

Lancaster County Council Infrastructure and Regulation (I & R) Committee Regular Meeting Agenda

Tuesday, December 11, 2018

Administration Office Conference Room
County Administration Building
101 N. Main Street
Lancaster, SC 29720

1. **Call to Order Regular Meeting – Committee Chair Larry Honeycutt** 3:00 p.m.
2. **Approval of the agenda** *[deletions and additions of non-substantive matters]*
3. **Citizens Comments**
4. **Approval of Minutes from the November 13, 2018 I&R Committee regular meeting – pgs. 2-4**
5. **Discussion / Action Items**
 - a. Discussion of ending the subsidy for disposal of solid waste collected by private haulers. – *Steve Willis/Jeff Catoe – pg. 5*
 - b. Discussion of development of ordinance mandating placement of trash cans at locations that serve food to go. – *Steve Willis – pgs. 6-8*
 - c. Discussion of amending commodities the County accepts for recycling. – *Jeff Catoe – pgs. 9-13*
 - d. Discussion of Inspections of newly constructed roads – *Jeff Catoe – pg. 14*
 - e. Discussion regarding final bids for Animal Shelter and additional considerations for bid phase completion – *Nicholas Miller – pgs. 15-20*
6. **Adjournment**

Anyone requiring special services to attend this meeting should contact 285-1565 at least 24 hours in advance of this meeting.

Lancaster County Council Infrastructure and Regulation Committee agendas are posted at the Lancaster County Administration Building and are available on the Website: www.mylancastercsc.org



Members of Lancaster County Council
I & R Committee

Larry Honeycutt, District 4, Chairman
Terry Graham, District 1
Billy Mosteller, District 3

DRAFT

Minutes of the Lancaster County Council Infrastructure and Regulation (I & R) Committee Regular Meeting

101 N. Main Street, Lancaster, SC 29720

Tuesday, November 13, 2018

Committee Members present were Larry Honeycutt, Terry Graham and Billy Mosteller. Also present were County Administrator Steve Willis, County Attorney John DuBose, Clerk to Council Sherrie Simpson, Deputy Clerk to Council Chelsea Gardner, Procurement Director Nicholas Miller, Budget Analyst Kim Belk, Director of Public Works Jeff Catoe, Airport Director Paul Moses, Airport Consultant Ken Holt, Director of Fire/Emergency Services Darren Player, EMS Manager Len Robinson, and various department heads and citizens. A quorum of the Lancaster County I & R Committee was present for the meeting.

The following press were notified of the meeting by e-mail in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act: *Lancaster News*, *Kershaw News Era*, *The Rock Hill Herald*, *Fort Mill Times*, Cable News 2, Channel 9 and the local Government Channel. The agenda was posted in the lobby of the County Administration Building and also on the county website for the required length of time.

Call to Order

Committee Chairman Larry Honeycutt called the Infrastructure and Regulation (I & R) Committee meeting to order at approximately 3:00 p.m.

Approval of the Agenda

Billy Mosteller moved to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Terry Graham. The Committee approved the agenda by unanimous vote of 3-0.

DRAFT

Citizens Comments

Darren Player, Director of Fire/Emergency Services, spoke regarding the need for a bay for Fire/Rescue Service in the Fleet Maintenance garage and also the need for a generator in that building.

Len Robinson, Manager of EMS, spoke regarding the need for a Fleet Maintenance garage.

Approval of Minutes

Terry Graham moved to approve the minutes from the October 9, 2018 I & R Committee regular meeting. The motion was seconded by Billy Mosteller. The approval of the October 9, 2018 I & R Committee regular meeting minutes passed by unanimous vote of 3-0.

Discussion / Action Items

Resolution 1028-R2018 regarding the Authorization to Design And Construct a Fleet Maintenance Facility

Resolution Title: A Resolution To Authorize And Approve The Administrator And All Necessary Staff To Move Forward With All Processes And Procedures Consistent With The Lancaster County Procurement Code For The Design And Construction Of A Fleet Maintenance Facility.

Steve Willis reviewed Resolution 1028-R2018. He noted that the POND architects are the design experts. Nicholas Miller reviewed information on labor rates for vehicle maintenance in the County, since there are not hard numbers available for Council regarding outsourcing. He explained that Council needs to decide what type of facility they want to commit to: a light maintenance, outsource type of facility or a full service maintenance garage. Steve Willis explained that Council needs to decide what they want to spend on the project. Larry Honeycutt stated that Council has indicated that the garage should be no more than two point seven five (2.75) million dollars. Billy Mosteller stated that Council has to do something as far as the facility. Terry Graham indicated that the budget from Council is two point seven five (2.75) million dollars and asked if a garage could be built for that amount of money. Nicholas Miller stated that a garage *that meets the needs of Lancaster County* cannot be built for two point seven five (2.75) million dollars.

Billy Mosteller moved to send to full Council with a recommendation from the I & R Committee to allocate no more than two point seven five (2.75) million dollars to either construct a new facility or add an addition to the existing building and that this budget should include fees, site prep, construction, furnishings and equipment. The motion was seconded by Terry Graham. The motion passed by unanimous vote of 3-0.

Updated Airport Capital Improvement Plan (ACIP) for Lancaster County Airport – McWhirter Field (LKR).

Ken Holt indicated that the Airport comes to Council once per year for approval of an updated five (5) year Capital Improvement Plan, which the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) requires

DRAFT

before January. He reviewed the Lancaster County Airport (LKR) Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) FFY 2020 – FFY 2024 with the Committee members, which can be found in the agenda packet on page 32. He noted that once the CIP is approved, the Airport will submit the pre-application to the FAA and that the County Administrator will need to be able to sign the pre-application on behalf of the County.

