

**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.**

<b><u>Name</u></b>	<b><u>C.C. No./Exp. Date</u></b>	<b><u>City/State</u></b>	<b><u>Status</u></b>
AECOM (f.k.a. Metcalf & Eddy of Ohio, Inc.)	22-2581306-5/28/10	Columbus, Ohio	MAJ
CH2M Hill (f.k.a. BBS Corporation)	59-0918189/5/15/10	Columbus, Ohio	MAJ
Camp Dresser & McKee	04-2473650-4/11/10	Columbus, Ohio	MAJ
Malcolm Pirnie, Inc.	13-2653703-4/7/10	Columbus, Ohio	MAJ

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

A total of four (4) statements were received in response to the advertised Request for Statement of Qualifications (RFSQ) in January 2002.

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

Metcalf and Eddy of Ohio, Inc (kna AECOM) was ranked as the most responsive based on the quality, feasibility, and comprehensiveness of their proposal. At the time of the original consultant selection in 2002 only the top offeror was selected, ranking of all other offerors was not performed.

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

AECOM (f.k.a. Metcalf & Eddy of Ohio, Inc.)  
2800 Corporate Exchange Drive, Suite 300  
Columbus, OH 43231  
Cheryl L. Green, P.E., (614) 890-5501  
CC#: 22-2581306  
Original CT#: EL003668  
Modification #1: EL005793

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.**

As per the recommendations of the Water beyond 2000 project, the original contract provided for a production study to evaluate the feasibility and changes required to increase the current design capacity of the Dublin Road Water Plant from 65 MGD to 90 MGD, while maintaining water quality and compliance with existing and future regulatory requirements. Full scale and pilot scale demonstrations required by the Ohio EPA for approval were to be authorized by a planned future modification (as anticipated in the original legislation). Contract Modification No. 1 provided for the design, bidding services, construction assistance, plant operation, data analysis and reporting for the Pilot Plant Study. This proposed contract modification (Contract Modification No. 2) will cover the cost relating to additional construction services, additional startup and operation services, and analysis of additional alternatives proposed by the Comprehensive Master Planning Team (CMPT), that have varied from the initial concept and beyond the original scope of the contract. No future phases of this project are anticipated.

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

The contract completion date for construction, startup, pilot plant operation, and decommissioning is August 28, 2010. The engineering services will be completed within three months of the completion of the construction work.

**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 \$3,380,238.00, EL005793, Ordinance No. 1873-2005 approved by City Council December 12, 2005. Modification No. 1 (as anticipated in the original legislation) provided for the design, bidding services, construction assistance, plant operation, data analysis and reporting for the Pilot Plant Study.

**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.)**

This contract modification will provide for additional construction services, additional startup and operation services, and analysis of additional alternatives proposed by the Comprehensive Master Planning Team (CMPT) due to design details and field conditions not known when preparing the scope of work. Added complexities that have been of significant impact to the amount of construction services required include:

- Building footprint increased, two roof levels (high-bay) and interior rooms added
- Building site moved due to size and utilities
- Auger cast pile foundation required due to poor bearing capacity of soil
- Buried construction debris discovered during construction of significant size and quantity
- Site location adjacent to rail spur posed grading restrictions, required design of a retaining wall foundation, and required close observation of construction activities
- Additional construction testing services required due to the site conditions and structural design
- Raw water line alignment revised due to process constraints requiring a complex temporary route and increased coordination effort
- Electrical duct banks and transformer increased
- Addition of a separate chemical storage building, raw water feed tank and pumps, discharge routing/monitoring manhole, external buried tanks and pump system for spent wash water and residuals, increased piping and controls for recirculation options, separate HVAC systems with firewall separation, multiple electrical panels and control systems, and increased complexity of process control and operation

The startup and operation services include the addition of a high-level Operations Specialist to spend 6-8 weeks preparing for and assisting with plant startup, and to direct the operations on site for the first six months, ensuring the efficiency and accuracy of operation and data collection. After the first 6 months of operation, the Operations Specialist will hand off operations management to the Senior Operations Engineer to lead the day-to-day work for the remaining 6 months. Some additional subconsultant effort is also included to cover high workload / weekend / holiday coverage for the required 24/7 operation. Also included are additional sampling and laboratory testing for the monitoring of additional emerging contaminants of concern, and redundant testing for quality assurance.

