August 10, 2012

TO: Mayor and Members of Council
FROM: Denise Turner Roth, City Manager
SUBJECT: Items for Your Information

Council Follow-Up Items
- **Best and Final Offer Process for Recycling Proposals**
  As a follow-up to a request from Council at the August 6, 2012 City Council Meeting, attached is a memorandum from Field Operations Director Dale Wyrick, dated August 10, 2012, providing the best and final offer process for recyclables proposals.
- **RFP# 08-12 for MSW Management Services: GBB Evaluation Update**
  As a follow-up to a request from Council at the August 6, 2012 City Council Meeting, attached is a memorandum from Field Operations Director Dale Wyrick, dated August 10, 2012, providing an update on the evaluation of proposals by Gersman, Brickner and Bratton, Inc. (GBB).
- **Original Recycling Contract Consultant**
  As a follow-up to a request from Councilmember Wade at the August 6, 2012 City Council meeting, attached is a memorandum from Field Operations Director Dale Wyrick, dated August 10, 2012, regarding who was responsible for establishing our initial recycling contract.
- **City’s Recycling Program**
  As a follow-up to a request from Councilmember Bellamy-Small at the August 6, 2012 City Council meeting, attached is a memorandum from Solid Waste Division Manager Sheldon Smith, dated August 10, 2012, providing a summary of the City’s recycling program.
- **Change Order on Construction Contracts**
  As a follow-up to a request from Councilmember Wade at the August 6, 2012 City Council meeting, attached is a memorandum from City Engineer Ted Partrick, dated August 10, 2012, providing a summary on construction contract awarded and the prevalence of change orders on construction contracts for FY 2009 through FY 2012.

**NCA&T Stormwater Improvements Change Order**
Attached is a memorandum from Water Resources Director Steven Drew, dated August 7, 2012, regarding a change order for the NCA&T Stormwater Improvement project, which has incurred cost over-runs that require Council’s approval. This will be on the agenda at an upcoming Council meeting.

**Contact Center Feedback**
Attached is the weekly report generated by our Contact Center for the week of July 30, 2012 through August 3, 2012.
Small Group Meetings
Attached is the weekly Small Group Meeting report for the week of August 3, 2012 through August 9, 2012.

DTR/mm
Attachments

cc: Office of the City Manager
    Global Media Distribution
August 10, 2012

TO: Denise Turner Roth, City Manager

FROM: Dale Wyrick, P.E., Field Operations Director

SUBJECT: Best and Final Offer Process for RFP #11-12: Processing and Marketing of Recovered Recyclables for the City of Greensboro

The purpose of this memo is to provide you with an update on the evaluation of proposals received in response to RFP #11-12 Processing and Marketing of Recovered Recyclables. Per City Council direction on August 6, 2012, the City will accept best and final offers from ReCommunity and Waste Management for further evaluation.

The proposed timeline for this process is as follows:

- Issuance of Best and Final Price Forms to Contractors: 8/13/12
  (Note: Both companies have been provided with DRAFT Price Forms for their review; those comments are due back to me by noon Monday, 8/13/12)

- Best and Final Price Offers Due: 8/20/12

- Staff Interviews for Both Companies: Week of 8/27/12 (specific dates and times TBD)

- City Council Work Session: 9/10/12 (Both companies will present to the Council at this work session)

- Council Selects Vendor: 9/18/12

If further is required, please advise.

DDW
August 10, 2012

TO: Denise Turner Roth, City Manager

FROM: Dale Wyrick, P.E., Field Operations Director

SUBJECT: RFP# 08-12 for MSW Management Services: GBB Evaluation Update

The purpose of this memo is to provide you with an update on the evaluation of proposals by Gershman, Brickner, and Bratton, Inc. (GBB) in response to RFP #08-12 for MSW Management Services. City Attorney Mujeeb Shah-Khan and I spoke with Mr. John Carlton of GBB this afternoon to discuss a more-detailed evaluation of the proposals. In our discussion, we asked GBB to provide additional professional services by completing the following tasks:

