|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Fixed Budget Variable Quantity Contracting Report** | | |
| Project Location: |  | |
| Project No: |  |  |
| Key No: |  |  |
| Project Manager: |  |  |
| Report Date: |  |  |

**Introduction**

This report was written to document the performance of Fixed Budget/ Variable Quantity Contracting on the above-mentioned project. This report is required by FHWA after completion of the project and final acceptance by the ITD. The report contains an overall evaluation of the project.

**Project Description**

<Provide a description of the project including project goals, objectives and particular challenges.>

<Provide the terms that defined how contractors bid the project.>

<Provide the conditions the Department used to determine the successful bidder.>

<List the items that were considered incidental to the primary bid item.>

<Mention any contingency items that were included in the bid schedule.>

<Discuss how contract time was defined and the specified amount for liquidated damages.>

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Initial Budget** | | | | | |
| Engineer’s Estimate ($): | $651,000 | | | | |
| Engineer’s Estimate (quantity): | 52,465 | | | Units | tons |
| Contract Time Determination: | 1 WD for every 2000 tons of crushed gravel | | | | |
| Initial Duration: | 26 | Units | Working days | | |
| Time Restraints: |  | | | | |

**Bidding Results**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Bid Results** | | | | | |
| Total Number of Bidders: | 5 | | | | |
| Bid Opening Date: | 1/7/14 | | | | |
| Contractor (low bid): | Woods Crushing and Hauling, Incorporated | | | | |
| Award Date: | 2/4/14 | | | | |
| Contractor’s Bid ($): | $661,500 | | | | |
| Contractor’s Bid (quantity): | 41,448 | | | Units | tons |
| Contract Time Determination: | 1 WD for every 2000 tons of crushed gravel | | | | |
| Contractor’s Bid (time): | 21 | Units | Working Days | | |

**Evaluation of Fixed Budget Variable Quantity Contracting Technique**

*Metric 1 – Cost of Inspection*

<Discuss the final cost of inspection and testing (CE) in comparison to the final construction cost.>

<Compare final CE costs to other similar, conventionally contracted projects.>

<Was the project successful by coming in below 10% of the bid amount?>

<Discuss how inspection and testing requirements were met.>

*Metric 2 – Final Construction Cost*

<Discuss the final contract cost in relation to the initial engineer’s estimate. Discuss how change orders, adjustments, overruns/underrun, etc. affected the initial construction budget. With regards to the overall construction budget, was the project a success by keeping within the 5% contingency?

<Provide a brief discussion that compares the initial and actual project duration. What changes occurred to affect project time: suspensions, extensions, delays, etc? Were liquidated damages assessed?>

*Metric 3 – Industry Reaction*

<Provide reactions from the parties involved, including District Management, Resident Engineer and contractor key personnel>

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Actual Project Statistics** | | | | | | | | | |
| Cost of Inspection (CE): | | | $44,986 | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Final Construction (CN): | | | $643,079 | | | | | |
|  | Change Orders (CN ): | | | $0 | | | | | |
|  | Other CN Adjustments: | | | $0 | | | | | |
|  | Total (CN): | | | $643,079 | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | |
| Final Quantity: | |  | | | | Units | |  | |
|  | | | | | | | | | |
| Actual Construction Duration: | | | | |  | | Units | |  |
| Project Completion Date: | | | | |  | | | | |

**Recommendations Using the Fixed Cost Variable Quantity Contracting Technique**

<Offer recommendations to improve the Fixed Budget Variable Quantity contracting method.>

**Conclusion**

The District and the contractor did not have any issues with the bidding technique and gave it a positive review after completion of the project. The fixed budget variable quantity contracting technique worked well and the District and the contractor recommends using on future similar projects.