

**Richland County  
Development and Services Committee  
March 23, 2004  
5:00 P.M.**

PRESENT: Susan Brill, Chair; Joseph McEachern; L. Gregory Pearce; Thelma M. Tillis; Doris Corley (arrived at 5:10 p.m.)

OTHERS PRESENT: Paul Livingston; Bernice G. Scott; Joan Brady; James Tuten; Kit Smith; T. Cary McSwain; Amelia Linder; Milton Pope; Tony McDonald; Ashley Bloom; Pam Davis; Roxanne Matthews; Chris Eversmann; Monique Walters; Marsheika Martin; Michael Criss; Chief Harrell; Rodolfo Callwood

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at approximately 5:06 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES: February 25, 2004**

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

**ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

It was moved and seconded to adopt the agenda as submitted. The vote in favor was unanimous.

**ITEMS FOR ACTION**

**Hobart Road Project**

Mr. McEachern moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to forward this item to Council without a recommendation. The vote in favor was unanimous.

**New Terminal and Hangar Expansion: Columbia Owens Downtown Airport**

Mr. Milton Pope, Assistant County Administrator, gave a brief update on the award of contract.

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

**ADJOURNMENT**--The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:14 p.m.

Submitted by,

Susan Brill, Chair

The minutes were transcribed by Marsheika G. Martin

## Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject:** Resurfacing 2002 Project

### **A. Purpose**

County Council is requested to approve the award of a construction contract in the amount of \$644,333.67 to Sloan Construction Company, Inc. for the completion of the remaining work on the Resurfacing 2002 Project. Please refer to Attachment 1 for a list of the roads remaining on the Resurfacing 2002 Project.

### **B. Background / Discussion**

Lanier Construction Company was the original contractor for the Resurfacing 2002 Project. Lanier's contract was terminated due to substandard work and unexcused delays that resulted in the expiration of the contract time.

Sloan Construction Company, Inc. was the second lowest bidder at the time of the bid opening and was therefore selected to provide a quote for the remaining work on the Resurfacing 2002 Project. The quote received from Sloan to complete the work is \$644,333.67. Please refer to Attachment 2 for a breakdown of the quote received from Sloan.

The Procurement Department, the Department of Public Works, and The LPA Group, Inc. (LPA) have reviewed the quote. The quote is approximately six percent higher than the original contract cost and is reasonable when considering that the original bids were opened two years ago. In addition, the unit prices received are fair when considering the quantities are approximately half of our typical resurfacing contracts.

### **C. Financial Impact**

The County Transportation Committee (CTC) approved \$1,250,000.00 for the Resurfacing 2002 Project. The work completed by Lanier prior to termination amounted to \$585,218.46. Therefore, there is \$664,781.54 remaining in the budget.

### **D. Alternatives**

1. Approve the award of construction contract in the amount of \$644,333.67 to Sloan Construction Company, Inc. for the remaining work on the Resurfacing 2002 Project.
2. Do not approve the award of contract to Sloan Construction Company, Inc. and forfeit the opportunity to complete the work remaining on the Resurfacing 2002 Project.

### **E. Recommendation**

It is recommended that County Council approve the award of a construction contract in the amount of \$644,333.67 to Sloan Construction Company, Inc. for the remaining work on the Resurfacing 2002 Project. A recommendation by LPA to award the contract to Sloan Construction Company, Inc. is also attached.

Recommended by: Christopher S. Eversmann, PE Dept: Public Works Date: 04/13/04

## F. Reviews

### Finance

Reviewed by (Finance Director): Carrie Neal

Date: 4/15/04

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Reviewed by (Budget Director): Daniel Driggers

Date: 4/15/04

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

### Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo A. Callwood

Date: 4/16/04

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

### Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia R. Linder

Date: 04/16/04

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: This request is at the discretion of Council.

### Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 4/19/04

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:



**Richland County  
Resurfacing Program 2002  
Uncompleted Road List**

Road	From	To	PCR	Map #	Length	District
Anwood Drive	Lochmore Drive	Kelford Drive	82	48E3	1,316	11
	Kelford Drive	Gala Drive	100	48E3	296	11
	Gala Drive	Gala Drive	93	48E3	510	11
	Gala Drive	Lochmore Drive	100	48E3	423	11
Brassfield Court	Brookstone Way	Cul De Sac	98	8D3	651	1
Brookstone Court	Brookstone Way	Brookstone Way	100	8D3	344	1
Brookstone Way	Shady Grove Road	Wildhorse Court	47	8D3	561	1
	Wildhorse Court	Brassfield Court	80	8D3	402	1
	Brassfield Court	Brookstone Court	94	8D3	378	1
	Brookstone Court	Brookstone Court	98	8D3	126	1
	Brookstone Court	Glen Eagle Circle	92	8C3	1,117	1
Crestmore Drive	Padgett Road	Trotter Road	93	48E3	1,195	11
Gala Drive	Anwood Drive	Anwood Drive	98	48E3	801	11
Galbra Street	Sawtimber Lane	Mockernut Lane	87	48F4	1,004	11
Greybark Drive	Bitternut Drive	Mockernut Lane	95	48F4	312	11
	Mockernut Lane	Sawtimber Lane	93	48F4	834	11
Hickory Ridge Drive	Shellnut Avenue	Dead End	95	48F4	168	11
Hicoria Court	Shagbark Avenue	Cul De Sac	95	48F4	243	11
Kelford Drive	Trotter Road	Anwood Drive	93	48E3	311	11
	Anwood Drive	Lochmore Drive	88	48E3	2,116	11
Kingnut Drive	Shagbark Avenue	Mockernut Lane	93	48F4	781	11
Lochmore Drive	Dead End	Anwood Drive	100	48E3	148	11

	Anwood Drive	Kelford Drive	95	48E3	305	11
	Kelford Drive	Anwood Drive	100	48E3	863	11
London Pride Road	Chadford Road	Bow Church Road	86	9F4	332	1
	Bow Church Road	Oak Hampton Road	66	9F4	648	1
	Oak Hampton Road	Bow Church Road	98	9F4	464	1
Misty Glen Circle	Brookstone Way	Oak Stand Court	74	8D3	307	1
Northway Road	Key Road	Shop Road	84	27F4	825	10
Old Dairy Drive	Cul De Sac	Bluff Industrial	100	27E5	990	10
	Bluff Industrial	Idlewilde Boulevard	78	27E5	1,102	10
	Idlewilde Boulevard	Pasture Lane	98	27F5	533	10
Ovanta Road	Sawtimber Lane	Mockernut Lane	93	48F4	758	11
Pasture Lane	Old Dairy Drive	Cul De Sac	80	27F5	736	10
Tomentosa Drive	Hickory Ridge Drive	Shellnut Avenue	89	48F4	1,167	11
Wildhorse Court	Brookstone Way	Cul De Sac	94	8D4	819	1

Total In Feet=	23,886
Total In Miles=	4.52

April 12, 2004

Mr. Rodolfo Callwood, CPPO, CPPB  
Procurement Director  
Richland County  
2020 Hampton Street- Suite 3064  
Columbia, South Carolina 29204

Subject: Richland County 2002 Roadway Resurfacing  
Recommendation of Intent To Award Remainder of Contract

Dear Mr. Callwood:

After our review of the cost estimate submitted by Sloan Construction Company, Inc. on April 7, 2004 for the remaining work on the 2002 Roadway Resurfacing Project, THE LPA GROUP INCORPORATED agrees that the costs submitted by Sloan Construction for this remaining work is a fair and reasonable cost. The cost estimate submitted by Sloan Construction is approximately a six (6) percent increase in cost of the current remaining contract amount. This increase is reasonable considering the original bids were received two (2) years ago for the project. THE LPA GROUP INCORPORATED recommends to Richland County to enter into an agreement with Sloan Construction Company, Inc., to complete the remaining portion of this contract.

