

Richland County Council
DEVELOPMENT & SERVICES COMMITTEE
Tuesday, October 24, 2000
5:00 PM

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bernice G. Scott, Chair; Buddy Meetze; Susan Brill; Greg Pearce; Thelma Tillis

OTHERS PRESENT: Paul Livingston, Tony Mizzell, James Tuten, Joseph McEachern, T. Cary McSwain, Milton Pope, Tony McDonald, Larry Smith, Michelle Cannon-Finch, Monique Walter, Pam Davis, Ash Miller, Mullen Taylor, Marsheika Martin, Stephany Snowden, Darren Gore, Ralph Pearson, Sack Edge, Amelia Linder, Jim Prater, Chief Harrell, Rodolfo Callwood

Call To Order

The meeting was called to order at approximately 5:02 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

September 26, 2000: Regular Session Meeting - (pages 3-6)

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Ms. Brill, to approve the minutes. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Adoption of Agenda

Ms. Scott stated a citizen would like to speak regarding the Greenleaf Drainage Project.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Ms. Brill, to allow the citizen to speak.

Mr. Tom Teuber spoke of concerns of the Greenleaf Drainage Project. Ms. Scott requested the County Engineer to address Mr. Toiler's concerns.

Ms. Brill moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to adopt the agenda as submitted. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Items for Action

Amendment to the Richland County Code: Deletion of "Facilities" in Rural Zones

Mr. Randy Jorgenson, Planning Director, stated this amendment would delete the word "facilities" from the current text because it is too broad; it allows for uses that cannot be defined.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Ms. Brill, to approve this item. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Amendment to the Richland County Code: Buildings / Lots to Have Access

Mr. Jorgenson stated this establishes specifics before building on a lot that is isolated.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Ms. Brill, to approve this item. The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Richland County Council
Development and Services Committee
October 24, 2000
Page Two**

Amendment to the Richland County Code: Plats Exempt from Commission Review

Mr. Jorgenson would call for subdivision of land and authorization for the Planning Director to approve such subdivisions, and place minimum conditions upon such approval.

Ms. Brill moved, seconded by Ms. Tillis, to approve this item. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Amendment to the Richland County Code: Continuation of Zoning Applications

Mr. Jorgenson stated this would authorize the zoning administrator to continue zoning applications to a later public hearing or meeting for good cause; for instance, if the applicant was to fall ill.

Ms. Brill moved, seconded by Ms. Tillis, to approve this item. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Amendment to the Richland County Code: Classification of Mobile Homes

Mr. Jorgenson stated this segregates units that are residential (singlewide) or standard (doublewide) design of manufactured homes. He stated singlewides would require special exceptions and doublewides would not require a special exception.

Ms. Tillis moved, seconded by Ms. Brill, to deny. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Amendment to the Richland County Code: Storm Water Management

Mr. Pearce questioned if this would hurt to defer for 30 days for further review.

Mr. Ralph Pearson, County Engineer, stated it would not hurt to defer this item for 30 days.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Ms. Brill, to defer this item for 30 days. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Approval to Proceed with Greenleaf Drainage Project

Mr. Pearson stated there is a limit as to how much to spend on this project. He requested for the project to be abandoned.

Mr. McSwain stated there are citizens who want it and some who do not want it. He stated legal condemnation would have to be done on two or three properties.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Ms. Brill, to defer until Mr. Morris goes out and talk to the community. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Budget Amendment: Broad River Regional Enterprise Fund

Mr. McSwain stated the Enterprise Fund has its own fund balance. He stated before the final reading could be achieved the 99/00 FY expired and the money had expired; therefore, it needs to start over again and do a budget amendment to set the money in place.

Ms. Brill moved, seconded by Mr. Meetze, to approve. The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Richland County Council
Development and Services Committee
October 24, 2000
Page Three**

Richland County Landfill Redesign for Phase IV

Mr. McSwain stated there are issues with the construction/demolition landfill on Monticello Rd. He stated it is very close to filling up, approximately two years. He requested for Council to consider alternatives. He discussed the alternatives.

A discussion took place.

Mr. McEachern requested to see numbers on the tonnage and wanted to know the income anticipated.

