#### **DIRECTOR'S INFORMATION SHEET**

<u>Information to be included in all Legislation authorizing entering into a Contract:</u>

| 1.  | The names, contract compliance no. & expiration date, location by City/State and status f all companies (NPO, MAJ, MBE, FBE, HL1, AS1, or MBR) submitting a competitive id or submitting an RFP or RFSQ. |  |                |                    |           |
|-----|--|--|----------------|--------------------|-----------|
|     | Name   | C.C. No  | /Exp. Date     | City/State         | Status    |
| 2.  | What type of bidding p   | rocess was used (ITB, RF   | FP, RFSQ, Cor  | mpetitive Bid).    |           |
| 3.  | List the ranking and or  | der of all bidders.  |                |                    |           |
| 4.  | Complete address, cont   | act name and phone nun   | ber for the su | ccessful bidder o  | nly.      |
| 5.  |  | work to be performed in known phasing of the con   |                | description of w   | ork to be |
| 6.  |  | r the contract including<br>of the contract and a pro  |                |                    | d ending  |
| 7.  |  | the economic impact or input in the development of the project.  |                |                    |           |
| 8.  |  | cost of the Contract inclu<br>are contract modification  |                | te estimate of any | and all   |
| 9.  |  | ub-Consultants identified to work on this contract, their contract compliance no. & spiration date, and their status (NPO, MAJ, MBE, FBE, HL1, AS1, or MBR): |                |                    |           |
|     | Name   |  | C.C. No./Exp.  | Date               | Status    |
| 10. | Scope of work for each subcontractor and their estimate of dollar value to be paid.  |  |                |                    | aid.      |
|     | Name   | Role/scope   |                |                    | Cost      |
|     |  |  |                |                    |           |

#### <u>Information to be included in all Legislation Modifying a Contract:</u>

## 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.

| Name            | C.C. No./Exp. Date   | City/State   | <b>Status</b> |
|-----------------|----------------------|--------------|---------------|
| URS Corporation | 34-1709349 / 3-16-17 | Columbus, OH | MAJ           |
| CDM             | 04-2473650 / 12-4-16 | Columbus, OH | MAJ           |
| ms Consultants  | 34-6546916 / 3-7-16  | Columbus, OH | MAJ           |

### 2. What type of bidding process was used (ITB, RFP, RFSQ, Competitive Bid).

### 3. List the ranking and order of all bidders.

**URS** Corporation

CDM

ms Consultants

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

URS Corporation 277 W. Nationwide Blvd Columbus, Ohio 43215

Jeff Kerr, P.E. (614) 464-4500

### 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.

Original contract: The design of a 12-ft diameter tunnel including a 60-in diameter sanitary sewer.

Mod #1: The re-design of the tunnel utilizing a 78-in diameter along the original alignment including a 60-in diameter sanitary sewer.

Mod #2: The design of the new alignment required for the 78-in diameter tunnel along with the original 60-in sanitary sewer.

Mod #3 (Planned): Completion of a Value Engineering Study as well as engineering services during construction.

Mod #4 (Added future with this modification): Engineering services during construction.

#### 6. An updated contract timeline to contract completion.

Please see the attached schedule.

# 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.

This project is to be undertaken as part of the JEDD the City of Columbus entered into with Harrison Township and the Village of Ashville which will allow for the development of the Intermodal Facility and the 936+ acre area surrounding it.

## 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.)

| Original Engineering Costs:   | \$3,865,122.72 |
|---|----------------|
| Engineering Design Services Mod #1:                                 | \$1,326,630.00 |
| Engineering Design Services Mod #2:                                 | \$ 623,354.44  |
| Engineering Construction Services Mod #3:                           | \$1,104,972.92 |
| Added Future Engineering Construction Services Mod #4:              | \$1,000,000.00 |
| (for the remainder of the Engineering Services During Construction) |                |

TOTAL \$7,920,080.08

Modification #4 has been added because it was determined that the original estimate for engineering services during construction was based on 12 months instead of the anticipated 30 month construction schedule.

