### **Committee Report**

**Environment Committee** 

Item: 2007 - 409

For the Metropolitan Council meeting of January 9, 2008

#### **ADVISORY INFORMATION**

Date Prepared: December 20, 2007

Subject: Authorization to Reject all Bids for Metropolitan Council Environmental Services

(MCES) Facility Roof Repair, Contract Number 07P093

#### **Proposed Action:**

That the Metropolitan Council authorize the rejection of all bids for Metropolitan Council Environmental Services (MCES) Facility Roof Repair, Contract Number 07P093.

## **Summary of Committee Discussion / Questions:**

The Committee asked for details about the grounds for rejecting bids. Staff explained that the right to reject bids is in all bid documents and, in this case, the bids are beyond the scope of the budget. Motion to accept proposed action was made, seconded, and passed unanimously.

**Environment Committee** 

Item: 2007 - 409

Meeting date: December 11, 2007

For the Metropolitan Council Meeting of January 9, 2008

**ADVISORY INFORMATION** 

Date: November 27, 2007

Subject: Authorization to Reject all Bids for Metropolitan Council

Environmental Services (MCES) Facility Roof Repair, Contract

Number 07P093

District(s), Member(s): All

Policy/Legal Reference: Council Policy 3-3 Expenditures – Procurement of Goods and

Services Over \$250,000

Staff Presented: Richard Halsted 651-602-1038

**Division/Department:** MCES c/o William G. Moore 651-602-1162

### **Proposed Action**

That the Metropolitan Council authorize the rejection of all bids for Metropolitan Council Environmental Services (MCES) Facility Roof Repair, Contract Number 07P093.

## **Background**

Bids were solicited to supply roof repair service for the MCES facilities for a three year period. A formal Invitation for Bids was issued and responses were obtained from five prospective bidders. The range of bids was \$472,500 to \$1,570,500. Each project awarded under this contract will have a maximum expenditure of \$25,000 per occurrence. Staff proposes re-issuing a formal Invitation for Bids for this work.

#### Rationale

- The lowest bidder was non-responsive as they did not provide a certified check or Surety Bond with their bid.
- The second lowest bid exceeded the budgeted amount by \$372,180.
- There are several other companies that, as demonstrated from the 2004 bid for this procurement, are more competitive with the lowest bidder.

#### **Funding**

Funds are available through the annual operating budget of each facility utilizing the roof repair service. Estimated expenditures for the roof repairs are \$500,000 over a three year period.

# **Known Opposition / Support**

None