If you should have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

THE LPA GROUP INCORPORATED

  
Danny White  
Project Representative

cc: Ralph Pearson-Richland Co. D.P.W.  
Chris Truluck-Richland Co. D.P.W.  
CR238026.1d

**Sloan Construction Company, Inc.**

Phone: (803)376-1240  
Fax: (803)376-1967

645 Rosewood Dr., 2 Nd Floor Bonitz Bldg.  
P.O. Box 1957  
Columbia, SC 29202

Date: 4/7/2004

<b>Submitted To:</b>	Richland County Procurement	<b>Bid Title:</b>	2002 Roadway Resurfacing Project-Richland County
<b>Address:</b>	2020 Hampton Street, Suite 3064 Columbia, SC 29204	<b>Bid Number:</b>	
<b>Contact:</b>	Danny White (LPA)	<b>Project Location:</b>	Various Roads-Richland County
<b>Phone:</b>	<b>Fax:</b>	<b>Project City, State:</b>	Columbia, SC
		<b>Engineer/Architect:</b>	

Item No.	Item Description	Estimated Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Total Price
A-010	MOBILIZATION	1.00	LS	\$39,000.00	\$39,000.00
A-020	TRAFFIC CONTROL	1.00	LS	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00
A-030	MILLING EXISTING ASPHALT PAVEMENT 2.0"	3,230.00	SY	\$4.50	\$14,535.00
A-030	MILLING EXISTING ASPHALT PAVEMENT 1.0"	6,499.00	SY	\$1.40	\$9,098.60
A-040	MUCKING (W/STONE BACKFILL)	100.00	CY	\$18.00	\$1,800.00
A-050	SELECT MATERIALS FOR SHOULDERS AND SLOPES	30.00	CY	\$25.00	\$750.00
A-060	LIQUID ASPHALT BINDER PG64-22	430.00	TON	\$206.00	\$88,580.00
A-070	FULL DEPTH ASPH. PAV. PATCHING 6" UNIF.	1,500.00	SY	\$32.00	\$48,000.00
A-080	SURFACE PATCH (2" UNIFORM)	300.00	SY	\$17.75	\$5,325.00
A-100	RUBBER MODIFIED HMA SURFACE COURSE	6,668.00	TON	\$44.20	\$294,725.60
A-110	LEVELING (SURFACE TYPE 1)	180.00	TON	\$48.85	\$8,793.00
A-120	4" YELLOW SOLID LINES THERMO-90 MIL.	478.00	LF	\$1.93	\$922.54
A-150	12" WHITE SOLID LINES (CROSSWALK LINES)-THERMO.-125 MIL.	116.00	LF	\$3.03	\$351.48
A-160	24" WHITE SOLID LINES (STOP BAR)-THERMO.-125 MIL	40.00	LF	\$4.13	\$165.20
A-190	TRAFFIC SIGNAL LOOP	1.00	LS	\$840.00	\$840.00
A-200	CATCH BASIN REPAIR -TYPE 1	1.00	EACH	\$550.00	\$550.00
A-240	CONCRETE CURB AND GUTTER REPLACEMENT (1'-6" OGEE)	70.00	LF	\$32.25	\$2,257.50
A-270	PERMANENT VEGETATION	200.00	SY	\$3.50	\$700.00
B-010	MOBILIZATION	1.00	LS	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00
B-020	TRAFFIC CONTROL	1.00	LS	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00
B-030	MILLING EXISTING ASPHALT PAVEMENT 1.5"	1,285.00	SY	\$6.25	\$8,031.25
B-040	LIQUID ASPHALT BINDER PG64-22	21.00	TON	\$206.00	\$4,326.00
B-070	HOT MIX ASPH. CONC. SURF. CR. TYPE 1	326.00	TON	\$34.75	\$11,328.50
C-010	ASPHALT RECLAMATION (6" UNIFORM)	13,322.00	SY	\$7.00	\$93,254.00

