



October 8, 2010

TO: Mayor and Members of Council
FROM: Rashad M. Young, City Manager *Rashad Young*
SUBJECT: Items for Your Information

Contact Center Feedback

Attached is the weekly report generated by our Contact Center for the week of 9/27/10 – 10/3/10.

October 12, 2010, Work Session Material

Attached is a memorandum dated October 7, 2010, by Robert Morgan, Deputy City Manager, providing detailed information related to the next phase of the Solid Waste disposal evaluation process. This includes the evaluation matrix and the vendor presentation requirements that will be discussed at Tuesday's Work Session.

Republic Services Contract

As a follow up from the October 5, 2010, City Council Meeting, the City's expiration date with Republic Services, the company that oversees the landfill in Montgomery County, is September 1, 2011.

Construction Contracts' Change Orders

As discussed at the October 5, 2010, City Council Meeting, attached are two documents related to the change order process:

- Attached is a memorandum from Butch Simmons, Director of Engineering and Inspections, dated October 4, 2010, providing background as well as a process change as it relates to change orders.
- Attached is a memorandum from Ted Partrick, City Engineer, dated September 30, 2010, with an actual change order for the Council's review. This change order will be on an upcoming council agenda.

Greensboro Economic Development Alliance

As a follow up to a request made by Councilmember Zack Matheny at the October 5, 2010, City Council Meeting, regarding a presentation by Greensboro Economic Development Alliance on job creation, Assistant City Manager Andrew Scott will be in contact about whether you would like to have this done at a Council Meeting or in a Special Work Session.

Public Hearings for Greensboro Urban Loop

NC Department of Transportation will hold a one pre-hearing open house and transportation corridor official map act public hearing for each of the Greensboro Urban Loop projects. Details of the public hearings are attached.

Festival Park Ice Rink

At the October 5, 2010, City Council Meeting, Councilmembers Mathney and Wade requested further information regarding the proposed ice rink at Festival Park. City Staff has been working with Renovo Designs, a local company who the City will contract with to install and operate the ice rink, to determine the utility costs associated with an ice rink. The following is an excerpt from last week's IFYI: *"The City's financial commitment would be to cover the one-time installation cost of \$23,000 for installation of a transformer to operate the ice rink chillers. The City would also incur an estimated \$20,000 in utility costs for electricity and water to be paid for out of Parks and Recreation's current maintenance and operations budget."* Additionally, Duke Power has agreed to donate the transformer, which is a savings of \$11,000; the \$23,000 installation cost will be used to purchase and install the electrical system for the ice rink chillers. The \$20,000 in utility costs would be an ongoing City cost.

Greensboro Historical Museum

As a follow-up to a request made by Councilmember Thompson at the October 5, 2010, City Council meeting, below are the figures related to the Historical Museum renovation project (as of October 7, 2010):

- Bond Authorization and Issuance: \$5,300,000
- Total Appropriation: \$5,300,000
- Total Expenditures to date: \$4,387,146.68 (includes the change ordered approved by City Council at its October 5, 2010 meeting)
- Total Remaining: \$912,853.32

Once all invoices are paid and the account is fully reconciled, City Staff believes there will be at least \$850,000 left in the project fund that only can be used for the renovation of the Greensboro Historical Museum "in order to provide additional exhibit space, including the acquisition of equipment and furnishings therefor" (excerpt from the bond authorization approved by voter referendum on November 7, 2006) or to pay debt service.

Library Incident Report

In last week's IFYI, we provided you with the monthly incident report for the period of August 19th – September 19th. The totals in the column "Total Number of Incidents" were incorrectly added in three categories. Attached is a memorandum from Sandy Neerman, Director of Greensboro Public Library, dated October 6, 2010, describing the incorrect totals, as well as the corrected version of the report.

Bus Stops Safety Along High Point Road

At the October 5, 2010, City Council Meeting, Councilmember Dianne Bellamy-Small requested Adam Fischer, Transportation Director, to evaluate public safety concerns around the bus stops along High Point Road towards Jamestown due to overgrown vegetation around the bus stops. Transportation Director Fischer reported that the majority of the overgrown vegetation has already been cut back and the remaining will be done by the end of next week.

