

ANGUS COUNCIL

ROADS COMMITTEE

22 NOVEMBER 2001

A92 MONTROSE BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

TENDER PROCESS

REPORT BY THE ACTING DIRECTOR OF ROADS

ABSTRACT

The Report recommends that tenders for the design and construction of the replacement bridge at Montrose be issued as soon as the tender documents are assembled and proposes how the Design and Construct Competition for Montrose Bridge Replacement will be determined.

1 RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Committee agree:-

- i) to authorise the Acting Director of Roads to issue tenders for the design and construction of the replacement bridge as soon as is practicable;
- ii) to approve the proposed (three stage) process for assessing the tender submissions once received.

2 INTRODUCTION

Following the Report Nos 106/00 and 457/00 presented to Committee on 27 January 2000 and 26 April 2000 respectively, it was agreed that the procurement methodology for the replacement bridge carrying the A92 over the River South Esk at Montrose would be a Design and Construct competition.

This form of contract has advantages in that the tenders submitted will involve designs by several companies allowing flair and innovation combined with practical experience in construction and a robust tender price. There will not be a specimen design. This will enable the tenderers to approach the project afresh. Each company will be encouraged to submit more than one design which may be on different road alignments, albeit the designs will be informed by the data collected through the earlier stages in the development of the project.

As a result the Council are likely to receive several tender submissions of various forms of bridges and different alignments, in various combinations. Even similar bridge forms submitted by different contractors will have cost differences, and each submission is likely to have differing advantages and disadvantages. Indeed this is an

aspect of the Design and Construct tender that is actively encouraged as part of the planning process.

The select list of tenderers for the project was agreed by the Roads Committee of 11 October 2001 (Report No 1168/01). It is now recommended that tender documents be issued to these contractors as soon as the tender documents are assembled. This is likely to be achieved by early January 2002.

The Council will however have to assess the tenders which are subsequently submitted and choose a preferred bidder to take the project forward to a Notice of Intention to Develop based on the form and alignment finally selected.

The assessment process will take several stages and will require to examine the submissions for various criteria to ensure the most suitable design, taking into account consideration of the environmental aspects and whole life costs to ensure best value. The assessment of tenders will not therefore be based on price alone, but will inter alia require to take cognisance of the requirements of the relevant European procurement regulations.

Therefore it is necessary to establish how the tenders will be assessed, and what the criteria will be (in outline). This needs to be established prior to tenders being issued such that the tenderers can be made aware of the assessment process. The recommended assessment process is detailed below.

3 **DETAILS**

3.1 **The Tender Assessment Process**

It is proposed that tenders be assessed to determine the most economically advantageous tender (MEAT) adopting the three stage process outlined below.

3.2 **Stage 1 of the Tender Assessment Process**

The first stage of the process will be a filtering exercise to ensure that the submissions satisfy the known constraints. As part of the study to date, by the Council's consultants, certain constraints have been established, including for example carriageway details and effect on river flow. Similarly there will be Employer's Requirements, which will include such issues as loading capacities, and river clearances. There will also be a financial assessment to filter any proposals which fall outside the budget limitations. Only submissions passing this filtering stage will progress to the next stages.

3.3 **Stage 2 of the Tender Assessment Process**

In the second stage of the process, submissions will be assessed against set criteria.

The proposed criteria are:-

- Costs (including whole life costing);
- Engineering;
- Maintenance;
- Environmental Issues;
- Planning;
- Aesthetics/Appearance;
- Community Issues.

The precise ranking and relative weighting of these criteria will be finalised by the Council's officers prior to tender issue.

It is proposed that the assessment should take the form of a series of 'pen pictures', which consist of set questions against which each submission is marked in a numerical range. The questions are weighted in line with the importance of the question and the criteria above. The overall mark gives the final rating.

The exact marking/weighting does not need to be finalised at this time but would be required to be established prior to return of the tenders. The 'pen pictures' would be established by officers from the appropriate Departments.

It is recognised that the "Aesthetics/Appearance" and "Community Issues" criteria should be informed by the views of the local community.

As such therefore it is proposed that within stage 2 of the assessment process only the first 5 criteria will be assessed, which assessment will result in the reduction of the tender submissions to a short list.

3.4 **Stage 3 of the Tender Assessment Process**

The short list bids would then be exhibited to the local public within the Montrose area and feedback sought on the Aesthetics/Appearance and on the Community Issues. The results of the analysis of that feedback would then be fed into the detailed assessment for those two criteria, to provide an overall assessment and ranking for the short listed tenders.

The resultant ranking of the bids would finally be reported back to Committee for its determination on the award of a contract.

4 **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no direct financial consequences as a result of this report as all the costs associated with the bridge tendering process have been included in the financial programme.

Whilst the detailed funding provision of the capital construction cost of the project (circa £7m) is yet to be finalised, it should be noted that issuing the tenders does not of itself bind the Council to a commitment to expend the capital funding. The

Committee is reminded that correspondence with the Scottish Executive is continuing in respect of provision of appropriate funding.

5 HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

There are no human rights implications arising from the proposals in this report.

6 CONSULTATION

The Chief Executive, the Director of Law and Administration, Director of Finance, Director of Planning & Transport and the Director of Property have been consulted in the preparation of this report.

7 CONCLUSION

Tenders for the bridge replacement contract should be issued in January 2002.

The proposed assessment of tenders subsequently received for the replacement of the bridge is a three stage process with an initial filtering of acceptable solutions by officers, marking using 'pen pictures' to produce a short list, input from the local community on Aesthetics/Appearance and Community Issues, resulting in a final recommendation to Committee for approval.

R W McNeil
ACTING DIRECTOR OF ROADS

NOTE:

No background papers, as defined by Section 50D of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973 (other than any containing confidential or exempt information) were relied on to any material extent in preparing the above Report.

IAC/PP
8 October 2001
REPORTS/mb.tend.process