

CITY OF PIEDMONT
City Council Staff Report

Date: April 4, 2005 City Council Meeting

From: Mark Delventhal, Director of Recreation

Re: AWARD OF CONTRACT AND SUPPLEMENTAL
APPROPRIATION FOR DRACENA PARK CHILDREN'S
PLAY AREA PROJECT

Staff Recommendation:

1. Award the construction contract (including base bid and alternates #1 and #2) for the Dracena Children's Play Area project to Cleary Brothers Landscape Inc. in the amount of \$418,000.00.
2. Appropriate \$133,564 from the Unappropriated General Fund Reserve to the Capital Improvement Fund Dracena Project.
3. Transfer \$20,000 from the Measure D Fund* to the Capital Improvement Fund Dracena Project.

Background:

Following many months of planning and community discussion led by the Recreation Commission with Park Commission involvement, the City Council authorized the solicitation of bids on October 7, 2003.

Bids were opened on June 17, 2004 (see attachment #1). With staff recommendation, the Council rejected all bids on July 19, 2004 for cost reasons and directed that the project be re-bid with a downscaled design to lower costs while maintaining the "basic integrity of the design."

After study and certain modifications to the project design, the project was re-bid. The bids were opened on March 10, 2005 (see attachment #2). A bid explanation from architect Phil Singer is also included (see attachment #3).

* As per the Public Works Department, \$20,000 in funding is available for this project from the Alameda County Waste Management Authority Measure D Fund for the Recycled Product Preference Program. The rubber "poured in place" surface material being used in part of the project surfacing qualifies as a recycled product.

Budget:

Funding Sources:

CIP Dracena Project Account Remaining Funds	90,000
Fundraising Projected Totals**	142,000
CDBG Funding (County)	75,000
Measure D Funding*	20,000
<u>Total Project Funding</u>	<u>327,000</u>

Project Expense:

Low Bid with alternates (Cleary Bros.)	418,695
10% Contingency Expenses	41,869
Total Construction with Contingency	460,564
<u>Appropriation Required:</u>	<u>133,564</u>

Discussion:

The cost for this project is obviously more than had been anticipated. However, by bidding the project twice and by scaling the design of the project “back a bit”, the city is now in a position to know with some certainty what the value of these improvements are.

The Cleary base bid is \$52,851 lower than the #2 bid, and is \$150,950 lower than the highest bid.

The bids for the two alternates are similar for all five of the bids received which indicates that the Cleary bids for the alternate items are reasonable.

** The fund raising total is currently \$111,000 but PFB has pledged \$25,000 upon Council award of the project and another \$6,000 has been committed by a donor. $\$111,000 + 25,000 + 6,000 = \$142,000$.

Alternative Actions for Consideration:

1. Reject all bids for the project.

Due to the months and months of study, community involvement and dialogue and because of the \$140,000 in private funding, this alternative is not being recommended.

2. Award the contract to the low bidder without Alternative #1 which is the Restroom Building and associated costs for a savings of \$52,650.

During the study and consideration of the project, it became clear that a restroom facility was strongly desired by the community. The PBF funding for the project (\$25,000) is being made with the understanding that the renovated facility will have a restroom.

3. Award the contract to the low bidder without Alternative #2 which is the Climbing Wall and associated costs for a savings of \$53,000. Direct that the Climbing Wall be installed at a later time as a later phase.

This alternative action is not being recommended for two reasons. First, the climbing wall feature has been one of the two primary design features (along with the slide) which have been most popular during the "community dialogue process". And second, installation of such a wall at a later time is likely to be more expensive.

4. Approve award of the project to the low bidder, but do so with no contingency (save \$41,869 which is 10%) or award the contract with a 5% contingency (save \$20,934).

This action is not being recommended because construction projects (renovations et al) of this kind typically involve necessary change orders through no fault of the city, the architect or the contractor. Approval of such change orders will only be done after careful review and scrutiny.

City Administrators' Comments:

I concur with Mr. Delventhal's recommendation.

Geoffrey L. Grote, City Administrator