**Public Affairs Department
Contact Center Weekly Report
Week of 9/27/10 - 10/3/10**

Contact Center

4780 calls answered this week

Top 5 calls by area

Water Resources

Balance Inquiry – 978

New Signup – 234

General Information – 149

Cutoff Request – 125

Signups/Owners – 98

Field Operations

Bulk Guidelines – 85

No Service/Garbage – 61

Repair Can/Garbage – 47

Dead Animal Pickup – 42

No Service/Recycle – 37

All others

Police/Watch Operations – 364

Landfill/Transfer/HHW – 107

Courts/Sheriff – 104

Police Records - 45

Guilford Metro - 34

Comments

We received a total of 2 comments this week:

Field Operations – 2 comments:

- Caller states he saw in Switzerland several years ago, a plant that intakes solid waste and converts it to building block, the blocks interlock and can be used for streets and building projects. Thinks this would be a good idea for the City of Greensboro to investigate.
- To whom it may concern: I phoned on Monday with some concerns about several sink holes in our backyard. I spoke with a very pleasant lady that took down my information, repeated it back to me to make sure it was all correct, and said I would be contacted by someone from the Storm Water Maintenance Section. Promptly, I had a returned call from the Crew Coordinator to set up a time to come. He visited the site and was informative and has led us in a direction for addressing the problem. He was pleasant and helpful and I just felt great about this department of the City of Greensboro. Thank you for the hard work you all do for the city.

Overall

Calls about the changes to the bulk collection schedule declined slightly last week. Otherwise, we received the normal mix of calls. Call volume remained steady through the end of the week.

Office of the City Manager
City of Greensboro



October 7, 2010

TO: Mayor and Members of Council

FROM: Robert W. Morgan, Deputy City Manager

SUBJECT: Matrix and Presentation Requirements for Solid Waste Disposal Proposals

Enclosed is a proposed matrix for the City Council's review that will be used to evaluate the proposals for solid waste disposal, as well as a Presentation Outline that will be provided to each respondent to the RFP to use in preparation for his/her presentation. We request that the City Council review both documents and provide feedback. Once agreement of the evaluation criteria is reached, then Council should assign a weighting factor to each of the criterion.

The Presentation Outline is based on the proposed selection criteria to ease in the evaluation of the proposals. Based upon a two-day interview process, it is suggested that each respondent be given 30 minutes for a presentation and 20 minutes for questions.

Following Council's deliberations on October 12, the respondents to the RFP will be notified of the process and requested to respond by October 20 if they are interested in making a presentation. If their answer is affirmative, they will be required to provide a copy of their presentation to the City by November 3.

Since Council suggested at their last meeting that the interviews be conducted in two days, members should come prepared to set the dates for the interviews on October 12th. Council members may want to consider the following:

- Weekday or weekend
- Back to back days or separated dates
- November, December or January.

If you have questions, please contact me.

RWM/nls
Enclosure

cc: Rashad M. Young, City Manager

Evaluation of Solid Waste Management Strategies

City of Greensboro, NC

DRAFT 10-6-10, V2

The purpose of this Decision Matrix is to 1) Identify important criteria related to determining the best solid waste management strategy moving forward, 2) assign a weighting factor to each criteria, and then 3) grade each offerer for each criteria by assigning a value from zero up to but not exceeding the weighting factor. The weighting factors should be assigned such that the sum of all factors is 100. The graded values will be totaled for each respondent. Note that many of the responses are not adequately detailed to assign a proper grade for each criteria (example: some responses did not include specific financial offerings). Also, some respondents offered more than one option related to solid waste management for the City. These issues will need to be resolved before completing the decision matrix.