Ms. Brill moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to accept the redesign of phase IV. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Increase in Tipping Fee for Waste Management Landfill

Mr. McSwain stated this is consistent with the current contract.

Ms. Brill moved, seconded by Mr. McEachern, to accept as information and forward to full council. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Increase in Solid Waste Tire Disposal Fee

Mr. McSwain stated the Firestone recall is impacting the county and Whitaker Container Service. He stated the contractor is taking tire disposals to Concord, N.C. and this is costing additional money to the contractor for extra labor and increased field cost for diesel.

Ms. Brill moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to approve this item. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. McSwain stated he is pleased with Whitaker service.

Contract Renewals for Solid Waste

Mr. Meetze moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to approve the contract renewals. The vote in favor was unanimous. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Approval of Regional Transportation Authority Agreement

Mr. Doug Phillips, Executive Director of the Central Midlands COG, updated Council on this item

Ms. Brill moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to approve an agreement with the other participating local governments that creates the Authority. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Items Pending Analysis

Citizen Complaints about Genesis Cable Company

Mr. Pope stated they have been working with Benchmark Cable Incorporated who is the service provider in the northeast area and a lot of the information has not been received as of yet. He stated they are requesting an extension of the transfer of ownership. Mr. Pope stated he spoke to Benchmark about having a consultant to speak with citizens.

**Richland County Council
Development and Services Committee
October 24, 2000
Page Four**

Petition to Close Vahalla Road

Ms. Brill stated the EMS report has been received and they are still awaiting traffic study report. She stated once they have both reports, they will make a report to Council.

Items for Information Items/Discussion

Impact of the Closing of the City of Columbia Landfill

Mr. Meetze voiced his concerns regarding debris going out to an illegal landfill.

Mr. Jim Prater, Public Works Director, and Ms. Julia Prater, Columbia Housing Authority, were present to answer questions.

Mr. Meetze requested issues such as this should come to Council first before any decisions are made.

This item was taken as information.

Adjournment

Mr. Meetze moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to adjourn the meeting at approximately 6:16 p.m. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Submitted by,

Bernice G. Scott
Chair

The minutes were transcribed by Marsheika G. Martin

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Purchase of Vehicles for Special Services

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve a purchase in the amount of \$84,863.60 for replacement vehicles (4 Crown Victorias) for the Department of Special Services.

B. Background / Discussion

As stated above, the four Crown Victorias are replacement vehicles. The vehicles being replaced are too costly to repair, and the downtime to repair them is an inconvenience for conducting assigned job duties and responsibilities. The useful life is 7, 9 and 10 years. Essentially, the current vehicles are worn out and must be replaced.

Mileage

MA-002	146,007
MB-003	185,219
MB-004	176,907
MC-001	128,083

Council's approval is requested to replace four cars so that employees can perform their assigned job duties as drivers and conduct essential county business around the metropolitan area on a daily basis. The four refuse control officers drive Crown Victorias on a daily basis to carry out their assigned job duties and responsibilities.

C. Financial Impact

Funds are available in the Department of Special Services Budget for these purchases (Account Number 10.3060.5313). According to the Procurement Department, under state contract, the cost is as follows:

(4) 2001 FORD Police Interceptors (Crown Victorias)	\$83,663.60
Tax	\$ 1,200.00
Total For 4 Vehicles	\$84,863.60

D. Alternatives

1. Approve this request through state contact.
2. Do not approve

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the request to purchase the four vehicles through state contract at a cost of \$84,863.60.

Recommended by: S. George Wilson Department: Special Services Date: 10/18/00

F. Approvals

Finance

Approved by: Darren P. Gore
Comments: Funds budgeted for FY01.

Date: 10/25/00

Procurement

Approved by: Rodolfo A. Callwood
Comments: State Contract Items

Date: 11/21/00

Legal

Approved as to form by: Bradley T. Farrar
Comments:

Date: 11/21/00

Administration

Approved by: Tony McDonald
Comments: Recommend approval of the purchase of four vehicles for the Special Services Department through the State Contract. Funding for this purchase was included in the Department's FY 2000-01 budget; no additional funding is required.

Date: 11/21/00

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Purchase of Road Maintenance Equipment

A. Purpose

County Council's consideration of the purchase of several pieces of equipment for the Road Maintenance Division of Public Works is requested.

