

Information to be included in all Legislation Modifying a Contract:

1. **The names, contract compliance no. & expiration date, location by City/State and status of all companies (NPO, MAJ, MBE, FBE, HL1, AS1, or MBR) submitting a competitive bid or submitting an RFP or RFSQ.**

<u>Name</u>	<u>C.C. No./Exp. Date</u>	<u>City/State</u>	<u>Status</u>
Arrow Ecology and Engineering Overseas, Ltd.	N/A	Wheeling, WV	N/A
BIO Petrol Ltd.	N/A	Jerusalem, Israel	N/A
Dynamic Environmental Solutions Group, Inc.	N/A	Germantown, TN	N/A
Kurtz Bros., Inc.	N/A	Groveport, OH	N/A
Ohio-Wil-Recycle	N/A	Columbus, OH	N/A
The Shaw Group Inc.	N/A	Baton Rouge, LA	N/A
Unity Fertilizer Company	N/A	Doylestown, PA	N/A

2. **What type of bidding process was used (ITB, RFP, RFSQ, Competitive Bid).**
RFSQ for Organic Waste Recovery and Reuse System (OWRRS) – September 1, 2004

3. **List the ranking and order of all bidders.**
N/A

4. **The name, address, contact name, phone number and contract number of the firm awarded the original contract.**
Kurtz Brothers, Inc., 2850 Rohr Road, Groveport, OH 43125, Thomas A. Kurtz, 614-491-0868, Organic Waste Processing Agreement - September 1, 2005

5. **A description of work performed to date as part of the contract and a full description of work to be performed during any future phasing of the contract.**
Design, construction and operation of the OWRRS Facility for processing of wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) sewerage sludge; processing of WWTP sewerage sludge incinerator ash; operation and maintenance of the City Trucked Waste Disposal Facility (TWDF).

6. **An updated contract timeline to contract completion.**
Contract terms are ten (10) years in duration and may be extended for an additional five (5) year period, at the option of Kurtz Bros., Inc. The ten year completion dates are as follow:
WWTP sewerage sludge incinerator ash processing – ending on 10/23/2018
TWDF operation and maintenance – ending on 12/01/2019
WWTP sewerage sludge processing – ending on 12/01/2020.

7. **A narrative discussing the economic impact or economic advantages of the project; community outreach or input in the development of the project; and any environmental factors or advantages of the project.**
The Organic Waste Processing Agreement contracted costs for the processing of ash and sludge and for operating and maintaining the City TWDF are comparable to the costs of the other methods of byproduct use and disposal currently employed by the City; this contract allows the City to continue diversifying processes and involving a community private business to cooperatively divert useful byproducts from the county landfill; this project will extend the life of the county landfill and increase the beneficial uses of WWTP byproducts.

8. A description of any and all modifications to date including the amounts of each modification and the Contract Number associated with any modification to date. (List each modification separately.)

Modification No. 1 – funding for yard waste processing - \$2,100,000.00 – SWACO CN
Modification No. 2 – funding for ash processing - \$150,000.00 – EL008890
Modification No. 3 – funding for ash processing - \$150,000.00 – EL009842
Modification No. 4 – funding for ash and sludge processing - \$987,500.00 – EL011600
Modification No. 5 – continuation of EL011600 for sludge processing into 2012 - \$0.00

9. A full description of the work to be performed as part of the proposed contract modification. (Indicating the work to be a logical extension of the contract is not sufficient explanation.)

Contract Modification No. 6 work will include the processing of sewerage sludge, the processing of incinerator ash and the operation and maintenance of the City TWDF.

10. If the contract modification was not anticipated and explained in the original contract legislation a full explanation as to the reasons the work could not have been anticipated is required. (Changed or field conditions is not sufficient explanation. Describe in full the changed conditions that require modification of the contract scope and amount.)

Contract Modification No. 6 was anticipated and explained in the original contract legislation.

11. An explanation of why the work to be performed as part of the contract modification cannot be bid out. (Indicating the work to be a logical extension of the contract is not sufficient explanation.)

Contract Modification No. 6 work was designated as part of the original contract.

12. A cost summary to include the original contract amount, the cost of each modification to date (list each modification separately), the cost of the modification being requested in the legislation, the estimated cost of any future known modifications and a total estimate of the contract cost.

Original Contract Amount - \$0.00
Modification No. 1 - \$2,100,000.00
Modification No. 2 - \$150,000.00
Modification No. 3 - \$150,000.00
Modification No. 4 - \$987,500.00
Modification No. 5 - \$0.00
Modification No. 6 - \$1,556,250.00

13. An explanation of how the cost of the modification was determined.

Cost of Contract Modification No. 6 was determined in the original contract.

14. Sub-Consultants identified to work on this contract, their contract compliance no. & expiration date, and their status (NPO, MAJ, MBE, FBE, HL1, AS1, or MBR):

<u>Name</u>	<u>C.C. No./Exp. Date</u>	<u>Status</u>
N/A		

15. Scope of work for each subcontractor and their estimate of dollar value to be paid.

N/A