<u>Dana G. 'Buck' Rinehart Public Utilities Complex Exterior Site Improvements</u> CIP No. 690026-100010, Mod #2

<u>Information to be included in all Legislation Modifying a Contract:</u>

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.

Name	C.C. No./Exp. Date	City/State	Status
E.P. Ferris & Associates, Inc.	31-1194974 - 5/8/21	Columbus, OH	MAJ
Dynotec, Inc.	31-1319961	Columbus, OH	MBE
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	31-2167170	Columbus, OH	MAJ
DLZ, Ohio, Inc.	31-1268980	Columbus, OH	MAJ

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

Requests for Proposals (RFP's) were opened on October 17, 2014.

3. List the ranking and order of all bidders.

- 1. E.P. Ferris & Associates, Inc.
- 2. Dynotec, Inc.
- 3. Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.
- 4. DLZ Ohio, Inc.

4. <u>Complete address, contact name, phone number, e-mail address, and contract number(s)</u> for the successful bidder only.

E.P. Ferris & Associates, Inc. (DAX #4823)

880 King Avenue, Columbus, OH 43212

Matthew E. Ferris, PE, PS, President, (614) 299-2999, mferris@epferris.com

Original CT: EL016759; Mod #1: PO067574

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. The planning area should also be listed as well as any street or neighborhood names.

The purpose of this project is to implement the first phase of improvements to the Public Utilities Complex according to a master site plan.

The original contract included the design of the master plan for the project.

Modification No. 1 included a Space Needs Assessment, the design of the master stormwater plan, fuel station upgrades, a material storage facility to replace the salt barn, and a wash out station that were recommended in the Master Plan.

Future phases of implementing the site master plan are yet to be determined and will require a new RFP for design services.

6. An updated contract timeline to contract completion.

a. The original agreement allowed for a total term of how many years? (ex. 4 year term) The term of the original contract was 9 months.

- **b.** Which year of the total term is this modification for? (ex. year 2 of 4 year term). This Modification No. 2 is being requested beyond the term of the original contract.
- **c.** The expiration date of this agreement is to be determined. Part of the Engineer's contract is to provide record drawings after the construction of this project, therefore, the contract completion date cannot be determined at this 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.

The goal of this project is to improve the conditions of the exterior site for the Dana G. 'Buck' Rinehart Public Utilities Complex. These improvements will provide for a safer and more efficient work environment for the employees of and visitors to the complex. If the current issues with the facility's site are not resolved, further deterioration of the pavement will occur and drainage issues will worsen, which can lead to increased safety concerns.

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 (Phase 1 Detailed Design) - \$806,338.79; EL016759 Modification No. 2 (current) - \$232,284.34; PO067574

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.)

Modification No. 2 (current) will include technical project representation during construction of the Phase 1 improvements and design for both a sewer lift station and retaining wall not previously identified as project requirements.

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 (No. 2) is a result of changes to the site master plan necessary to comply with the city's stormwater design standards. The site master plan called for an openair soil spoils stockpile area with hose for washing soil out of dump truck beds, but it was later determined that this area must be covered and drain to a sanitary sewer. The implementation of this design change requires the installation of a sanitary sewer lift station and retaining wall.

This contract modification also includes technical representation services during construction will be necessary to approve contractor submittals and respond to contractor requests for information. These services were not included previously with the contract.

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.)

This work is integrated with the ongoing design of Phase I improvements to the public utilities complex and involves unique knowledge of the project which an additional design consultant would not possess.

ORD #1752-2019

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.

Original Contract (Master Plan Design) - \$299,029.61 Modification No. 1 (Phase 1 Detailed Design) - \$806,338.79 Modification No. 2 (Current) - \$232,284.34

Total Cost = \$1,337,652.74

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

Cost proposals were provided by E.P. Ferris & Associates, Inc., reviewed by the Division of Water, and were deemed acceptable.