TO: HONORABLE CITY COUNCIL
FROM: CITY MANAGER DEPARTMENT: PUBLIC WORKS
DATE: SEPTEMBER 12, 2005 CMR:371:05
SUBJECT: REJECTION OF BIDS AND AUTHORIZATION TO RE-SOLICIT BIDS FOR PARKING LOT R SUPPLEMENTAL LIGHTING PROJECT - CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PROJECT PE-95030

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that Council reject all bids for installation of supplemental lighting at the Lot R parking garage, Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Project PE-95030 and direct staff to revise plans and readvertise for construction bids.

BACKGROUND
On March 19, 2001, Council adopted a “Resolution Adopting Engineer’s Report, Confirming the Assessment, Ordering the Work and Directing Actions with Respect Thereto” for the new University Avenue Area Off-Street Parking Assessment District (Assessment District). The assessment district, which was formed for $49.5 million, financed the construction of two parking garages downtown as well as related design, inspection, finance and bond interest costs. The Lot R (High/Alma South) garage was completed in September 23, 2003 and the Lot S and L garage (Bryant/Lytton) was opened on November 26, 2003. The new garages provide over 900 parking spaces, which is an increase of 700 spaces over what had previously existed in the downtown area.

Funding for the construction was budgeted for in Capital Improvement Program project 19530/PE-95030 and paid for within the $45.9 million assessment district. The project had surplus funds of $4,041,756, of which $3,541,756 was used to redeem a portion of outstanding bonds and another $500,000 was set aside to pay for long-term capital improvements that would someday be needed at the garages (CMR:282:04).

In addition to setting aside $500,000 for future capital improvements, $632,000 was set aside to fund near-term miscellaneous improvements. These were items that were not in the original construction plans which were identified as needed by the Chamber of Commerce Parking Subcommittee, garage users and City maintenance staff. These improvements include improved lighting for the Lot R garage, supplemental exterior entrance signage for both garages, stairwell enclosures at both garages to prevent sleeping under the stairs, pigeon abatement, increased metal framing supports to prevent vandalism to fire exit signs and additional “bang bars” that would help prevent cars from damaging ductwork and other equipment.
DISCUSSION

Project Description
The work to be performed under the contract is for installation of new lights and replacement or modification of existing lights at parking Lot R. The need for additional lights was identified from complaints from nighttime garage users who stated that the lighting was too dim. Staff checked the lighting at night and agreed that the lighting should be brighter. The new lights installed in the Lot R garage will be the same type as those in the Lot S/L garage.

Bid Process
A notice inviting formal bids for the project was posted at City Hall and sent to six contractors and eight builder's exchanges on June 1, 2005. The bidding period was 29 days. A pre-bid meeting was held on June 13, 2005; one bidder attended the meeting. Bids were received from two qualified contractors on July 5, 2005, as listed on the attached bid summary (Attachment A). Bids ranged from a high of $347,359 to a low bid of $263,200.

Summary of Bid Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bid Name/Number</th>
<th>Parking Lot R Supplemental Lighting Project IFB #112048</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Length of Project</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Bids Mailed to Contractors</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Bids Mailed to Builder’s Exchanges</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Days to Respond to Bid</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Bid Meeting?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Company Attendees at Pre-Bid Meeting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Bids Received</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bid Price Range</td>
<td>From a low of $263,200.00 to a high of $374,360.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bid summary provided in Attachment A.

Staff recommends that Council reject the bids due to an error in the technical specifications. The specifications allow the contractor to install any one of several different brands of light ballasts and fixtures into the light housing. The manufacturer of the housing, however, will not sell the housing to the contractor without the ballast and fixtures already installed, since adding different parts would invalidate the Underwriter’s Laboratories (UL) listing. The UL is a private non-profit laboratory that tests electrical products to make sure they meet safety standards. At the time of bid staff was unaware that the fixture would need to be sold as a unit in order to maintain the UL listing.

Staff recommends rejecting all bids and revising the technical specifications so that the lights must be purchased as part of a complete unit. Re-bidding later in the year would also allow for more competitive contractor bids, since summer is the busiest time of year for contractors and therefore fewer contractors have the time to review plans and submit construction bids.
RESOURCE IMPACT
Funds for this project are included in CIP project PE-95030 within the $45.9 million assessment.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS
This recommendation does not represent any change to existing City policies.

TIMELINE
The specifications would need to be revised by the electrical engineering consultant. They would be re-advertised for bids in the fall of 2005.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
The building was designed with down turned beams to prevent light spillage so the new lighting will not impact the outside environment. An Environmental Impact Report was prepared as part of the PC zoning application for the garage and was certified by Council on December 20, 1999, Resolution number 7917. No additional environmental review will be needed as the work is a minor maintenance alteration to an existing facility.
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Attachment A: Bid Summary
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