	City Assigned Weighting Factor (Total = 100)	Advanced Disposal	CICO	Herzog	MRR Southern	Republic Services	Uturnagen	Waste Connections	Waste Industries	Waste Management
1 Qualifications and Experience of the Respondent Qualifications and experience of the Company, Company's staff, teaming partners and subcontractors. Demonstrated experience with projects of similar type and magnitude. History of successful project implementation.										
2 Financial Offering to the City Life cycle costs to City, tipping fee structure, escalators, up front cash payments, assumption of current financial liabilities, lease payments, royalties or host fees.										
3 Company Financial Depth and Stability Demonstrated ability to meet stated goals of the proposal and fund project implementation. Favorable borrowing and insurance capacity, funding mechanisms, track record on funding similar projects. Financial strength is adequate as related to capital and operating cost of system implementation.										
4 Viability of Proposed Technology Proposed technology is valid and performance has been demonstrated on previous projects (perhaps by others) using similar feedstock and throughput levels.										
5 Reference Facilities, Operational Experience and Regulatory Track Record Company/team/key staff have developed similar facilities, and have demonstrated successful operation and management of similar facilities with sound regulatory compliance and environmental track record. Company can provide and meet performance guarantees using proposed technology.										
6 Implementation Schedule Company has outlined a realistic implementation schedule and terms of service related to the waste management strategies proposed, and schedule is consistent with the City's needs and expectations.										
7 Use of City Assets Does Company require use of City property, landfill capacity, or other assets? If so, how does offer impact those assets, including potential remaining life of the landfill? (Council will need to determine if use of City assets is viewed as a positive or negative attribute and revise this wording accordingly).										
8 Service Area Does respondents offer utilize City and County waste, or expand service area beyond County limits? (Council will need to determine if expansion of the service area beyond Guilford County is a positive or negative attribute and revise this wording accordingly).										
9 Integration of System Components Does offerer propose to manage only MSW disposal, or are other components enhanced, such as increasing recycling or diverting waste?										
10 Environmental Impacts of Proposed Technology Impacts including surface and groundwater, air emissions, and legacy impacts that exist after facility closure. (Lower environmental impact means higher score for respondent).										
11 Community Concerns Potential for impacts including traffic, odors, noise, affect on property values. (Less negative community impact means higher score for respondent).										
12 Economic Development Potential for project to positively impact local economy by addition of jobs, future development, etc. Impact to current solid waste staff jobs?										
13										

Total Score

100

Presentation Outline

Each respondent will be given 30 minutes to make a presentation. Following the presentation the Council will have 20 minutes for questions. In order to ensure consistent information is received during the presentations, respondents are requested to cover the following information in a PowerPoint format:

- Introductions
- Brief summary of offering
 - Landfill, energy conversion technology, etc.
- Qualifications and Experience
 - Explain the experience of the Company, Company's staff, teaming partners and subcontractors. Discuss experience with projects of similar type and magnitude and history of successful project implementation.
- Company Resources and Financial Strength
 - Explain Company's depth of resources and financial stability, ability to finance the proposed project, history of similar project financing experience.
- Financial Offering to the City
 - Explanation of life cycle costs to City, tipping fee structure, escalators, up front cash payments, assumption of current financial liabilities, lease payments, royalties, host fees, community investment, etc.
- Explanation of Proposed Waste Management System
 - Overview of proposed strategy, implementation schedule, technology to be employed, with demonstrated performance on previous projects. Discuss ability to meet performance guarantees.
- Reference Facilities and Operational Experience
 - Discuss reference facilities (preferably developed by respondent) that use proposed technology with similar feedstock and throughput level as that proposed for the City. Discuss Company's experience in managing and operating similar facilities, as well as regulatory and environmental track record.
- Community Concerns
 - Explain how the Company intends to address community concerns.
- Deviations from Original Response
 - The City has reviewed the written responses provided by each offerer. Describe any differences that may exist between the written response received March 1, 2010 and this presentation.
- Summary and Wrap Up
 - Summarize qualities which you believe differentiate your offer from others.
- Questions and Answers
 - Council will ask questions following the formal presentation.