1. Provide an additional cost analysis where the City of Greensboro would operate the transfer station for 3 years and 5 years with all other hauling and disposal options in place

2. Provide an additional cost analysis that would account for an annual tonnage of MSW to be 125,000 tons in addition to 225,000 tons annually with an assumption that the city will operate the transfer station

3. Develop a list of clarifying interview questions for companies and interview companies in partnership with City staff

4. Provide a recommendation for a contractor to haul and dispose of the City’s MSW

5. Provide a presentation to the Greensboro City Council summarizing these findings and answer questions from the Council

GBB has agreed to complete these tasks and will follow-up on Monday, 8/13/12 with a schedule and fee for providing these services. Once received, I will provide you with that information as well as an updated timeline for that process.

If further is required, please advise.

DDW
August 10, 2012

TO: Denise Turner Roth, City Manager
FROM: Dale Wyrick, P.E., Field Operations Director

SUBJECT: Original Recycling Contract with FCR

At the August 6, 2012 City Council meeting, Councilmember Wade asked who was responsible for establishing our initial recycling processing contract with FCR in 1992. I researched the question with former staff and determined that it was a combination of the Environmental Services Department leadership, the City’s Legal Department, and representatives from FCR.

Please advise if further is required.

DDW
August 10, 2012

TO: Denise Turner Roth, City Manager

FROM: Sheldon D. Smith, Solid Waste Division Manager

SUBJECT: Recycling Updates

In response to the inquiries made at the August 6, 2012 City Council meeting from Councilmember Bellamy-Small, I wanted to provide you with a summary of our recycling participation for FY12. In August 2010, we established new recycling routes, based on 1150 collection points’ average per route, to accurately measure participation. Our current residential participation is 62.65%, our highest participation rate to date.

Over the past year, we have launched three major recycling campaigns. The Cans and Cash campaign was a concentrated effort for City elementary and middle schools, to collect aluminum cans and receive monetary rewards based on weight. The Plastic Bottle Blitz for the Earth Day Celebration in April included cash prizes to group participants sponsored by ReCommunity. The Triad Recycle & Win challenge, sponsored by Coke and Harris Teeter, will potentially reward residents with a $50 gift card for the placing the right recyclables in the collection cart.

Waste Reduction staff continues to support recycling education efforts with public outreach campaigns through on-site participation, public service announcements’ and recycling facility tours for Guilford County Schools, senior groups, youth events, community gatherings and area colleges and universities. Cumulative educational totals equaled 9885 participants in 2011. We anticipate increasing our program awareness once we have awarded our recycling processing contract. Waste reduction will collaborate with the successful bidder to reduce our residue rates and provide more concentrated efforts to increase our residential and commercial tons.

If you should require any additional information, please contact me at 373-4379.

SDS
August 9, 2012

TO: Walter Simmons, Director

FROM: Ted Partrick, PE, City Engineer

SUBJECT: Change Orders on Construction Contracts

In response to Councilmember Wade’s request at the August 6 City Council meeting, a summary report on the construction contracts awarded over the four years of FY 2009 through FY 2012 is attached. This report was prepared to provide information on the prevalence of change orders on our contracts.

The summary report on change orders, “Change Order History for Construction Contracts Awarded in FY 2009 through FY 2012”, has a variety of statistics taken from ProTrack, the City’s construction management and contract database. The Engineering and Facilities Divisions of the Engineering & Inspections Department work to ensure that the additional cost of change orders as a percent of the contract costs is properly managed. Because of this, the results shown indicate that the City has been successful in controlling change orders. Please note that some contracts are still active, primarily those awarded in FY 2011 and FY 2012, and may still incur change orders.

The change order amounts included in this report include unanticipated costs due to errors and unforeseen conditions. They also include change orders to expand the scope of contracts to benefit from low bids. Many contracts have funding sources that allocate grant funds that will be lost if not used for the construction of projects. The designs for projects are prepared to comply with budgets, but on many projects the bids are low enough to allow additional work to be added within the budget.