B. Background / Discussion

In the fiscal year 2000/2001 Public Works budget, funds were approved for the purchase of one tandem dump truck, two single axle dump trucks and one motorgrader. All of this equipment is to be purchased through the State-purchasing contract. Following is a list including budgeted amounts and actual costs:

Single Axle Dump Trucks

Love Chevrolet	Budget
\$41,706.84	\$40,000.00
\$42,809.47	\$40,000.00

Tandem Axle Dump Truck

Love Chevrolet	Budget
\$64,569.31	\$60,000.00

Motorgrader

Mitchell Distributing	Budget
\$105,883.00	\$135,000.00

Total

\$254,968.62	
\$1,200.00(taxes)	
<hr/>	
\$256,168.00	\$275,000.00

The two single axle dump trucks are to replace two 1985 Ford single axle dump trucks that are currently 7 years out of their life cycle. The tandem dump truck is to replace a 1986 Ford tandem dump truck that is currently 5 years out of its life cycle. The motorgrader is to replace a 1986 Fiat motorgrader that is currently 6 years out of its life cycle. All of this equipment has become uneconomical to maintain and all major repairs are no longer covered under our service agreement with First Vehicle Services.

C. Financial Impact

As shown above, the total of all four purchases is within the amount budgeted. No additional funding is necessary.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request as shown above.
2. Do not approve

E. Recommendation

Alternative 1 is recommended.

Recommended by: Ralph B. Pearson, P.E. Department: Public Works Date: 10/30/00

F. Approvals

Finance

Approved by: Darren P. Gore

Date: 11/06/00

Comments:

Procurement

Approved by: Rodolfo A. Callwood

Date: 11/21/00

Comments: State Contract Items

Legal

Approved as to form by: Bradley T. Farrar

Date: 10/31/00

Comments:

Administration

Approved by: Tony McDonald

Date: 11/6/00

Comments: Recommend approval of the purchase of road maintenance equipment, from the State Contract, in the total amount of \$256,168.00. Funds have been appropriated in the FY 2000-01 budget; no additional funding is required.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Storm Water Management

A. Purpose:

Approval of this request will amend the County's Drainage, Sediment, and Erosion Control Ordinance to bring the County's storm water ordinance into compliance with the Federal Clean Water Act. In addition, approval of this request will move the Conservation Commission ordinance from Chapter 8 to Chapter 2 in the Code of Ordinances, and amend the County's Garbage, Trash, and Refuse code to make it consistent with the new Stormwater Management, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance. This will necessitate the approval of three separate ordinances.

B. Background / Discussion

On March 17, 2000, The S.C. Department of Health and Environmental Control issued Richland County its NPDES permit for the storm drainage system in the County pursuant to the Federal Clean Water Act. That permit requires that the County enact ordinances giving it the authority to regulate activities that impact the level of pollutants in stormwater runoff. Our consultant, Ogden Environmental and Engineering Services, has reviewed our storm drainage and sediment and erosion control ordinances and recommended extensive amendments and additions required to address these issues.

The major changes to the ordinance are:

- **TITLE** – STORMWATER MANAGEMENT, EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL encompasses more than just drainage and suggests plan of action. This amendment shows up throughout the ordinance change and is simply a change in the naming.
- **SEC. 8-19(a)** – Insertion of new topic “industrial storm water pollution prevention plans”. Allows the County to review and monitor local industry water pollution prevention plans.
- **SEC. 8-21** – Addition of new requirements for as-built plan submittals, including that the site plan be tied to the South Carolina State Plane Coordinates and that a digital copy of the plan is submitted along with a hard copy. Correlating new development to a common datum will provide for better stormwater inventory. Addition of construction details for landscaping and easement characteristics. Addition of maintenance plan regulations, as pertaining to privately owned stormwater management facilities.
- **SEC. 8-23(c)** – Allows Richland County Engineering the time needed to review plans with multifaceted design pertaining to land use and associated stormwater management.
- **SEC. 8-25** – Addition of variances and explanations. This allows the County Engineer to grant variances from the Ordinance.
- **SEC. 8-27(c)**– Provisions for modifying existing channels.
- **SEC. 8-29** – Provision of new topic “Minimum Water Quality Requirements”. The County Engineer may determine that additional facilities are necessary and may: 1)

require access to the facility, 2) agree to the over-design of the facility; and/or 3) may participate financially in construction of a stormwater management facility in an effort to assure water quality.