October 4, 2010

TO: Rashad Young – City Manager
FROM: Walter Simmons – Director, Engineering & Inspections
SUBJECT: Change Orders on Construction Contracts

In response to recent concerns expressed about change orders on our construction contracts, the Engineering & Inspections Department has prepared a brief summary of the issue. This covers projects built by both the Facilities Division (new and renovated buildings) and the Engineering Division (new and reconstructed roadway and underground water utilities). The construction contracts are prepared and managed for all the City departments, but the primary department clients are GDOT, Water Resources, Police, Fire, Parks and Recreation, Libraries and the Coliseum.

Change orders are the result of three factors: changes in the scope of a project, unforeseen circumstances, and errors or omissions.

- **Change in Scope.** The typical change in scope occurs when the client department identifies a program need after the contract is let. This can be the result of receipt of new funding or the opportunity to use savings in a contract when it is under budget. When a change of scope is proposed, the City Manager will be notified and a recommendation, including estimates, will be provided. Approval of these changes will be sought at a regularly scheduled City Council meeting.
- **Unforeseen Circumstances.** The most common unforeseen circumstances are the result of concealed structural damage, rock and unsuitable soils. Regulatory issues can also arise when the regulatory agencies find conditions they did not account for in plan review and permit approval. Similar problems can result when existing underground utilities are not identified by their owners before construction. When an issue is discovered, the City Manager will be notified immediately and a rough estimate of the cost provided (see Process Change section below).
- **Errors and Omissions.** In the planning and design of a project, features can be left out or errors made. Most errors and omissions occur because most of the City's construction projects are custom designs using new plans and details. They are usually discovered late in the project. When an issue is discovered, the City Manager will be notified immediately and a rough estimate of the cost provided (see Process Change section below).

Process Change

Approval of change orders over \$20,000 can only be done by City Council. However, stopping the construction work pending approval of a change order will usually result in additional costs –

contracts allow the contractors to recover their costs due to re-mobilization, storage of materials, rental of equipment, additional costs to maintain an idle site, and other costs.

To prevent additional costs and delays, some flexibility is required in the timing of approvals, including allowing contractors to continue with the work prior to approval. "Unforeseen circumstances" and "errors and omissions" will frequently require work to continue. In order to address these situations, it is recommended that the City Manger notify City Council as soon as possible. This would mean that these change orders would be considered at the next Council meeting most likely by an addendum to the meeting. If this were not possible, Council would be notified in the IFYI of a need to proceed with the change order with formal action taking place at the next Council meeting.

BS/bwm/nls

cc: Robert Morgan, Deputy City Manager



September 30, 2010

TO: Rashad Young – City Manager
FROM: Ted Partrick – City Engineer, Engineering & Inspections
SUBJECT: **[Errors and Omissions]** Cost Overruns and Blasting of Rock:
Intersection Improvements at Tankersley Dr. and Church St.

Rock has been discovered in the area where storm sewer pipe has to be installed across the west side of intersection – crossing Tankersley near the intersection. The contractor's price for the additional work to remove enough rock to lay the pipe will result in an increase of \$85,500. A copy of the quote is attached. The time required for the blasting and excavation is anticipated to add two weeks or more to the construction time.

The additional cost will result in a contract change order requiring the approval of the City Council. The current contract award amount is \$486,844. Every alternative has been evaluated to avoid the extra cost. Re-routing of the sewer was reviewed, but a higher cost is estimated for that. A shallower depth of burial was reviewed, but the sewer is already as shallow as it can go. Elimination of the sewer was even considered. However, this portion of the sewer is a large 30" line carrying all the storm water on the west side of Church, including much of the Moses Cone property, all the way from Wendover to the creek below Tankersley. Significantly, the storm sewer is also sized and located to accommodate the widening of N. Church Street in the near future.

Rock is seldom an issue on roadway projects, especially intersection improvements, and was not anticipated on this project. No pricing was included in the bidding, so our construction superintendent is continuing to negotiate the pricing of the work. It is quite possible that the cost will be less than anticipated.

Having found the rock on the west side of the intersection, additional investigation has begun across Church to determine if rock is in our storm sewer location along that side. It is still unlikely that rock will be encountered, but the investigation will be made. If additional rock is found, there may be additional costs.

