Information to be included in all Legislation Modifying Contracts:

The names, location by City/State and status of all companies submitting a competitive bid or submitting an RFP or RFSQ for the original contract

Name	City/State	Majority/MBE/FBE
DLZ Ohio	Columbus, Ohio	Majority
Brown & Caldwell	Columbus, Ohio	Majority
Metcalf & Eddy	Columbus, Ohio	Majority

The name of the firm awarded the original contract and the Contract Number. DLZ Ohio – EL004058

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.

This contract is for professional engineering services for the rehabilitation of approximately 6,000 LF of 30" sanitary sewer. This particular sewer is in Glen Echo Ravine, an environmentally sensitive area.

An updated contract timeline to contract completion.

Plans and specifications will be completed in 2007 after further input from residents and community groups. Pending land acquisition, the project will be bid for construction in 2008.

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)

No previous modifications to contract.

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 bring a stream restoration expert, FMSM, onto the team. This subcontractor will address the multitude of concerns raised by residents and community groups. Specifically, the subconsultant will perform a geomorphic survey of the project site, generate ravine restoration plans, obtain a USACE Nationwide permit, perform an ecological assessment, and assist the City and DLZ at a second public meeting.

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.)

There has been an overwhelming interest from the community in this project. At an initial public meeting, they raised specific concerns about ravine and stream restoration that require specialized services well beyond our typical scope. To satisfy community concerns and be environmentally friendly in the sensitive ravine, it is in the best interest of the City to go above and beyond in our restoration planning efforts for this project.

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 City and DLZ solicited three proposals for this work. FMSM and Biohabitats submitted proposals; Oxbow chose not to respond. FMSM had a clearly defined approach that will accomplish our goals on this project. In addition, their's was the lowest fee.

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 - \$342,069.68 No previous contract modifications This modification request - \$60,651.70 No known or anticipated future contract modifications

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.

11-2-06