

**SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

116



FROM: Redevelopment Agency

SUBMITTAL DATE:
November 14, 2005

SUBJECT: Construction Contract Change Order - Ripley Community Park Improvement Project

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Directors

1. Make a finding that the solicitation of bids for the additional construction activities required for the Ripley Community Park Improvement Project would not produce an advantage to the County;
2. Approve a Contract Change Order request in the amount of \$82,695.42 for the CSA 62 Ripley Community Park Improvement Project; and
3. Authorize the Executive Director or designee to execute and process all required change order documents.

BACKGROUND: Continued Page 2

RZ:JC:TE:JT:MT

S:\RDACOMDIS4\Ripley\ParkChangeOrderF11.doc

[Signature]
Robin Zimpfer
Executive Director

FINANCIAL DATA

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|-------|
| Current F.Y. Total Cost: | \$ 82,695.42 | In Current Year Budget: | Yes |
| Current F.Y. Net County Cost: | \$ 0 | Budget Adjustment: | No |
| Annual Net County Cost: | \$ 0 | For Fiscal Year: | 04-05 |

COMPANION ITEM ON BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AGENDA:

SOURCE OF FUNDS: Redevelopment Agency Funds

| | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Positions To Be Deleted Per A-30 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Requires 4/5 Vote | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVE

[Signature]

County Executive Office Signature

Consent
 Policy
 Consent
 Policy
 Dept Recomm.:
 Per Exec. Ofc.:

Prev. Agn. Ref.: 7/29/03[4.3]; 8/19/04[4.5];
11/18/03[3.12]; 6/7/05[4.3]; 8/19/05[4.2]

District: 4

Agenda Number:

Background (continued): On August 9, 2005, the Board of Directors approved the construction contract in the amount of \$494,000 between the Agency and AZCA Drilling and Pump, Inc., for the CSA 62 – Ripley Community Park Improvement Project. Construction activities commenced in September 2005.

Upon implementation of the Project, it was necessary for the contractor and engineer to coordinate design specifications and construction activities with an adjacent, ongoing County project – the Ripley Water Treatment System Improvement Project. The engineer and contractor determined that various utility, off-sites, and park configuration modifications were necessary. Furthermore, several important park amenities were omitted from the final design specifications; these included on-site lighting and a “tot lot” play area. The playground modifications would ensure an ADA accessible and age appropriate recreation site that would be useable for ages 2 through 14.

The result of these construction modifications directly impacts the cost of the Project. Consequently, the contractor and engineer have negotiated a price of \$82,695.42 for the additional construction activities. Based upon Agency staff review of the contractor’s submittal, and the engineer’s analysis, staff concurs with the necessity of the change order and the additional cost estimate.

The proposed \$82,695.42 change order represents 17% of the original contract amount of \$494,000. Below is a summary of contract activity:

| | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|
| Original Contract Amount | \$494,000.00 |
| Change Order #1 | <u>82,695.42</u> |
| Total Amended Contract (Proposed) | \$576,695.42 |

Staff is recommending approval of the change order request based upon the following:

1. **Project Necessity** – The construction activities associated with the park re-configuration are necessary for the completion of the Project. The change order is necessary to compensate the contractor for additional equipment, material, and manpower.
2. **Funding Availability** – The Agency has approved a project budget of \$650,000. The amended contract amount of \$576,695.42 leaves a sufficient balance of \$73,304.58 for contingencies.

Bidding of Additional Work – based upon recommendations from the project engineers and CSA 62 field staff, it has been determined that soliciting bids for the additional construction would be cost-prohibitive and would not produce an advantage to the County. It is highly unlikely that the County would receive reasonable or cost-effective bid proposals given the size of the project, nature of the work required, and the remote location. In addition, if the work is to be performed by another contractor, the current contractor would have to demobilize and then remobilize to complete the original tasks. These mobilization costs would be passed-on to the County.

Attachments: Copy Contract Change Order.