

**Information to be included in all Legislation Modifying Contracts:
For Ordinance No. 0331-2006**

The names of all companies bidding, or submitting an RFP or RFSQ, for the original contract.

1. Mid-Ohio Pipeline, Inc
2. Fields Excavating, Inc.
3. Hockran Excavating, Inc.
4. Darby Creek Excavating, Inc.

The location by City and State of all companies bidding, or submitting an RFP or RFSQ, for the original contract.

1. Mid-Ohio Pipeline, Inc| Lexington, OH
2. Fields Excavating, Inc.| Kitts Hill, OH
3. Hockran Excavating, Inc.| Andover, OH
4. Darby Creek Excavating, Inc.,| Circleville, OH

The status, Majority, MBE, FBE, of all companies bidding, or submitting an RFP or RFSQ, for the original contract.

1. Mid-Ohio Pipeline, Inc.| Active/Male/White Status
2. Fields Excavating, Inc.| Active/Male/White Status
3. Hockran Excavating, Inc.| Inactive/Male/White Status
4. Darby Creek Excavating, Inc.| Active/Male/White Status

The name and location of the firm awarded the original contract and the Contract Number.

Mid-Ohio Pipeline, Inc.| P.O. Box 3049| Lexington, OH 44904| EL002260

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 to change the discharge point of the Castle Road Sanitary Pump Station from a combined sewer (OSIS) to a separate sanitary sewer (Scioto Main) at Frank Road/S.R.104 at I-71 has been completed.

An updated contract timeline to contract completion.

The contract work has been completed.

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)

Contract Modification No. 1| City Auditor's Contract No. EL003775| \$341,684.83

This modification funded Change Order No. 1 through an Ohio Water Development Authority Supplemental Loan. This change order authorized changing the installation method under I-71 from directional drilling to a cased-auger bore. The directional drilling installation method was attempted but encountered an unforeseen obstruction causing the drilling reamer to become stuck under I-71. A portion of the HDPE pipe force main material was removed from the bore hole. Several other directional drilling routes were attempted but met with a similar resistance near the same location relative to I-71. The design professional/CM/Resident Project Representative and the contractor considered other boring/tunneling options and selected the next most economical installation method which was the cased-auger bore.

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)

Contract Modification No. 2| As authorized by this Ordinance| \$153,240.00

While performing the cased-auger bore, the alignment encountered a pocket of flowing sand. This was located under the traveled lanes of I-71. The void was immediately grouted to prevent any settlement and the advance of the auger bore was stopped. Consideration of the possibility of encountering additional pockets of flowing sand with the auger bore method led to this second change order to perform the installation by a method called pipe ramming. Pipe ramming does not maintain an open face at the heading and therefore any sand pocket encountered could not flow into the casing pipe and create a void.

These changed conditions were not indicated by adjacent work and soil borings taken for the adjacent projects. The adjacent project soils information was utilized by the design professional in his determination that directional drilling was a feasible method(bid) and a cased-auger bore was a feasible substitute (Change Order #1). The soils information was supplemented with geotechnical observations at two adjacent large diameter tunnel installations. One under Frank Road/ S.R. 104 west of I-71 and just north of the force main alignment and one under I-71 just south of the force main alignment.

The ODOT District 6 was contacted during the design process and would not consider installation of the force main within the Frank Road/S.R. 104 right-of-way under I-71.

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.)

While performing the cased-auger bore, the alignment encountered a pocket of flowing sand. This was located under the traveled lanes of I-71. The void was immediately grouted to prevent any settlement and the advance of the auger bore was stopped. Consideration of the possibility of encountering additional pockets of flowing sand with the auger bore method led to this second change order to perform the installation by a method called pipe ramming. Pipe ramming does not maintain an open face at the heading and therefore any sand pocket encountered could not flow into the casing pipe and create a void.

These changed conditions were not indicated by adjacent work and soil borings taken for the adjacent projects. The adjacent project soils information was utilized by the design professional in his determination that directional drilling was a feasible method(bid) and a cased-auger bore was a feasible substitute (Change Order #1). The soils information was supplemented with geotechnical observations at two adjacent large diameter tunnel installations. One under Frank Road/ S.R. 104 west of I-71 and just north of the force main alignment and one under I-71 just south of the force main alignment.

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 contractor had his excavation shored for the work. If this modification had been put out for bid the existing contractor would have had to remove his shoring (at our expense) and the successful bidder would then have had to replace the same which would have been included in his bid price. Also, the successful bid modification contractor would include his mobilization costs. The existing contractor had several items of equipment mobilized for the cased-auger bore and had purchased the casing pipe for the cased auger bore which was utilized for the pipe

ramming operation. Thus, bidding the modification would have resulted in additional expense to the project.

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: EL002260| \$243,422.64

Contract Modification No. 1: EL003775| \$341,684.83

This Contract Modification No. 2: TBD| \$153,240.00 (This is the final contract mod.)

Total Contract Amount: \$783,347.47

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.

6/20/05