- **SEC. 8-30(e)** – Listing of Stormwater Management facilities and design provisions. Specifies requirements of property owner to maintain stormwater management facility and keep proper records in accordance with NPDES Permit.
- **SEC. 8-31** – Insertion of new topic “Maintenance of Stormwater Management Facilities.” Describes the owner’s responsibilities for maintaining a stormwater management facility.
- **SEC. 8-32** – Insertion of new topic “Illicit Discharges and Improper Disposal.” Describes and prohibits certain illegal discharges into a storm drainage system.
- **SEC. 8-33** – Insertion of new topic “Spill Response.” Explains the rights and responsibilities of the Director of Emergency Services or designee, or authorized fire official, in regards to the emission of hazardous materials into the environment.
- **SEC. 8-36** – Insertion of new topic “Right-of-Entry”. Describes County Engineer’s accessibility to properties in determination of NPDES compliance to the extent of issuance of search warrants upon refusal of access by property owner.
- **SEC. 8-49** – The Stormwater Management, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance is enforceable by law.
- **SEC. 8-50** – Maximum fine is \$500 or 30 days imprisonment or both.

In addition, this request includes the approval of two other ordinances. The first will simply move the Article regarding the Conservation Commission, previously located in the same chapter as the stormwater ordinance, to the section of the County Code containing ordinances on other County commissions. Other than moving this Article to a different section in the Code, no changes are being made to the Conservation Commission Ordinance. The second additional ordinance will amend the Garbage, Trash, and Refuse code to raise the penalty of violating this code from \$200.00 to \$500.00. This will make the current code consistent with the Stormwater Management, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance.

C. Financial Impact

Costs to date for consulting services associated with this permit total approximately \$173,000. The FY 2000/2001 budget for stormwater management activities required to implement the permit is \$531,370. This action itself has no impact on these costs.

D. Alternatives

The alternatives available to County Council are:

1. Approve the ordinances as presented.
2. Take no action.

E. Recommendation

Alternative 1 is recommended.

Recommended By: Ralph B. Pearson, P.E. Department: Public Works Date: 9/13/00

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Miles Road & North Donar/Clemson Rd. Connector

A. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to request County Council's consideration of construction bids for the Miles Road Paving Project, the North Donar/Clemson Road Connector Project and the Claudia Dr./Hearn Dr. intersection improvements

B. Background / Discussion

On April 12, 2000, the CTC authorized \$125,000 for construction of the Miles Road Paving Project and the North Donar Drive / Clemson Road Connector. The Administrator's office issued instructions on July 5, 2000 for this department to initiate the necessary actions to get the projects underway. In response, the engineering and right-of-way acquisition were initiated and have since been completed. Simultaneously, this office proposed to the CTC that safety improvements at the intersection of Claudia Drive and Hearn Drive be included in the DOT's matching fund program for intersection improvements. Under this program, the DOT matches C funds with State highway funds for intersection improvements on the State Highway System. The CTC concurred and suggested that the project be combined with the other two and constructed under one contract. The combined project was, therefore, advertised for construction bids, which were opened on October 19, 2000. Below is a tabulation of the bids received:

Bidder	Amount
C.R. Jackson	\$310,459.86
C. Ray Miles Construction	\$335,162.77
Plowden Construction	\$453,717.70
Lanier Construction	\$286,442.24
Wiley Easton Construction	\$239,280.17
Condor Construction	\$308,716.13
 Engineer's Estimate	 \$329,666.62

Our engineering consultant, LPA Group, Inc. has reviewed the bids and the qualifications of the low bidder and recommends award to, Wiley Easton Construction Co. Inc.

C. Financial Impact

Total projected costs for the combined project are as tabulated below:

Engineering	\$ 36,150
Appraisals	\$ 500
Right-of-way	\$ 15,000
<u>Construction</u>	<u>\$239,280</u>
Total	\$290,930

“C” funds in the amount of \$300,000 have been requested for this project under PIN 24904. No County funding is requested.