Under separate contract, one of the directives given to the Comprehensive Master Plan Team (CMPT) was to identify possible cost savings approaches for new projects, as well as for projects already underway. Two additional alternatives suggested by the CMPT are to be evaluated by AECOM on the same basis as the original alternatives were evaluated, in order to achieve a meaningful comparison of full scale construction and O&M costs to the previously evaluated alternatives on a present worth basis. The results of this comparison will be used to determine whether to pursue evaluation of one or possibly both of these alternatives through piloting.

**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.)**

At the time Contract Modification No. 1 was proposed (October 25, 2005) and approved (February 14, 2006), the scope was outlined and estimated on the basis of the extent of detail described in the Study and Evaluation Report. All that was known at that time concerning construction details was what appeared on the Process Schematic and Concept Floor Space Plan for the Pilot Plant. The permanent building design was based on the concept that the building would be a pre-engineered structure requiring little input from the process engineer. The complexities of the actual building configuration, soils conditions and resulting foundation requirements, and site / utility routes and interferences were not identified at the time the contract modification was proposed. The pilot system design was based on the 3 basic process trains shown on the concept schematic being essentially delivered as vendor-furnished skids and control systems that would be interconnected in the field. The complexities of piping and controls, and the addition of equalization and recirculation of waste flows back through the pilot processes, were not yet identified at the time of the contract modification estimate. The following items from the Contract Task 3 scope substantiate that the detail process scheme was not developed at the time of the contract modification proposal. Due to the untraditional nature of this project, in that it is comprised of multiple vendor-supplied equipment and control systems and also requires a commitment of ongoing responsibility throughout pilot operation and ultimate system demolition, the contractor has had more questions and more need for coordination than anticipated in a traditional project. This is not even a typical pilot project because of its size and the multiple process trains. Just as the design fee could not be accurately estimated until the study and conceptual design were completed, the extent of construction assistance could not be accurately predicted until the detail design was complete. In October 2005, Contract Modification No.1 was proposed to carry the DRWP Increase Evaluation and Study through the piloting phase in order to lead the City to a selected technology for the future water plant expansion. A typical 2-week period was included for plant startup. The operation of the pilot plant was based solely on a preliminary process schematic and a preliminary building footprint available at the time of the Modification negotiation. Just as the construction assistance was difficult to estimate without a detail design, the operational requirements for the pilot plant were estimated without the benefit of a detail design. During the course of design, additional thought has evolved with respect to the specific personnel assignments for startup and operation of the pilot plant, particularly with the addition of quality assurance testing and sampling for additional parameters.

**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 process of selecting and contracting with a new consultant team at this time would further delay the project. This modification keeps the construction project on schedule to finalize the Dublin Road Water Plant Pilot Study. The contract was well under way when these design decisions were made. The consultant team is very familiar with the details of the project, the approving agencies and the bid documents. The additional cost and time associated with bidding out this work would well exceed any benefit.

**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	\$ 485,125.00
Modification #1	\$3,380,238.00
Modification #2 (current request)	<u>\$ 926,888.00</u>
Current new contract amount	\$4,792,251.00

**12. 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. City Project management staff reviewed and approved these cost summaries.

**13. 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):**

<b><u>Name</u></b>	<b><u>C.C. No./Exp. Date</u></b>	<b><u>Status</u></b>
Dynotec, Inc.	31-1319961-5/13/11	M1A
WM Engineering	30-1409153-12/6/09	MAJ
Donahue Ideas, LLC	06-1716807-6/11/11	F1
Prime Engineering & Architecture, Inc.	31-1373357-4/8/10	F1
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	11-2167170-1/7/10	MAJ
Water Treatment Operation & Maintenance Consulting	98-0507125-6/11/11	MAJ

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

Dynotec, Inc.	On-site project representative	\$ 40,000
WM Engineering	Electrical engineering assistance	\$ 12,000
Donahue Ideas	Pilot operation staff	\$ 80,000
Prime Engineering & Architecture, Inc.	Pilot Data Management	\$ 0 addl.
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	Pilot laboratory analyses	\$ 50,000
Water Treatment Operation & Maintenance Consulting	Pilot Operation Management	\$ 130,000