**Sloan Construction Company, Inc.**

Phone: (803)376-1240  
Fax: (803)376-1967

645 Rosewood Dr., 2 Nd Floor Bonitz Bldg.  
P.O. Box 1957  
Columbia, SC 29202

Date: 4/7/2004

<b>Submitted To:</b>	Richland County Procurement	<b>Bid Title:</b>	2002 Roadway Resurfacing Project-Richland County
<b>Address:</b>	2020 Hampton Street, Suite 3064 Columbia, SC 29204	<b>Bid Number:</b>	
<b>Contact:</b>	Danny White (LPA)	<b>Project Location:</b>	Various Roads-Richland County
<b>Phone:</b>	<b>Fax:</b>	<b>Project City, State:</b>	Columbia, SC
		<b>Engineer/Architect:</b>	

Item No.	Item Description	Estimated Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Total Price
----------	------------------	--------------------	------	------------	-------------

Total Bid Price: \$644,333.67

- Notes:
- \* This offer may not be withdrawn by Sloan until 60 calendar days after today. If this offer is not accepted by that date, then the offer is automatically withdrawn.
  - \* Sloan will require a minimum five (5) calendar days advance notice of work and must be allowed sufficient time to complete the work. Nighttime work is not included.
  - \* Sloan will not be responsible for any damages done to Sloan's work by parties not under the direct charge of Sloan.
  - \* Engineering, layout, and staking (as required) will be provided by others at no cost to Sloan.
  - \* All rap will become property of Sloan Construction due to distance to Sloan's Facility versus Richland County's property.
  - \* A full time inspector will be supplied in order to make on-site decisions.
  - \* Any price adjustment formula applicable to asphalt cement shall be applicable to all asphalt cement placed by Sloan and the full amount of any such price adjustment (whether increase or decrease) shall be due to Sloan.
  - \* Completion Date: 90 Calendar Days after Notice to Proceed.

**Payment Terms:** Payment due within 30 days of date of invoice, regardless of when payment is made by Owner.

<p><b>ACCEPTED:</b> The above prices, specifications and conditions are satisfactory and are hereby accepted.</p> <p>Buyer _____</p> <p>Signature _____</p> <p>Date of Acceptance _____</p>	<p><b>CONFIRMED:</b> <b>Sloan Construction Company, Inc.</b></p> <p>Authorized Signature: _____</p> <p>Estimator: Bradley Smith</p>
---	---

# Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject:** Engineers and Surveyors Professional Services

## **A. Purpose**

The purpose of this report is to request County Council's consideration of establishing a qualified list of engineering and surveying firms with whom staff may negotiate and contract to provide services on an "as-needed" basis for County projects

## **B. Background / Discussion**

Richland County solicited Request for Qualifications, (RFQ) # RC-008-Q-0304, for Engineering and Surveying Services from qualified engineering and surveying firms to assist the County with the surveying, designing, bidding, and construction phase of its transportation, storm drainage, and surveying projects. The RFQ was solicited on October 23, 2003. Responses were received in the Procurement Department on December 4, 2003. Twenty qualifications were received. The qualifications were reviewed and evaluated by an evaluation team comprised of three evaluators. The evaluators recommended thirteen of the twenty firms as qualified to do business with the County.

On November 27, 2001 County Council approved placing eleven engineering firms on a listing to provide similar required engineering services. This method has proven to be efficient and is able to streamline the process and reduce considerable costly delays.

The firms selected and approved by Council will be placed on the list and that list shall be a listing of all firms considered highly qualified to perform engineering and surveying services. The County will be able to request proposals from firms on the listing with which the County can negotiate and award a contract. All firms on the final selection and approved list are considered "selected firms" or "qualified firms" with whom the Director of Procurement may negotiate. This process will allow all the selected and approved firms an opportunity to compete for projects.

