

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 RFSO.**

<u>Name</u>	<u>C.C. No./Exp. Date</u>	<u>City/State</u>	<u>Status</u>
Burgess & Niple, Inc.	31-0885550 – 12/10/10	Columbus, Oh	Majority
C.T. Consultants, Inc.	01-3633425 (expired)	Columbus, Oh	?
DLZ Oh, Inc.	31-1268980 – 3/10/11	Columbus, Oh	MBR
Dynotec, Inc.	31-1319961 – 5/13/11	Columbus, Oh	M1A
EMH&T, Inc.	31-0685594 – 9/21/11	Columbus, Oh	Majority
MS Consultants, Inc.	34-6546916 – 5/27/12	Columbus, Oh	Majority
Prime Engr. & Arch., Inc.	31-1373357 – 3/31/12	Westerville, Oh	F1
Resource International, Inc.	31-0669793 – 6/3/12	Columbus, Oh	F1
W.E. Stilson Consult. Group	31-1702689 – 8/28/10	Columbus, Oh	Majority
URS Corporation – Ohio	34-0939859 – 8/28/11	Columbus, Oh	Majority
Woolpert Constr. Ser., LLC	20-1391406 – 6/29/11	Columbus, Oh	Majority
Stantec Consult. Ser., Inc (formerly R.D. Zande)	11-2167170 – 12/17/11	Columbus, Oh	Majority

- 2. What type of bidding process was used (ITB, RFP, RFSO, Competitive Bid).**

The Department undertook a successful Request for Proposal process in accordance with Section 329.12 of the Columbus City Codes in an effort to find three firms to provide an ongoing source of technical personnel to supplement existing city inspection personnel that are required to protect its customers' investment in its sanitary sewer and water infrastructures. Based upon an evaluation of the twelve proposals received for the three construction administration and inspection contracts to be awarded for the years of 2008-2010, utilizing predetermined criteria, a selection committee submitted the rankings to the Director of Public Utilities.

- 3. List the ranking and order of all bidders.**

The Director of Public Utilities determined that DLZ Ohio, Inc., Prime Engineering & Architects, Inc., and Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. were the highest ranking firms capable of providing the required services.

- 4. The name, address, contact name, phone number and contract number of the firm awarded the original contract.**

Prime Engineering and Architecture, Inc.
 470 Olde Worthington Road, Suite 325
 Westerville, Ohio 43082
 Telephone: (614) 839-0250
 Fax: (614) 839-0251
 Contact: Sugu Suguness, P.E., E-mail: sugu@primeeng.com
 EL008273

- 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.**

The work includes furnishing professional services for Construction Administration Services during 2008-2010 on projects for the Division of Power and Water (DOPW) and the Division of Sewerage and Drainage (DOSD). The work includes full time or part time construction administration services including resident project inspection for the specific project identified. In general the consultant will respond to the contractor's requests for information, respond to inquiries regarding the interpretation of the contract documents, review contractors claims for additional services and costs, review quality or materials/equipment substitutions and provide recommendations to the City, coordinate project submittals, schedule and chair progress meetings, and other services as directed by the City.

The original contract included services for the Morse Road Booster Station, River South Phase I, and Clintonville Private Source I/I Lateral Lining projects.

Modification 1 included services for the Short Street Demolition and Remediation Project and the NW Alum Creek Wet Weather Renovations Project.

Modification 2 included services for the OSIS Downtown Odor Control Project, the Group Three Water Line Improvements Project, and the Reservoir Pollution Reduction Project.

Modification 3 included services for the Alton-Darby Road 12-inch Water Main, Phase II and the Clime Road Water Line Improvements.

Modification 4 will include services for the Miscellaneous Booster Station Improvements – Morrison Road project.

6. An updated contract timeline to contract completion.

The original contract was for a duration of three years beginning in 2008 and ending in 2010. The specific duration of services on each project will be as negotiated between the contracting agency and the consultant. There is one Division of Power & Water project involved with this modification: Miscellaneous Booster Station Improvements – Morrison Road with a duration of 270 calendar days.

7. 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 in the amount of \$915,000.00 provided services for the Short Street Demolition and Remediation Project and the NW Alum Creek Wet Weather Renovations Project.
- Modification No. 2 in the amount of \$1,314,516.15 provided services for the OSIS Downtown Odor Control Project, the Group Three Water Line Improvements Project, and the Reservoir Pollution Reduction Project.
- Modification No. 3 in the amount of \$221,556.16 provided services for the Alton-Darby Road 12-inch Water Main, Phase II and the Clime Road Water Line Improvements.
- Modification No. 4 in the amount of \$85,115.25 provided services for the Miscellaneous Booster Station Improvements – Morrison Road Project.

8. 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.)

The work includes furnishing professional services for Construction Administration and Inspection for the Division of Power and Water (DOPW) for the Miscellaneous Booster Station Improvements – Morrison Road project.

9. 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.)

The modification was anticipated and explained in the original legislation.

10. 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.)

The original contract selected three firms to provide construction administration services for projects in 2008, 2009, and 2010.

11. 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:	\$ 540,000.00
Modification 1	\$ 915,000.00
Modification 2	\$1,314,516.15
Modification 3	\$ 221,566.19
Modification 4 (current)	\$ 85,115.25
Total (Orig. + Mods 1 - 4)	\$3,076,197.59

Future modifications are anticipated, but unknown at this time.

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

A cost proposal was provided by Prime Engineering and Architecture, Inc., reviewed by the DOPW, and was deemed acceptable.