated their building capabilities as well as smaller fitout projects, and one office fitout to the value of \$1M. Their experience included a wide range of community sports facilities for City of Gosnells, City of South Perth, City of Fremantle, City of Cockburn, and City of Gosnells. *Shelford* also provided further examples of their commercial and office building experience for private developers.

Construct360 provided examples of construction work they are undertaking. Whilst this included a larger construction project in South Hedland, their fitout projects were smaller in size and scope. Examples included fitout for St John of God in Subiaco and Midland, retail fitout, and offices for Bethanie Aged Care. Their submission also included the recently completed small fitout project undertaken for the City.

The assessment of this criterion has resulted in the following ranking:

Tenderer	Ranking
Shape	1
Broad	2
Broad (ALTERNATIVE TENDER)	2
Aurora	4
Hoskins	4
Northerly	4
RHG	7
Scope	7
Shelford	7
Construct360	10

Evaluation Criteria 3 – Tenderer's Proposed Methodology (15%)

Broad provided a clear considered approach to this criteria advising how they would manage the construction process and address specific issues such as maintaining access in order that the City could continue to operate during the construction period, and management of the relocation process. *Broad's* submission included a detailed Gantt chart construction program that provided concise and considered construction timeframes to meet project deadlines for the phasing of the works and staff moves.

Shape demonstrated a clear understanding of the project constraints, and their approach to managing the construction process, staff relocations, access and maintaining City operations during the construction period. *Shape* submitted a detailed Gantt chart construction program providing a well-considered construction schedule incorporating phasing of the works and staff moves.

Hoskins gave thought to project constraints and phasing, providing generic information on the construction methodology, however there appeared to be some misunderstanding in assuming they would do the relocation. *Hoskins* included a Gantt chart which highlighted the phased operations and moves.

Northerly provided a well thought out response and outlined the construction process with detailed site access design, and undertaking works in maintaining operations of the Civic Centre. *Northerly* submitted a Gantt chart construction program providing detailed consideration of construction timeframes and the phasing of the works and staff moves.

Other tender submissions had some shortcomings in demonstrating an understanding of the project requirements, or their submissions lacked sufficient detail and clarity in their construction methodologies.

RHG incorporated more generic information and a brief overview of construction methodology and minimal information on the impact on Civic Centre operations. *RHG* included a Gantt chart which highlighted the phased operations and moves.

Shelford incorporated generic statements and general information regarding methodology but did not provide information on coordinating the construction with existing operations and the staff relocation. *Shelford* provided a high level overview Gantt chart.

Construct360 provided a high-level overview of methodology and site constraints in minimising impact on the impact on Civic Centre operations; and noted that further development of this would be required following discussions with the City. *Construct360* included a Gantt chart which provided an overview of the sequencing of the phased works.

Scope's response provided a brief overview of construction methodology and a Gantt program which provided an overview of the sequencing of the works.

Aurora did not present any statement on methodology, with general comments only, and no Gantt chart program.

The assessment of this criterion has resulted in the following ranking

Tenderer	Ranking
Broad	1
Broad (ALTERNATIVE TENDER)	1
Shape	1
Hoskins	4
Northerly	4
RHG	6
Shelford	6
Construct360	8
Scope	9
Aurora	10

Evaluation Criteria 4 - Tenderer's resources and capacity to meet the requirements of the Contract (10%)

The tenderer's resources as presented in their tender submission were assessed in order to evaluate their capacity to meet the requirements of the contract and considered staff resources, vehicles, plant/equipment and workshop support to manage the contract.

Shape nominated an extensive team who has experience in managing fitout and building projects. CV's were included which provided an overview of relevant experience of proposed staff. *Shape* also provided a WA organisation chart demonstrating further depth in providing back up from Head office.

Broad provided a capable and experienced team. CV's were included which further illustrated the competence of proposed staff in managing fitout and relocation projects and to meet the requirements of this project. *Broad* identified allocation of the proposed delivery team, with further back up of the team from Head office.

Northerly's proposed team is experienced in managing large fitout and building projects, however, their CV's did not clearly present details of past involvement managing fitout and relocation projects. The allocation of time and availability to the project was not detailed.