Two recent examples of additions to the scope of work in contracts are a good demonstrations of this. They concern energy upgrades on two large City projects: MMOB Glass Replacement and the Sub-Metering contracts. ARRA funding was provided to encourage energy efficiency enhancements on City facilities. The bidding on the contracts left enough funds within the grants to allow additional work on the enhancements. Of the $144,900 in change orders on Facilities projects in 2012, a total of $141,050 was spent on expanding the scope of these two cost-saving contracts.

This is an update of a report issued with an IFYI memorandum on August 11, 2011.

THP
Attachments
Change Order History for Construction Contracts Awarded in FY 2009 through FY 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineering Division Contracts</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Contracts Awarded</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average $ Value of Contract Award</td>
<td>$2,012,337</td>
<td>$2,058,530</td>
<td>$764,913</td>
<td>$1,194,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Change Orders To Date &gt; $0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average $ Value Change Order &gt; $0</td>
<td>$100,875</td>
<td>$32,130</td>
<td>$65,312</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $ Value of Change Orders &gt; $0</td>
<td>$806,997</td>
<td>$321,298</td>
<td>$522,493</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $ Value of All Contracts</td>
<td>$30,185,058</td>
<td>$47,346,196</td>
<td>$19,122,814</td>
<td>$25,084,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Orders as Pct. of Contract</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities Division Contracts</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Contracts Awarded</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average $ Value of Contract Award</td>
<td>$698,062</td>
<td>$935,030</td>
<td>$192,098</td>
<td>$122,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Change Orders To Date &gt; $0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average $ Value Change Order &gt; $0</td>
<td>$20,318</td>
<td>$10,730</td>
<td>$16,661</td>
<td>$36,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $ Value of Change Orders &gt; $0</td>
<td>$203,183</td>
<td>$236,065</td>
<td>$249,908</td>
<td>$144,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $ Value of All Contracts</td>
<td>$17,451,558</td>
<td>$48,621,543</td>
<td>$5,570,848</td>
<td>$3,432,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Orders as Pct. of Contract</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. The numbers and averages for change orders are for work-to-date. Contracts in FY 2011 and 2012 may have change orders remaining if the contract has not been completed and closed out.

2. "Add Change Orders" are those which increase the contract award. Many change orders, especially in lump-sum contracts are deductive and reduce the contract. The change orders included in this report were limited to additive only.
August 7, 2012

TO: Michael Speedling – Assistant City Manager

FROM: Steven Drew, Water Resources Director

SUBJECT: A&T Stormwater Improvements
Contract 2012-003
Change Order

Summary

Contract 2012-003 may incur cost over-runs that require approval of a contract change order by City Council. The Contract has utilized 64% of its contingency allowance with anticipation that the remaining 36% of the contingency will be absorbed by the completion of the Contract. There have been numerous unforeseen conditions encountered during construction with substantial expenses that have accounted for the absorption of contingency thus far. With construction at 66% complete, additional expenses may be incurred in the remaining portion of the project that would require approval by City Council.

Background

Charles D. Lowder, Inc., a North Carolina Licensed General Contractor, was awarded the contract 2012-003 for the A&T Stormwater Improvements Contract by the City Council on April 3, 2012. The contract was estimated by the engineering staff in the amount of $3,176,752.00 using historical pricing data. It was awarded to the contractor in the amount of their bid, $2,607,417.40.

The work includes replacing a failing and under capacity 66-inch storm sewer with a large box culvert and upgrading aging sanitary sewer. The alignment of the work is down the center of A&T University’s campus. The stormwater work on A&T’s campus is a significant construction project with impacts to both the City and A&T’s privately held utilities. Working on A&T’s campus poses unique challenges with aging underground infrastructure and unknown utility information. It involves risks of encountering unforeseen conditions that cause delays and additional costs.