D. Alternatives

The alternatives available are:

1. Accept the low bid: Under this alternative, the contract will be awarded to Wiley Easton Construction Co. in the amount of \$239,280.17 and work can begin as soon as the contract documents are executed.
2. Reject the bids: Under this alternative, the County could either re-bid the project or abandon it altogether. This is not considered a realistic alternative, however, since the bids were submitted in good faith in accordance with the County’s solicitation and the low bidder is responsive and qualified to accomplish the work. The low bid is also within budget and the engineer’s estimate.

E. Recommendation

Alternative 1 is recommended.

Recommended By: Ralph B. Pearson, P.E. Department: Public Works Date: 10/31/00

F. Approvals

Finance

Approved by: Darren P. Gore Date: 11/03/00
Comments:

Procurement

Approved by: Rodolfo A. Callwood Date: 11/06/00
Comments:

Legal

Approved as to form by: Amelia R. Linder Date: 11/06/00
Comments:

Administration

Approved by: Tony McDonald Date: 11/6/00
Comments: Recommend the award of a contract to Wiley Easton Construction Company, Inc., in the amount of \$239,280.17, for Miles Road and the North Donar/Clemson Road Connector. This project is being funded through “C” Funds; no additional County funding is required.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Sewer Relocation at US 176 and I-26

A. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to seek County Council’s approval to enter into a construction contract for the relocation of sewer lines at the intersection of US 176 and I-26.

B. Background / Discussion

The Department of Transportation (DOT) has undertaken a project to modify the intersection of highways US 176 and I-26. Richland County Utilities has several sanitary sewer lines in this area which must be relocated to avoid conflict with the proposed new highway structures. The DOT has agreed to pay up to \$ 285,752.00 to the County the have the sewer lines relocated.

Richland County has entered into a contract with Hussey, Gay, Bell and DeYoung to design the relocation of the affected sewer lines. The design is complete and the project was bid by the Richland County Procurement Department. The following were the three lowest bids received:

1.	Wiley Easton Construction Co.	\$ 128,990.00
2.	Condor Construction Co.	\$ 138,297.50
3.	G.H. Smith Construction Co.	\$ 142,690.00

C. Financial Impact

The DOT has agreed to reimburse the County up to \$ 285,752.00 for the relocation of the sewer lines. The engineering fees for this project are approximately \$ 22,250.00. Those fees, added to the low bid brings the total estimated project cost to \$ 151,240.00. This amount is well within the amount to be funded by the DOT. No additional funds will be required.

Funding for the construction contract will initially be provided from available construction funds in the Broad River Regional Enterprise Fund. These funds will be reimbursed once the project is completed by DOT.

D. Alternatives

1. Award the construction contract to the lowest bidder.
2. Award the construction contract to any other bidder.
3. Do nothing – the sewer lines will be damaged during the construction.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that County Council approve the award of a construction contract to Wiley Easton Construction Co., in the amount of \$128,990.00, plus a twenty percent (20%) contingency to cover the cost of encountering any unexpected obstacles.

Recommended by: Andy H. Metts

Department: Utilities & Services

Date 11/2/00

F. Approvals

Finance

Approved by: Darren P. Gore

Date 11/02/00

Comments:

Procurement

Approved by: Rodolfo A. Callwood

Date 11/06/00

Comments:

Legal

Approved as to form by: Amelia R. Linder

Date: 11/06/00

Comments:

Administration

Approved by: Tony McDonald

Date: 11/6/00

Comments: Recommend approval of the award of a construction contract to Wiley Easton Construction Company, Inc., in the amount of \$128,990, plus a twenty percent (20%) contingency, for the relocation of sewer lines at the intersection of U. S. 176 and I-26. Costs associated with this project will be reimbursed by the S. C. Department of Transportation.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Award of Contract for Haskell Heights Sewer Project

A. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to seek County Council's approval to enter into a contract in the amount of \$39,925.00 for the engineering design and construction services for phase II of the Haskell Heights Sanitary Sewer Project.

B. Background / Discussion

The Procurement Department solicited qualifications from engineering firms interested in providing engineering services for utility projects. An evaluation committee reviewed the qualifications and made a recommendation to County Council. County Council approved the use of Hussey, Gay, Bell and DeYoung (HGB&D) and Power Engineering as two firms to negotiate with for future design projects.