Hoskins submission demonstrated capability and the roles of personnel on the project; however, the CV's listed projects with minimal detail on past involvement managing fitout and relocation projects. The allocation of time and availability to the project was not detailed.

Aurora provided an extensive and experienced team. CV's were included which further illustrated the competence of proposed staff in managing fitout and relocation projects and to meet the requirements of this project. However, *Aurora's* submission was lacking in detail on capacity and availability.

RHG proposed team is experienced in managing building projects; however, their CV's did not clearly present details of past involvement managing fitout and relocation projects. The allocation of time and availability to the project was not detailed.

Shelford provided an adequate response with a team experienced in larger construction projects however, their CV's did not clearly present details of past involvement managing fitout and relocation projects. The allocation of time and availability to the project was not detailed; however, *Shelford* did include contingency measures for key personnel if allocated to other projects.

Scope's submission included a small team and deemed inadequate for a complicated project. CV's were not included and the allocation of time and availability to the project was not detailed.

Construct360 submission included a small team and their CV's demonstrated capability with small fitout and building projects.

The assessment of this criterion has resulted in the following ranking:

Tenderer	Ranking
Shape	1
Broad	2
Broad (Alternative Tender)	2
Northerly	4
Hoskins	5
Aurora	6
RHG	6
Shelford	6
Scope	9
Construct360	10

Evaluation Criteria 5 - Tenderer's Safety and Quality Management Systems (20%)

Evidence of safety and quality management systems was assessed from the tender submissions. The assessment for safety management was based on the tenderers' responses to an Occupational Health and Safety Management System Questionnaire included within the tender documentation.

The Tender Evaluation Panel's OSH officer carried out a more detailed scrutiny of each tender submission, focussing on how tenderers address the particulars of this project and how its systems, policies and practices are embedded within the organisation.

Broad was assessed having provided a very clear and integrated OH&S Management System and risk management procedures.

Other submissions assessed by the panel demonstrated varying degrees of capability, capacity and experience in regards to Occupational Health and Safety Management.

Aurora demonstrated awareness of legislation and proactive approach. The submission provided reasonable evidence of use of Safe Work Method Statements (SWMS) and permits provided, plus other reports with no actual examples.

Construct360 have subcontractor policy, OSH templates, risk management processes, SWMS and site safety management plan provided.

Hoskins have extensive policy and OSH templates, however, there were some legislative errors (referencing) within their submission. *Hoskins* provided evidence of OSH Plan from previous project, project risk assessments, and JSA templates.

Northerly's submission provided evidence of an effective Incident Report, SWMS and permit systems in place, but parts of their submission provided minimal information such as inclusion of a contents page as evidence of OSH Management System.

Shape's WHSE system summary suggested extensive systems including subcontractor management, and they provided staff training matrix, sample SWMS and JSA; however, there were also some limitations noted in their submission.

Shelford provided evidence of good systems in place, various templates, SWMS, permits and handbooks and completed example documents. *Shelford* provided examples of Safety Management Plans developed for each site and Risk Management principles were recognised.

RHG provided an adequate response with generic templates but no actual examples. An OSH Management Plan was provided with evidence of permit systems; however, they provided limited reference to risk management principles.

Scope's OSH Management System was not audited or reviewed on a regular basis and lacked clarity on accountability. Their Site Safety Management Plan included a very limited hazard/risk assessment form and the permit system lacked detail.

The assessment of this criterion has resulted in the following ranking:

Tenderer	Ranking
Broad	1
Broad (Alternative Tender)	1
Aurora	3
Construct360	3
Hoskins	3
Northerly	3
Shape	3

Shelford	3
RHG	9
Scope	10

Overall Weighted Assessment and Ranking

Tenderer's submissions were reviewed in accordance with the Tender Evaluation Plan with the following key observations:

- The key component of the tender evaluation is price (40%); and
- The tenderers' bids were evaluated in accordance with the selection criteria and were assessed as having the necessary resources, previous experience, capability and safety and quality management systems to undertake the tender.