Tankersley Drive was closed to allow for the quickest completion of the work and to minimize disruption of traffic on Church Street. Rock will delay us further, and Engineering needs to get approval to proceed as soon as possible.

TP

cc: Robert Morgan – Deputy City Manager
Adam Fischer – Director, Department of Transportation
Butch Simmons – Director, Engineering & Inspections

From: Saunders, Jeffrey (APAC-Greensboro) [mailto:jwsaunders@apac.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2010 2:07 PM
To: Clark, Dale
Subject: Tankersley Drive Rock Blasting

Dale,

We have completed our inspections of the trench rock on Tankerlsey Drive. After test drilling all of the storm runs from structure # 1 thru # 7, it appears that we are going to encounter rock in the following areas:

- 7 to 6, 6 to 5 (1/2 of run), 5 to 4, 3 to 4, 4 to 2 (1/2 of run) and 2 to 1
- Based on depths, we estimate the quantity or rock to be approximately 140 CY

The following price is based upon blasting the trench rock to a depth of 6" below the invert and includes the following:

- Utility Locates
- Test drilling for rock quantities
- Drilling and Blasting by Licensed subcontractor (Mid South Drilling, Inc.) Includes mobilization and blasting mats
- Utility Crew on-site for covering and uncovering blast areas and rock removal after blasting
- Pre-blast inspections (Vibra-Tech, Inc.)
 - Inspections cover three (3) locations: Greensboro Fire Station #1 Training Facility, 1st Citizens Bank & Moses Cone Apartments
 - Vibra-Tech inspection details any exterior and interior defects prior to blasting or construction activity. The defects documented include cracks, separations, or other conditions that may have occurred since the structure was constructed. Defects are systematically documented in writing and photographed.
 - Vibra-Tech will provide a letter outlining which properties were inspected, and field notes and pictures will remain on file at Vibra-Tech for a minimum of seven (7) years.
- Seismic Monitoring (Vibra-Tech, Inc.)
 - Vibra-Tech will have an experienced Field Technician monitor each blast site.
 - Vibra-Tech will develop a customized website for this project that will include all seismic data for each blast. Additionally, every blast will be mapped on a digital aerial photo. All pertinent data will be stored on the website in an organized, sortable manner.

For this work, we quote the Lump Sum price of **\$85,500.00**

Please give me a call if you have any questions. We would like to be able to start shooting next week sometime.

Jeff W. Saunders
Estimator

Thompson-Arthur Paving & Construction
APAC-Atlantic, Inc.
Phone: (336) 412-6811
Fax: (336) 412-6777
Mobile: (336) 451-4592
Web: www.thompsonarthur.com

**PRE-HEARING OPEN HOUSE MEETINGS AND TRANSPORTATION
CORRIDOR OFFICIAL MAP ACT PUBLIC HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR
THE GREENSBORO URBAN LOOP**

The N.C. Department of Transportation will hold one pre-hearing open house and transportation corridor official map act public hearing for each of the Greensboro Urban Loop projects during the following times and locations in Guilford County:

- Greensboro Eastern Urban Loop: Lawndale Drive (State Road 2303) to U.S. 70 East of Greensboro

When: Monday, Oct. 18
Pre-hearing informal open house from 4:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.
Transportation corridor official map act public hearing at 7 p.m.

Where: Northeast Guilford High School (cafeteria and auditorium)
6700 McLeansville Road
McLeansville

Reference TIP# U-2525B & C

- Greensboro Western Urban Loop: Bryan Boulevard near Piedmont Triad International Airport to Lawndale Drive (State Road 2303)

When: Monday, Oct. 25
Pre-hearing informal open house from 4:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.
Transportation corridor official map act public hearing at 7:00 p.m.