Whenever engineering and/or surveying services are required, a Request for Proposal will be sent to the firm on the list and will remain open for fifteen days. All proposals submitted will be reviewed, evaluated, negotiated, and an award will be made to the firm providing a fair cost and value to the County to include attainment of our goals of fifteen percent Disadvantaged Business Enterprises, Small and Local Business participation, and assuring local economic impact in our County.

Firms interested in providing engineering and surveying services to the County will be able to submit their qualifications, together with a list of the types of work for which they would like to be considered. An evaluation team will evaluate all submittals and the Procurement Office shall review the recommendation, and compile and maintain an up-to-date list of the firms. Firms will have to update their qualifications no less than every two years.

The evaluation and selection team for this process consisted of the following personnel:

Ralph B. Pearson, County Engineer  
 Chris Truluck, Assistant County Engineer, Transportation  
 Rocky Archer, Assistant County Engineer, Stormwater

The Director of Procurement reviews the team evaluation and selections, conducts research and analysis as to location, Disadvantaged Business Enterprises, responsiveness, and responsibility. Once the assessment is made, a recommendation is provided to Council.

The firms recommended for placement on a listing of approved firms to provide engineering and surveying services in the areas for which they were qualified are listed below in alphabetic order:

<b><u>Transportation</u></b>	<b><u>Minority Owned</u></b>	<b><u>Location</u></b>
BP Barber		Richland County
Chao & Associates	Asian American	Columbia
Florence & Hutchinson		Richland County
Jordan, Jones & Goulding		Richland County
LPA Group		Richland County
Mulkey Engineering & Consultant	Female	Columbia
Stantec		Richland County
Wilbur Smith Associates		Richland County
PBS & J		Richland County

<b><u>Storm Drainage</u></b>	<b><u>Minority Owned</u></b>	<b><u>Location</u></b>
BP Barber		Richland County
Chao & Associates	Asian American	Columbia
American Engineering		
Florence & Hutchinson		Richland County
Jordan Jones & Goulding		Richland County
LPA Group		Richland County
Power Engineering		Richland County
Stantec		Richland County
Thomas & Hutton Engineering		
Wilbur Smith Associates		Richland County

<b><u>Surveying</u></b>	<b><u>Minority Owned</u></b>	<b><u>Location</u></b>
BP Barber		Richland County
Chao & Associates	Asian American	Richland County
American Engineering		
Construction Support Service	Asian American	Richland County
Florence & Hutchinson		Richland County
Jordan Jones & Goulding		Richland County
Mulkey Engineering & Consultant	Female	Columbia
Power Engineering		Richland County

Stantec  
Wilbur Smith Associates

Richland County  
Richland County

The following firms were deemed not qualified to provide services in the areas of Transportation, Storm Drainage, and Surveying:

Engineering Resources Corp  
GMK Associates  
Hussey, Gay, Bell & DeYoung  
Milone & Macbroom  
Palmetto Consulting Engineering  
Roberson Engineering  
Site Development Engineering Inc.

#### **C. Financial Impact**

Funding for the engineering and surveying services on projected projects usually comes from C funds, the Public Works budget, or economic development funds. No funding, therefore, is requested.

#### **D. Alternatives**

1. Approve establishing a qualified list of engineering and surveying firms with whom staff may negotiate and contract to provide services on an “as-needed” basis for County projects. Under this alternative, the selected firms will be provided an opportunity to compete by a proposal on each project, negotiate, and contracts would be awarded for on-call engineering services. Projects would be awarded to the firm(s) identified as providing a fair cost and which is the most qualified, responsive, and responsible for the type of project for that which is being solicited. An effort will be made to distribute the work equitably among the firms.
2. Do not approve establishing a qualified list of engineering and surveying firms with whom staff may negotiate and contract to provide services on an “as-needed” basis for County projects. Under this alternative, initiation of the firms for a project would require a formal Request for Proposal (RFP), appointment of a selection team, the evaluation and selection of the most qualified firm, and approval of the selection by County Council. This is a 2 to 3 month process.