The overall weighted assessment resulted in the following tender ranking:

Tenderer	Ranking
Broad (Alternative Tender)	1
Broad	2
Shape	3
Hoskins	4
Northerly	5
Shelford	6
Aurora	7
RHG	8
Construct360	9
Scope	10

Consultation

Conceptual planning for the Extension building commenced in December 2014 and a project team consisting of stakeholders from each of the City's Directorates has liaised through a series of workshops with the consultant team to agree to the physical form, operational function, energy and green star ratings, and nature of the office building extension.

Following the tender process for the Wanneroo Civic Centre Extension in February 2016; the construction contract was awarded to Pindan on 24 May 2016, with construction commencing on 20 June 2016 and Practical Completion scheduled for 5 October 2017.

The same project team/stakeholders liaised through a series of design workshops in January and February 2016 with the interior consultant to agree the physical form of the fitout and refurbishment design. The stakeholders/project team continued to meet throughout the delivery of the project in agreeing and finalising the scheme, prior to completing the project's fitout design documentation in October 2016.

During the fitout documentation phase, cost consultants provided pre-tender estimates for the project, which was reviewed by the project team/stakeholders. This culminated in the project team and design consultants undertaking a value management review between October 2016 and February 2017 in identifying further cost savings for implementation within

the final design. The basis of this finalised documentation was issued for Tender in April 2017.

William Buck Consulting (WA) Pty Ltd were appointed to provide probity advisor services to the City in relation to this tender and have provided a report with regard to the probity aspects of the tender evaluation process, refer **Attachment 2**.

Comment

During the tender evaluation process, further clarifications regarding aspects of the higher ranked tenderers submission were sought that were assessed as having impact upon the evaluation of each individual submission.

Broad was consulted on program critical path items, disposal of assets, proposed services subcontractors, confirmation of addendum incorporation and verification of its proposed (Alternative Tender) workstation solution was a like-for-like with its conforming tender offer. Responses were deemed to provide satisfactory clarification.

Shape was consulted on program critical path items and working hours, proposed services subcontractors, and disposal of assets. Responses were deemed to provide satisfactory clarification.

After responses were received and further evaluation was conducted, the overall weighted scores were refined where appropriate.

The overall weighted assessment resulted in the following tenderer ranking:

Tenderer	Ranking
Broad (Alternative Tender)	1
Broad	2
Shape	3
Hoskins	4
Northerly	5
Shelford	6
Aurora	7
RHG	8
Construct360	9
Scope	10

The tender submission from *Broad (Alternative Tender)* achieved the highest overall ranking and satisfied the overall value for money assessment in accordance with the assessment criteria and weightings as detailed in the Tender Evaluation Plan.

The quantity surveyor's assessment of the *Broad (Alternative Tender)* tender provided the following comments:

- *Broad (Alternative Tender) tender is highly competitive and represents value for money;*
- *There is no arithmetical error in the breakdown of Broad (Alternative Tender) tender;*
- *Broad (Alternative Tender) costs are reasonable in relation to the other tenders;*

- *Broad (Alternative Tender) tender is highly competitive and represents value for money; and*
- *Subject to the City of Wanneroo and the Design team being satisfied with the alternative proposed, Broad (Alternative Tender) tender should be considered for acceptance.*

Broad's submitted Lump Sum Price is lower than the quantity surveyor's pre-tender estimate.

Testimonials within *Broad's* submission indicate that this tenderer has constructed major building projects for past clients, and that it has successfully constructed an extensive and varied range of large construction and fitout projects in Perth. In April 2017, *Broad* also successfully completed the Quinns Mindarie Community Centre (PR-1121) project for the City.

After a detailed evaluation, *Broad (Alternative Tender)* has been determined as the highest ranked tenderer and it is recommended to accept the *Broad (Alternative Tender)* tender for Tender No 16231 - Fitout of the Wanneroo Civic Centre Extension and Refurbishment of the Wanneroo Civic Centre Building.