To date, unforeseen conditions of two electrical ductbanks were discovered during Construction. One ductbank, which ran above the City’s stormwater pipe, was already collapsing due to the deterioration of the City’s 66-inch culvert that supported the ductbank from below. Work was completed to fix the collapsing ductbank at a total cost of $9,822.12. The second ductbank was in conflict with the large box culvert design and had to be relocated. The ductbank relocation was completed at a cost of $193,215.40. The work was performed immediately after the conditions were discovered to eliminate the risk of a ductbank collapse and to prevent shutting the project down.

Preliminary investigations were made into the underground utilities on the campus prior to completion of the project design. The ductbanks were uncovered at selected locations, according to common practice, by excavation during the investigations. This information, however, did not reveal the inadequate structural
integrity or exact location of the entire ductbank extents, due to the inconsistency in the ductbank configuration over the large span of the project excavation.

Alternatives were reviewed to reduce cost, including redesign of the culverts, shut down the electrical feeds for quick repairs, and moving the duct banks without shut-down. The large box culvert which had to be constructed underneath the duct bank could not be re-designed due to depth and capacity constraints. Shutting down the feeds would reduce the cost, but it would require a long shutdown of power, telephone and network for the entire A&T University campus. Relocation of the ductbank was the only practical and economical alternative. The expense of repairing and relocating the electrical ductbanks was paid from contingency funds in the Contract.

Other unknown underground utilities have also been encountered, including abandoned steam tunnels, additional private water lines, and fiber optic. Alternatives were reviewed for each design conflict and the most economical and feasible alternative was chosen based on collaboration among the City and A&T University campus.

Contingency funds were included in the contract for unforeseen conditions surrounding active steam line conditions, underground soil conditions, and rock excavation. To date, 64% of the contingency funds have been spent with 66% of the project complete. Upon completion and close-out of the project, any unspent contingency funds and contract quantity under-runs will be returned to the funding account.

jcs

cc: Butch Simmons – Director, Engineering & Inspections Department
    Kenny McDowell – Deputy Director, Water Resources Department
    Ted Partrick – City Engineer
Public Affairs
Contact Center Weekly Report
Week of 7/30/12 – 8/03/12

Contact Center
5678 calls answered this week

Top 5 calls by area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Resources</th>
<th>Field Operations</th>
<th>All others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Sign up - 297</td>
<td>No Service/Garbage - 88</td>
<td>Police Records - 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Info - 248</td>
<td>Repair Can/Garbage - 79</td>
<td>Privilege License - 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Extension - 151</td>
<td>HHW/Transfer - 74</td>
<td>Courts/Sheriff - 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutoff Requests - 146</td>
<td>E-waste - 34</td>
<td>Overgrown Lots - 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

We received a total of 5 comments this week:

Field Operations – 2 comments:

- Suggests putting requirements about large cardboard boxes collection / disposal in "At Your Service". They are having problems in her neighborhood where tenants are leaving large furniture boxes at curb for weeks at a time.

- Wanted to say thanks to the city for doing such a great and prompt job fixing her trip hazard that she reported recently

Library – 1 comment:

- I love the library

Parks & Recreation – 1 comment:

- Please remove the Stand Up Paddle restrictions from our local lakes! I live close to Lake Brandt and would love to paddle there but am unable to due to the marina restrictions. Thank you!

Transportation – 1 comment:

- Lives in Guilford Hills and works in the Friendly Center. Despite the fact that I work a mile from where I live, up until recently I was unable to walk or bike to work because there was no way for me to get across Benjamin Parkway. The light at Pembroke barely stays green long enough for a car to get across. I was hoping when I saw that the sidewalks were being put in on Pembroke that there would eventually be a crosswalk signal as well and I was not disappointed! I walked to work yesterday, enjoying the sidewalks and the crossing signal! Please let whoever is responsible for this decision know that it was a good one and is greatly appreciated by the residents of Guilford Hills!

Overall

Volume continued to be heavy this week, with the normal mix of calls.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Councilmember</th>
<th>Department / Person Contacted</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Council Notification Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 9, 2012</td>
<td>Mayor Perkins</td>
<td>Executive / City Manager Roth</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Friday, August 10, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Small Group Mtg is 2 or more Councilmembers w/ City Staff*