Phase I of the Haskell Heights sewer project is complete. Phase II will include the extension of sewer lines installed in Phase I and will provide sewer service to approximately forty (40) additional households.

HGB&D has submitted a proposal to provide the engineering design and construction period services for this project. A fee has been negotiated that is within the budgeted amount for this phase of the project. HGB&D was selected in an attempt to spread the design work equally between the two engineering firms. Power Engineering was recently awarded the design contract for the Broad River Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrade.

C. Financial Impact

A CDBG grant has been obtained to fund the design and construction of this project. The negotiated fee of \$39,925.00 is within the amount budgeted for engineering services. No additional funds should be required.

D. Alternatives

1. Award the engineering services contract to HGB&D.
2. Award the engineering services contract to another firm – A negotiated fee will be required to insure services will be provided within budget.
3. Do nothing – Phase II will be put on hold.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that County Council approve engineering services contract with HGB&D in the amount of \$39,925.00.

Recommended by: Andy H. Metts

Department: Utilities & Services

Date 10/18/00

F. Approvals

Finance

Approved by: Darren P. Gore

Date: 10/23/00

Comments:

Procurement

Approved by: Rodolfo A. Callwood

Date: 10/23/00

Comments:

Grants

Approved by: Sherry Wright

Date: 10/23/00

Comments: Grant funds are available.

Legal

Approved as to form by: Bradley T. Farrar

Date: 10/26/00

Comments:

Administration

Approved by: Tony McDonald

Date: 10/26/00

Comments: It is recommended that County Council approve the engineering services contract with Hussey, Gay, Bell & DeYoung in the amount of \$39,925.00. The cost for the engineering services will come from CDBG funds awarded to the County for this project.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Change Order for Atlas Road Sanitary Sewer Project, Phase 1

A. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to seek County Council's approval of a change order to the construction contract for the Atlas Road Sanitary Sewer Project, Phase 1.

B. Background / Discussion

During the November 17, 1998 County Council meeting, Council approved the award of a construction contract to Hobby Construction Company in the amount of \$ 1,017,339.00 for Phase 1 of the Atlas Road Sanitary Sewer Project. During the course of the project, several unexpected obstacles were encountered which required changes in the routing of the sewer lines. In addition, the City of Columbia required that sewer service be extended to all unimproved lots. These two issues justify the need for a change order to the original construction contract.

The City of Columbia has agreed to pay for the construction of sewer service to all unimproved lots. There were approximately 109 services extended at the City's request at an estimated cost of approximately \$ 64,000.00. Additional depths of cut, manholes, and ductile iron pipe were required to avoid other unexpected obstacles encountered during construction. The actual quantities will be included in the final pay request form.

C. Financial Analysis

This project is being funded by a HUD grant with additional funding provided by County Council. The total funds available are approximately \$ 1,267,200.00. The City of Columbia will be contributing approximately \$ 64,000.00, which brings the total available funds to approximately \$ 1,331,200.00. From this amount \$ 120,000.00 engineering fees and \$ 68,000.00 sewer tap fees must be deducted which leaves approximately \$ 1,142,400.00 available for actual construction. The initial construction contract amount was \$ 1,017,339.00. This leaves approximately \$ 125,061.00 available to cover change order cost.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve a change order in an amount not to exceed \$ 125,061.00 to cover the sewer services to unimproved lots and the unexpected obstacles.
2. Disapprove the change order.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that County Council approve a change order to the construction contract for Phase 1 of the Atlas Road Sanitary Sewer Project in an amount not to exceed \$125,061.00.

Recommended by: Andy H. Metts

Department: Utilities & Services

Date 11/2/00

F. Approvals

Finance

Approved by: Darren P. Gore

Date 11/02/00

Comments:

Procurement

Approved by: Rodolfo A. Callwood

Date 11/06/00

Comments:

Grants

Approved by: S. Wright

Date: 11/7/00

Comments:

Legal

Approved as to form by: Amelia R. Linder

Date: 11/07/00

Comments:

Administration

Approved by: Tony McDonald

Date: 11/7/00

Comments: Recommend approval of the proposed change order to the construction contract for Phase 1 of the Atlas Road Sanitary Sewer Project in an amount not to exceed \$125,061.00. Adequate funding is available to cover the change order; no additional funding will be required.