Works Programme

The fitout of the WCC Extension and refurbishment of the WCC works programme is outlined as follows:

Tender Award by Council	25 July 2017
Contract (letter of award) by	27 July 2017
Contract commencement	31 July 2017
Possession of Site (To be negotiated with the appointed Tenderer)	Tentative October 2017
Staff moves are phased to tie in with completion of fitout and refurbishment as they are progressed	25-26 November 2017 7-8 January 2018 15-16 April 2018
Practical Completion	9 May 2018

Following tender award the City's Project Manager along with appointed consultants will administer the contract during the construction and after practical completion of the works; and thereafter attend upon the 12 month defects liability period.

The current program also allows for:

- Completion of the Civic Centre Extension building construction and for any potential construction issues to or defects to be resolved prior to commencement of the fitout and refurbishment works contract;
- The issuing of an occupancy certificate so that the Fitout Refurbishment Contractor can take possession of Extension building to commence the fitout works; and
- The Fitout and Refurbishment Contractor to place orders that have a long lead-in time, and or seek approvals for works requiring shop-detailing approvals prior to site possession.

Statutory Compliance

Tenders were invited in accordance with the requirements of Section 3.57 of the *Local Government Act 1995*. The tendering procedures and evaluation complied with the requirements of Part 4 of the *Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996*.

Strategic Implications

The proposal aligns with the following objective within the Strategic Community Plan 2017 – 2027:

“4 Civic Leadership

4.3 Progressive Organisation

4.3.2 Ensure excellence in our customer service”

Enterprise Risk Management Considerations

Risk Title	Risk Rating
CO-O07 Purchasing	Moderate
Accountability	Action Planning Option
Executive Management Team	Manage

Risk Title	Risk Rating
CO-O08 Contract Management	Moderate
Accountability	Action Planning Option
Executive Management Team	Manage

The above risks relating to the issue contained within this report has been identified and considered within the City's corporate risk register. Action plans have been developed to manage this risk to improve the existing management systems.

Financial and Performance Risk

Financial Risk

A financial risk assessment was undertaken as part of the tender evaluation process and the outcome of this independent assessment by Corporate Scorecard Pty Ltd advised that Broad Construction Services (QLD) Pty Ltd has been assessed with a satisfactory (*Broad* achieved a very strong rating) financial capacity to meet the requirements of the contract,

Cost Risk

The Quantity Surveyor will continue to manage payment certification and cash flow during the construction of the tendered works by employing the recommended tenderer's priced Bill of Quantities as the basis for progress payments and pricing contract sum adjustments.

Performance Risk

Broad has recently completed a building project for the City; Quinns Mindarie Community Centre (PR-1121). There were no performance issues during the works and completion of the contract was approximately 3 months ahead of schedule. *Broad* has also demonstrated that it has successfully constructed an extensive and varied range of large construction and fitout projects in Perth.

Operational Risk

Project risk mitigation will be identified and addressed as part of the construction management and programming phase so that it aligns with the daily operations of the Civic Centre, public use and access around the Civic Centre.

Social and Environmental (Sustainable Procurement) Considerations

In accordance with section 19 of the City's Purchasing Policy, the tender document included social and environmental considerations as non-weighted criteria *Broad* stated that:

We [Broad] understand the City of Wanneroo's specific objectives in ensuring environmental performance within the delivery of this project.

We [Broad] have identified the re-use of furniture, fixtures and fittings within the project documentation and are aware of the particular Waste Targets including a target of over 90% recycling in construction.

We [Broad] note the specific comments in relation to this target, 'Careful consideration of demolition to facilitate high capture of materials from existing facility' and 'Use of high efficiency resource recovery facility to sort waste in construction'.

Also of fundamental importance to the environmental targets for this project are the Greenstar targets and the Contractors particular responsibility in this area including;

- *Ensuring the Greenstar performance targets during the Test & Commissioning phase for the fit-out and refurbishment stage of the project.*
- *Ensuring we are ISO 14001 certified and have implemented a site specific environmental management plan*
- *Ensuring that 80% of waste by weight is reused or recycled for all construction waste*

We [Broad] have carefully studied the project documentation and identified those items that are designated for reuse or disposal by MKDC for this project.

Upon contract award, we [Broad] propose to use the mobilisation period to establish a detailed asset inventory for this project to clearly identify those assets that are earmarked as surplus and, through collaboration, design a recycling strategy for these items.