Where: Bur-Mil Park Clubhouse (meeting & events center)
5834 Bur-Mil Club Road
Greensboro

Reference TIP # U-2524C & D

NCDOT proposes the construction of an approximate 15-mile controlled-access freeway for the remaining western and eastern legs of the Greensboro Urban Loop on a new location. Existing roads that are to be crossed by the proposed freeway will either be separated from the proposed freeway by a proposed bridge or will have direct access to the proposed freeway by way of proposed interchanges. The purpose of these projects is to improve traffic flow within the city by completing a bypass alternative around the north side of Greensboro.

NCDOT representatives will be available at each pre-hearing open house to answer questions and receive comments relative to the proposed project. Interested citizens may drop-in anytime at the pre-hearing open houses as indicated above.

The formal transportation corridor official map act public hearing will consist of an explanation of the proposed Greensboro Urban Loop corridors. The hearings will be open to those present for statements, questions and or comments. The presentations and public comments will be recorded and a written transcript will be prepared.

Anyone who would like to speak during the formal hearings may register at the pre-hearing open house prior to the formal hearings or by calling Ed Lewis at (919) 431-6585. Speakers will be called in the order they registered. A three-minute time limit will be imposed for those who registered to speak. Additional spoken comments will be received after those who registered have finished their comments.

Maps displaying the location of the Greensboro Urban Loop projects are available at: <http://www.ncdot.gov/projects/greensborourbanloop/> and are on public display at the following locations:

- City of Greensboro-Transportation Department
300 W. Washington St. (entry from Greene Street)
Melvin Municipal Office Building (3rd floor)
Greensboro
- NCDOT Division Engineer's Office
Transportation Office
1584 Yanceyville St.
Greensboro
- Guilford County Courthouse
201 S. Eugene St.
Greensboro

Additional information may be requested by contacting Ed Lewis at (919) 431-6585, via e-mail at elewis@ncdot.gov or the project website stated above. Residents may also write, referencing Transportation Improvement Program projects U-2524C & D and U-2525B & C, to

Ed Lewis
NCDOT Human Environment Unit
1598 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1598

Additional written comments may be submitted to Lewis until Nov. 30.

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, the NCDOT will provide auxiliary aids and for disabled persons who want to participate in these meetings. Anyone requiring special services should contact Lewis at the above address, phone, fax or e-mail as early as possible so arrangements can be made.

Libraries
City of Greensboro



October 6, 2010

TO: Rashad Young, City Manager
FROM: Sandy Neerman, Library Director
SUBJECT: Correction to August 19 – September 19 Incident Report

The August 19th – September 19th Incident Report contained incorrect totals in four areas. The following is the corrected information:

Total number of Disorderly Conduct Incidents	13
Total number of Sleeping Incidents	5
Total number of Theft Incidents	5
Total number of incidents for the Library Department	34

The subtotals for each library location are correct. The error occurred due to incorrect calculation.

Attachment

cc: Denise Turner
Nelsie Smith
Mary McCollough

Updated on 10/05/10

Greensboro Public Library

August 19 - September 19, 2010

Library Incident Report by Category

Incidents by Category	Central Library	Benjamin Branch	Glenwood Branch	Hemphill Branch	Kathleen Edwards Family Branch	McGirt-Horton Branch	Vance-Chavis Branch	Total no. of Incidents	Total no. of Bans
Assault	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alcohol	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Communicating Threat	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Computer Misuse	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Customer Complaint	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disorderly Conduct	5	0	0	3	1	0	4	13*	5
Drug Paraphernalia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Eating	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Fire	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Indecent Behavior	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Littering	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Loitering	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medical	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Missing Persons*	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Panhandling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pornography	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Sleeping	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5*	4
Smoking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Theft	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	5*	0
Trespassing	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Unattended Child	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vandalism	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1
Weapons	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0
Warrant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	23	0	1	3	1	0	7	34	13

Other – Parking issues and customer inquiry about their ban release date

*Parent informed Lankford officer about a missing child from the home. (Did not count under total # of incidents.)

Note: This report reflects the total number of incidents listed in the Lankford Security Log located at Central Library.

Total # of incidents: Total number of incidents changed from 31 to 34 due to an incorrect calculation.

- Incorrect calculation