#### **E. Recommendation**

It is recommended that Council approve alternative number one, approve establishing a qualified list of engineering and surveying firms with whom staff may negotiate and contract to provide services on an “as-needed” basis for County projects.

Recommended by: Rodolfo A. Callwood Dept: Procurement Date: April 16, 2004

**F. Reviews**

**Finance**

Reviewed by (Finance Director): Carrie Neal

Date: 4/16/2004

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Reviewed by (Budget Director): Daniel Driggers

Date: 4/16/04

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: No recommendation

**Legal**

Reviewed by: Amelia R. Linder

Date: 04/19/04

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: This request is at the discretion of Council.

**Administration**

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 4/19/04

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

## Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject:** Purchase of a Compactor for C&D Landfill

### A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve the purchase of a Caterpillar 826G II compactor from Blanchard **Machinery Company** in the amount of **\$390,202.00** which includes 5% sales tax plus \$12,350.00 extended warranty for use at the County's C&D Landfill. The addition of this equipment will enable the Public Works Solid Waste & Recycling Division to efficiently manage the working face at the C&D Landfill. This purchase will provide a replacement for a compactor destroyed by fire.

### B. Background / Discussion

The County uses this piece of equipment to maximize the landfill airspace and efficiently manage the size of the disposal area. South Carolina Department of Health & Environmental Control has maintained that Richland County must replace the compactor destroyed by fire to remain compliant per the landfill permit issued to Richland County.

The 2004 budget request was submitted with the purchase of this piece of equipment. If we choose not to purchase the compactor, we will continue to lose valuable landfill airspace and risk enforcement action from state regulatory agencies.

Additional information on selected compactor:

Company	Blanchard Machinery, Company
Brand Name	Caterpillar
Model	826G II
Standard Manufacturer Warranty/Hours	1 Year/No Limit
Extended Warranty Coverage/Hours	5 Years/7500 (\$12,350.00)
Delivery timeframe upon receipt of order	80-90 calendar days

### C. Financial Impact

The funds for this purchase are budgeted at \$398,000.00.

Caterpillar 826G II	\$359,859.00
Tax	\$17,992.95
Extended Warranty	\$12,350.00
<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$390,201.95</b>

### D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to purchase the Caterpillar 826G II compactor in the amount of \$390,201.95 from Blanchard **Machinery Company** for use at the County's C&D Landfill Facility.

2. Do not approve the request to purchase the Caterpillar 826G II compactor in the amount of \$390,201.95 from Blanchard **Machinery Company** for use at the County's C&D Landfill Facility.

**E. Recommendation**

It is recommended that Council approve the request to purchase the Caterpillar 826G II compactor in the amount of \$390,201.95 from Blanchard **Machinery Company** for use at the County's C&D Landfill Facility.

Recommended by: Rodolfo Callwood, Director Department: Procurement Date: 4/13/04

**F. Reviews**

**Finance**

Reviewed by (Finance Director): Carrie Neal Date: 4/22/04  
x Recommend Council approval  Recommend Council denial  
Comments regarding recommendation:

Reviewed by (Budget Director): Daniel Driggers Date: 4/22/04  
✓ Recommend Council approval  Recommend Council denial  
Comments regarding recommendation:

**Legal**

Reviewed by: Amelia R. Linder Date: 04/22/04  
 Recommend Council approval  Recommend Council denial  
Comments regarding recommendation: This request is at the discretion of Council.

**Administration**

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald Date: 4/22/04  
✓ Recommend Council approval  Recommend Council denial  
Comments regarding recommendation: