



City of Nedlands

Technical Services Reports

Committee Consideration – 12 August 2014

Council Resolution – 26 August 2014

Table of Contents

| Item No. | | Page No. |
|----------|--|----------|
| TS15.14 | Tender No. 2013/14.17 Lawn Maintenance Estate Areas..... | 2 |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| TS15.14 | Tender No. 2013/14.17 – Lawn Maintenance Estate Areas |
|----------------|--|

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Committee | 12 August 2014 |
| Council | 26 August 2014 |
| Applicant | City of Nedlands |
| Officer | Andrew Dickson – Manager Parks Services |
| Director | Mark Goodlet – Director Technical Services |
| Director Signature |  |
| File Reference | TS-PRO-00025 |
| Previous Item | Not Applicable |

Executive Summary

To award the term contract for maintenance of lawns in estates and other areas in the City of Nedlands for maintenance operations.

Recommendation to Committee

Council:

1. **agrees to award tender no. 2013/14.17 to Skyline Landscape Services (WA) for the provision of lawn maintenance services as per the schedule of rates (Attachment 1) submitted; and**
2. **authorises the Chief Executive Officer to sign an acceptance of offer for this tender.**

Strategic Plan

KFA: Natural and Built Environment

Award of this tender enables the City to maintain its streetscapes, reserves and gardens in accordance with agreed levels of service.

Background

As part of the parks services operational works the City of Nedlands includes a provision for the contracting of lawn maintenance to estates and other areas to maintain and improve the City's public places. Expenditure in this contract is likely to exceed \$100,000 and to comply with legislative requirements outlined in the *Local Government Act 1995* and ensure the best value for money for the City, this service must be tendered.

Tender documents were advertised on Saturday 31 May 2014 in the West Australian Newspaper. Tenders opened on Tuesday 3 June 2014 and submissions closed at 2:00 pm Wednesday 18 June 2014, with submitted tenders being opened by Officers of the City at the closing of the tender.

Conforming tenders were received from the following eleven companies:

1. Landscape and Maintenance Solutions Pty Ltd
2. Programmed Group Corporate
3. LD Total
4. Green Life Group
5. Lochness Landscape Services
6. External Works
7. Skyline Landscape Services
8. Workzone Pty Ltd
9. ZIL Commercial Mowing and Landscape
10. Cobey Maintenance
11. D E Parker t/a Lawn Doctor

Key Relevant Previous Council Decisions

Nil.

Consultation

Required by legislation:

Yes

No

Required by City of Nedlands policy:

Yes

No

Legislation / Policy

Local Government Act 1995, section 3.57

Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, Part 4

City of Nedlands Policy – ‘Purchasing of Goods and Services’

Budget/Financial Implications

Within current approved budget:

Yes

No

Requires further budget consideration:

Yes

No

Allowance is made in the parks services operations budget for the supply of lawn maintenance to estates and other areas in accordance with this contract.

Risk Management

Failing to appoint the contract will impact on the City’s ability to maintain current service levels to streetscapes, reserves and gardens.

Key risk areas, including financial and regulatory risks, have been addressed through the control measures applied through the tender documentation and

evaluation process. Reference checks were completed on the recommended contractor following the evaluation process.

Discussion

The tender was independently evaluated by three (3) City Officers in accordance with the qualitative criteria specified in the tender documentation, as set out in the below table extract from RFT 2013/14.17.

| Qualitative Selection Criteria | Weighting |
|--|-------------------|
| <p>Key Personnel, Skills and Experience</p> <p>Tenderer’s must, as a minimum, address the following information in an attachment and label it “Key Personnel”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Nominate key personnel to be involved in this contract; and b) Provide relevant industry experience, current qualifications and registrations of the key personnel. | <p>10%</p> |
| <p>Relevant Experience</p> <p>A Tenderer must, as a minimum, address the following information in an attachment and label it “Relevant Experience”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Provide details of similar work; b) Provide scope of the Tenderer’s involvement including details of outcomes; c) Provide details of issues that arose during the project and how these were managed; and d) Demonstrate competency and proven track record of achieving outcomes. | <p>20%</p> |
| <p>Tenderer’s Resources (Equipment and Personnel)</p> <p>A Tenderer must, as a minimum, address the following information in an attachment and label it “Tenderer’s Resources”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Plant, equipment and materials; and b) Any contingency measures or back up of resources including personnel (where applicable). | <p>10%</p> |

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| <p>Performance</p> <p>A Tenderer must as a minimum, address the following information in an attachment and label it “Performance”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The ability to supply and sustain the necessary technical resources, staff and equipment; b) Demonstrate ability to provide high quality and standard of work; and c) Demonstrated ability to meet specifications of this request. | <p>30%</p> |
| <p>Price</p> <p>A Tenderer must as a minimum, address the following information in an attachment and label “Price”:</p> <p>The tendered price(s) will be considered along with related factors affecting total cost to the Principal. Early settlement discounts, lifetime costs, the major components to be utilised, the Principal's contract management costs may also be considered in assessing the best value for money outcome.</p> | <p>30%</p> |

The priced items were compiled in to a spreadsheet for analysis of value comparison. A price criteria score was allocated based on the best value being scored at 100% and other values scored proportionally against this price.

The pricing was weighted at 30% of the assessment with the remaining % being allocated to the qualitative section criteria.

Evaluation:

The tenderer who scored highest on the evaluation was Skyline Landscape Services with a score of 83%.

Conclusion

After an assessment of the submitted tenders it is proposed that the tender submission received from the contractor Skyline Landscape Services (WA) be accepted having attained the highest score in the evaluation and providing the most cost efficient outcome.

The contract provides the option to extend the contract for a period of two (2) 12 months extensions at the end of the initial one (1) year period, subject to satisfactory performance.

Attachments

1. Confidential Schedule of Rates (not to be published)
2. Confidential Tender Assessment (not to be published)