# 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.)

It should be noted that items 1 through 4 listed below are additional tasks that were added to the planned modification for engineering services during construction. It was requested that these items be added as a potential construction cost savings measure.

- 1. Conduct a Value Engineering (VE) study of the project.
- 2. Make any plan, specification or GBR changes required/recommended from the VE process.
- 3. Completion of an independent construction cost estimate.
- 4. Evaluate gravity connection options for Rickenbacker lift station 904 to the future LIS subtrunk.
- 5. Complete the required PTI permits.
- 6. Conduct the first 12 months of engineering services during construction as detailed in the attached scope document.

# 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.)

This was a planned and anticipated modification. Ordinance 2011-2012, passed by City Council on October 15, 2012, stated that a proposed future modification of \$1,000,000 which was anticipated to cover the cost of engineering services during construction. However, this modification has been increased to \$1,104,972.92, as presented in this ordinance; to not only cover the first 12 months of engineering services during construction, but also for an additional Value Engineering study, any potential project plan or GBR changes, the completion of an independent construction cost estimate and additional engineering to evaluate the future connection of lift station 904 to the subtrunk sewer. The estimated cost of these additional services is (including all subs) is \$344,904.32 which would leave \$760,068.60 for the first 12 months of engineering services during construction.

The VE study is intended to validate the design and determine if there are any cost or construction time saving measures that could be implemented before the project is bid. Additionally, a future Modification #4 for \$1,000,000 is proposed to cover the final 18 months of engineering services during construction.

### 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.)

Re-bid of the project under the new requirements will likely result in a higher project costs as much of the project history would be lost and required to be rediscovered by another consultant unless won by the same consultant. In such a case, we would have wasted significant time in acquiring and evaluating the new proposals without significant benefit.

# 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:                                     | \$3,865,122.72 |
|---|----------------|
| Mod #1:   | \$1,326,630.00 |
| Mod #2:   | \$ 623,354.44  |
| Mod #3: VE Study and engineering services during construction | \$1,104,972.92 |
| Added Mod #4: Engineering services during construction        | \$1,000,000.00 |
|   | \$7,920,080.08 |

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

The costs of Mod #3 were determined by negotiations between URS and DOSD.

### 14. <u>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>

| <u>Name</u>                         | C.C. No./Exp. Date   | <u>Status</u> |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| Eagon & Associates, Inc.            | 311152778 / 5-29-16  | MAJ           |
| Ronald E. Heuer                     | 318340525 / 2-14-16  | MAJ           |
| Snyder Engineering, LLC             | 841609851 / 2-18-16  | MAJ           |
| Gregg Korbin                        | 680068975 / 2-5-16   | MAJ           |
| Peregoy Construction Services, Inc. | Seeking Now          |               |
| Venegas Value Management Consultant | 583265259 / 6-1-17   | HIS           |
| H.R. Gray                           | 311050479 / 10-29-15 | MAJ           |
|                                     |                      |               |

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

Eagon & Associates – Will conduct all required well surveys, well monitoring, complaint investigations, remediation oversight and engineering support during construction. - \$73,598.00

Ronald E. Heuer – Will assist with the Value Engineering (VE) task. - \$18,900.00

Snyder Engineering, LLC – Will assist with the Value Engineering (VE) task. - \$16,095.00

Gregg Korbin – Will assist with the Value Engineering (VE) task. - \$18,406.00

Peregoy Construction Services, Inc. – Will assist with the Value Engineering (VE) task and conduct a third party construction estimate for the project. - \$18,700.00

Venegas Value Management Consultant – Will facilitate the Value Engineering (VE) task. - \$15,036.00

 $H.R.\ Gray-Will$  assist in assembling the bid documents, with review of the specifications, conduct a bid review, attend the prebid meeting and assist with the Value Engineering (VE) task. - \$60,688.00

Note: The Contract should be considered to include any and all work that is anticipated to be awarded to the company awarded the original contract throughout the contract/project timeline. This includes the original contract and any and all future anticipated modifications to the contract to complete the contract/project.

Updated as of 4-10-10