This recycling strategy will include options for sending materials to a recycling centre and/or re-distributing assets such as furniture to other organisations for use. Once a recycling plan has been developed, this will be incorporated into our Relocation Plan to ensure that items on the inventory are disposed or relocated as agreed during the demolition and relocation stages of project delivery.

Methodologies we [Broad] employ onsite in order to meet our environmental targets include:

- *Providing separate bins to enable waste segregation onsite.*
- *Engaging a specialist contractor to implement our waste management strategies*

On completion of the works a consultant will audit the extension building compliance in meeting the environmental and energy ratings endorsed by Council (refer Item No IN02-05/15), to ensure that measures implemented by the Bollig Design Group (BDG), into the Extension building design are within the parameters required to meet:

- 5 Star – NABERS energy rating; and
- 5 Star – (version 2) Green Star Office Design ratings.

It should be noted that compliance with the stipulated environmental and energy ratings can only be verified by a physical audit, this is normally undertaken after a year's total occupation of the constructed facility.

Broader Economic Impact Implications for the City of Wanneroo

The tender document included broader economic impact implications as a non-weighted criterion through the use of a "Buy Local" questionnaire. The response from *Broad* is summarised below:

- *23 out of 51 WA employees live locally.*
- *Broad intends to solely engage with Western Australia sub-contractors, in particular with a preference towards local businesses in or within close proximity to the City of Wanneroo and the City of Joondalup.*

- *Broad's Local Content Policy Statement outline's its commitment to supporting Western Australia.*
- *Confirmation of sub-contractors locations can be confirmed upon award.*

Policy Implications

Tenders were invited in accordance with the requirements of the City's Purchasing Policy.

Financial (Budget) Implications

Based on the tenderer's lump sum, historic expenditures, previous works carried out and the capital projects program, the project total cost /estimated expenditure is summarised below.

PR-2332

Description	Expenditure	Budget
Budget:		
Budget up to 30 June 2016		\$2,709,827
Budget for the period 1 July 2016 to 30 June 2017		\$14,041,502
Adopted Capital Works Budget for 2017/18 (PR-2332)		\$10,000,000
Allocated Capital Works Budget for 2018/19 (PR-2332)		\$132,283
Expenditure:		
Expenditure incurred up to 30 June 2016	\$2,709,827	
Expenditure for the period 1 July 2016 to 30 June 2017	\$14,041,502	
Expenditure for the period 1 July 2017 to date	\$599	
Commitment to date	\$2,845,932	
Project Management and Administration Fees	\$500,000	
Professional Fees & Disbursements	\$200,000	
Other Works (incl. Public Art and Fees, Water and Power Fees, Relocation Fees)	\$471,000	
Fit-out and refurbishment Costs based on recommended tender price	\$5,196,854	
Construction & Fitout Contingency	\$700,000	
Total Estimated Expenditure	\$26,665,714	
Total Funding commitment for PR-2332		\$26,883,612

Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

Recommendation

That Council ACCEPTS the alternative tender submitted by Broad Construction Services (QLD) Pty Ltd for Tender No. 16231, for the Fitout of the Wanneroo Civic Centre Extension and Refurbishment of the Wanneroo Civic Centre Buildings, at the Fixed Lump Sum of \$5,196,854 in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in the tender document.

Attachments:

- 1 [↓](#) Tender #16231 Lump Sum Pricing 17/229980
- 2 [↓](#) Tender 16231 - William Buck Probity Report 17/231694

Attachment 1

Tender No. 16231 – Fitout of the Wanneroo Civic Centre Extension and Refurbishment of the Wanneroo Civic Centre Buildings

This attachment is confidential and distributed under separate printed cover to all Elected Members.

Administration Use Only

Attachment 1 – TRIM # 17/229584

Attachment 2 – William Buck Probity Report

Tender No 16231 – Fitout of the Wanneroo Civic Centre Extension and Refurbishment of the Wanneroo Civic Centre Buildings

This attachment is confidential and distributed under separate printed cover to all Elected Members

Administration Use Only

Attachment 1 – TRIM # 17/231595