

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>
DLZ Ohio, Inc.	31-1268980: 2/22/13	Columbus, OH	MBR
ms consultants	34-6546916: 5/27/12	Columbus, OH	MAJ
R.D. Zande (now Stantec)	11-2167170: 12/17/11	Columbus, OH	MAJ

2. **What type of bidding process was used (ITB, RFP, RFSO, Competitive Bid).**
Requests for Proposals (RFPs) were received January 22, 2001.
3. **List the ranking and order of all bidders.**
DLZ ranked highest followed by ms consultants and RD Zande
4. **The name, address, contact name, phone number and contract number of the firm awarded the original contract.**
DLZ Ohio, Inc
6121 Huntley Rd.
Columbus, OH 43229-1003
David Day (614)848-4141
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 of Raw Water Line (RWL) to connect new South Wellfield to the Parsons Avenue Water Plant (original contract 1964-2001 EA025197-002). Original contract assumed waterline to be installed in right-of-way (outside pavement) of SR 23, ODOT changed policy after original alignment was designed disallowing longitudinal occupation of right-of-way. Modification No. 1 allowed for redesign to place RWL outside of right-of-way requiring easements. Modification No. 2 allowed for submission of steel pipe in the bids, which required geotechnical work and plant changes, and additional coordination with ODOT was required due to upcoming work in the same area.

Current modification is to perform services during bidding and construction for Part 1 of the project, along with easement acquisition and survey services during the land acquisition phase of Part 2 of the project. Original contract was anticipated to be completed in 2004, at time of Modification No. 1 project was anticipated to be completed in 2007. With Modification No. 2, the project was bid in July 2011 and executed in October 2011 under emergency legislation due to future ODOT work planned in the same area.

A future contract modification will be required to complete the plans and specification for Part 2 of the project to extend the Raw Waterline into Pickaway County. This project has been shifted out several years due to reductions in projected water demand.

6. An updated contract timeline to contract completion.

Part 1 was bid in July 2011, with a Notice to Proceed in October 2011. Construction is expected to last through September 2012. Part 2 Land Acquisition began in March 2011.

Part 2 is currently scheduled for construction in 2016. A contract modification will be required to complete bid document preparation and to perform engineering services during construction at that time.

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 necessary to meet anticipated demand projections for the Parsons Avenue Water Plant service area. The PAWP is an essential and integral component in the Columbus area water supply and treatment infrastructure. Adequate supply of water is essential to economic growth and development.

This project was developed as a result of the Water Beyond 2000 plan. Water Beyond 2000 included extensive public meetings and notifications. There were specific meetings related to the South Wellfield Expansion of which this project is a component.

Portions of the raw waterline installation that are located within main intersections will be installed by jack and bore to minimize impacts on traffic and the public.

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 (1848-2005, EL005785, \$295,499.94) allowed for redesign to place RWL outside of right-of-way which required preparation of easement documents. Contract modification also allowed for additional site survey, telemetry design and services during construction.

Modification No. 2 (1450-2010, EL011348, \$150,838.93) allowed for geotechnical investigation and evaluation, ODOT Coordination activities, and additional design activities.

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.)

Current modification is to perform services during bidding and construction for Part 1 of the project, along with easement acquisition and survey services during the land acquisition phase of Part 2 of the project. Original contract was anticipated to be completed in 2004, at time of Modification No. 1 project was anticipated to be completed in 2007. With Modification No. 2, the project was bid in July 2011 and executed in October 2011 under emergency legislation due to future ODOT work planned in the same area.

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.)

The original contract and modifications focused on the design and conditions that impacted the design, such as the new alignment out of the ODOT right-of-way and geotechnical investigations to allow for the submission of steel pipe. As the project progressed into construction, the bidding and construction portion of the contract did not account for the

additional work required for new corrosion requirements, for coordination with the Professional Construction Management Team (PCM), or for additional information necessary as a part of the land acquisition process.

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.)

The current consultant is familiar with the project and has completed all the work to date on the plans as well as attended all the coordination meetings with ODOT. Bidding the work to another consultant will further delay the project and will probably result in higher costs due to bringing the new consultant up to speed on the project.

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.

CONTRACT AMOUNT:

Original contract amount	\$460,284.00
Modification No.1	\$295,499.94
Modification No. 2	\$150,838.93
Modification No. 3	\$129,076.33
<u>Future Modification No. 4 (2016)</u>	<u>\$300,000.00</u>
New contract amount	\$1,335,699.20

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

The Consultant prepared a detailed estimate of cost per task for remaining scope of work, broken down by project phase. The Consultant also prepared a cost for all work that was performed outside the original scope of work. City Project management staff reviewed and approved these cost summaries.

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