Information to be included in all Legislation Modifying a Contract:

1. <u>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.</u>

| Name | C.C. No./Exp. Date | City/State | <u>Status</u> |
|--|----------------------|----------------|---------------|
| CH2M Hill Engineers, Inc. (fka BBS Corp) | 32-0100027: 1/7/15 | Columbus, OH | MAJ |
| ARCADIS US Inc. (fka Malcolm Pirnie) | 57-0373224: 8/25/13 | Columbus, OH | MAJ |
| Burgess & Niple, inc. | 31-0885550: 10/4/14 | Columbus, OH | MAJ |
| CDM (now CDM Smith) | 04-2473650: 5/23/14 | Cambridge, MA | MAJ |
| DLZ Ohio, Inc. | 31-1268980: 2/19/15 | Columbus, OH | ASN |
| URS Corporation - Ohio | 34-0939859: 7/28/13 | Columbus, OH | MAJ |
| ms consultants, inc. | 34-6546916: 4/5/14 | Columbus, OH | MAJ |
| AECOM (fka Metcalf & Eddy) | 95-2661922: 10/11/14 | Columbus, OH | MAJ |
| Stantec Consulting Svcs. (fka R.D Zande) | 11-2167170: 12/21/13 | Columbus, OH | MAJ |
| Tetra Tech | 95-4148514: Inactive | New Albany, OH | MAJ |
| SEI | 31-1105116: Inactive | Powell, OH | MAJ |

2. <u>What type of bidding process was used (ITB, RFP, RFSQ, Competitive Bid).</u> Requests for Proposals (RFP's) were received on August 25, 2004.

3. List the ranking and order of all bidders.

Only the following three Offerors were invited to submit Technical Proposals:

- 1. CH2M Hill Engineers, Inc. (fka BBS Corp)
- 2. ARCADIS US Inc. (fka Malcolm Pirnie)
- 3. Burgess & Niple, Inc.
- 4. <u>The name, address, contact name, phone number and contract number of the firm</u> <u>awarded the original contract.</u>

CH2M Hill Engineers, Inc. (fka BBS Corp) 1103 Schrock Rd., Suite 400 Columbus, Ohio 43229 Lisa Gourley; (614) 825-6725 Original contract number EL005320, Ord. No. 0474-2005

5. <u>A description of work performed to date as part of the contract and a full description of</u> work to be performed during any future phasing of the contract.

The original contract provided for the preliminary and detailed design of the HCWP Sludge Pump Station Renovations and Electrical Upgrades.

Modification No. 1 provided for the construction administration and construction inspection services for this project.

Modification 2 reimbursed funds that provided for the immediate response to the Ohio EPA due to lime sludge spills from the HCWP sludge force main. Modification 2 also provided a pilot project requested by DPU Asset Management to assist in their development of an O&M Ready specification for their reliability centered maintenance initiative and to meet new DPU Asset Management requirements.

Modification 3 will provide the engineering services required to replace the quarry pumps.

6. <u>An updated contract timeline to contract completion.</u>

The contract will be completed with the completion of the project record documents and O&M manuals which the Consultant has estimated to be October 2013.

7. <u>A narrative discussing the economic impact or economic advantages of the project;</u> <u>community outreach or input in the development of the project; and any environmental</u> <u>factors or advantages of the project.</u>

It is necessary to replace the Hap Cremean Water Plant quarry pumps due to repeated failures. These pumps are critical to the water treatment process because they dispose of the sludge produced during the water treatment process by pumping it to the McKinley Ave Quarry. The lagoon pumps have been used as backup when the quarry pumps have failed but they pump the sludge to the nearby lagoons which need to be cleaned when they are filled. Removing the sludge from the lagoons and trucking it to the McKinley Ave Quarry is more expensive than pumping the sludge directly. Installing new quarry pumps is more cost effective than using the lagoon pumps to dispose of the sludge. Sludge disposal is a critical part of the water treatment process and is necessary to provide an adequate and safe supply of drinking water which is essential to economic growth and development.

8. <u>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.)</u>

Modification No. 1 - Ord. No. 2053-2006, EL006687, \$4,318,963.00 Modification No. 2 - Ord. No. 0300-2011, EL011632 (replaced EL012075 due to name change), \$1,653,740.00 Current modification (Mod No. 3) - \$108,520.00

9. <u>A full description of the work to be performed as part of the proposed contract</u> <u>modification. (Indicating the work to be a logical extension of the contract is not</u> <u>sufficient explanation.)</u>

This contract modification will provide the engineering services needed to select and recommend new quarry pumps to replace the existing quarry pumps. It will also provide the construction administration and construction inspection services needed for the quarry pump replacement, the engineering services to update the record documents, and the services to revise the quarry pump online training course.

- 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 contract modification was not anticipated because the repeated failures of the quarry pumps did not occur until after Modification No. 2 was executed.
- 11. <u>An explanation of why the work to be performed as part of the contract modification</u> <u>cannot be bid out. (Indicating the work to be a logical extension of the contract is not</u> <u>sufficient explanation.)</u>

The current consultant is familiar with the project and has completed all the engineering work to date on the project. Going through the process to select another consultant would further delay the selection and installation of the quarry pumps which are critical to the Hap Cremean Water Plant treatment process and would result in higher costs due to bringing the

new consultant up to speed on the project. Delaying the installation of new quarry pumps would increase the risk of additional failures to the existing pumps which would result in additional expensive repair costs and possible need to pump sludge to the lagoons. Pumping sludge to the lagoons results in more frequent cleaning of the lagoons and higher costs.

12. <u>A cost summary to include the original contract amount, the cost of each modification</u> 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

| estimate of the contract cost. | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | |
| \$2,150,597.00 | | | |
| \$4,318,963.00 | | | |
| \$1,653,740.00 | | | |
| <u>\$ 108,520.00</u> | | | |
| \$8,231,820.00 | | | |
| | | | |

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

The consultant prepared an estimate based on the scope of work for this contract modification. City staff reviewed and approved this cost estimate.