Terry Graham moved to approve and send the updated Airport Capital Improvement Plan for Lancaster County Airport forward to full Council with a favorable recommendation from the I & R Committee. The motion was seconded by Billy Mosteller. The motion passed by unanimous vote of 3-0.

Discussion of 2019 calendar (Final adoption will be held at the November 26th Council Meeting).

Steve Willis stated that the 2019 calendar does not have any real significant changes except the request to add Veteran's Day as an official County holiday. He reviewed the expense for the County by adding Veteran's Day to the County holiday schedule. He noted that Council should let him know if they have any questions or concerns.

Jeff Catoe reviewed the holiday schedule for solid waste. Terry Graham requested that the schedule be posted.

Larry Honeycutt requested that private garbage haulers be added to the December agenda.

Larry Honeycutt asked for an update on the Animal Shelter and Nicholas Miller stated that the bids are being submitted in November. He noted that there were about nine (9) general contractors at the pre-bid meeting.

Steve Willis explained that the County would now be going to bid first before submitting quotes to Council so that staff can have better estimates for Council regarding building projects.

Adjournment

Terry Graham moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Billy Mosteller. The motion to adjourn passed by unanimous vote of 3-0. There being no further business, the I & R Committee meeting adjourned at approximately 3:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Approved by the I & R Committee

Sherrie Simpson
Clerk to Council

Larry Honeycutt, Chairman

Agenda Item Summary

Ordinance # / Resolution#:	Discussion Item
Contact Person / Sponsor:	Steve Willis/ Jeff Catoe
Department:	Admin/ Public Services
Date Requested to be on Agenda:	December I&R Committee

Issue for Consideration:

Ending the subsidy for disposal of solid waste collected by private haulers.

Points to Consider:

For at least two decades (not sure when this started as it was before my time with the County) Lancaster County has paid the tipping fee for solid waste collected by residential private haulers. My understanding is that the theory was that if the private haulers were not collecting the waste the residents would have brought it to the recycling centers anyway.

This was not a problem when the number of haulers was small and we were certain they were only collecting from Lancaster County residents as they were all located in central Lancaster County.

Today the number of private haulers has escalated from all the residential growth in the panhandle. We have no way of determining how much of the waste is coming from Lancaster residents versus residents in the same area but outside Lancaster County. We are basically operating on the honor system and this has greatly increased our costs.

We propose to end this subsidy following notice to all private haulers. Councilman Carnes has expressed concern with this approach.

We still plan to pay for the municipalities unless Council would like to consider the concept of separate tax millage only for the unincorporated area.

Funding and Liability Factors:

If we continue on the current path we will be increasing our solid waste disposal costs annually.

Councilman Carnes had suggested freezing reimbursements for current haulers. I have concerns with the impact on new businesses attempting to compete with existing businesses.

Council Options:

We can handle this administratively but wanted to allow for Council to weigh in. We can modify our reimbursements or we can stay the course and increase the budget.

Staff Recommendation:

Modify our practice to eliminate the subsidy.

Committee Recommendation:

To be determined.

Agenda Item Summary

Ordinance # / Resolution#:	Discussion Item
Contact Person / Sponsor:	Steve Willis
Department:	Administration
Date Requested to be on Agenda:	December I&R Committee

Issue for Consideration:

Do we develop an ordinance mandating placement of trash cans at locations that serve food to go?

Points to Consider:

Attached is a memorandum outlining an ordinance adopted by the City of Philadelphia. Their requirement was modeled on research from Disney World as well as internal research.

Funding and Liability Factors:

N/A

Council Options:

This is a policy decision for Council.

Staff Recommendation:

Pursue crafting such an ordinance for consideration by Council.

Committee Recommendation:

To be determined.

MEMORANDUM

TO: I&R Committee

FROM: Steve Willis, County Administrator *SW*

TODAY'S DATE: November 26, 2018

DUE DATE: N/A

SUBJECT: **Concept of Mandating Trash Receptacles at Locations that Sell Food Items To Go**

It was suggested that perhaps an ordinance requiring that a trash receptacle be available at the exit of any business location that sells "to go" food and drink might make an impact on litter. Following some brief on-line research I did not find anything on point for a rural locale such as ours. I did find that the City of Philadelphia has adopted such a requirement and done research on the impact of trash receptacles on littering. Admittedly there is not a direct correlation to a major metropolis and Lancaster County but I thought it would be enough to start the conversation to see if the Committee desired to pursue such a requirement here.

In 2015 the City Council passed Bill 150198 which reads:

Any place of business which sells prepared or prepackaged food for takeout or consumption off the premises shall provide a receptacle for waste and a separate receptacle for recycling within ten (10) feet of the public entrance to the business during the business' normal hours of operation.

I could not find any research on point to Bill 150198 but did find a study from 2018:

PHILADELPHIA — The City's Zero Waste and Litter Cabinet today announced the results of two studies in coordination with the City's GovLabPHL Behavioral Science Initiative. The results show that changes to trash can placement and using trash cans with lids could be an important tool to help the City tackle its Zero Waste goal to eliminate the use of landfills and conventional incinerators by 2035.

"These studies show how the City is committed to applying data and evidence to answer important policy questions and to best determine how resources should be used," said Anjali Chainani, Director of Policy and GovLabPHL. "Engaging our academic partners and the Zero Waste and Litter Cabinet to use behavioral science allows us to have a better understanding of how people think and act when it comes to waste and how we can further inform our litter reduction strategies," she added.

The Zero Waste and Litter Cabinet (ZWL Cabinet) intends to use the outcomes of these studies to help improve litter reduction efforts and increase recycling diversion.

“GovLabPHL allowed us to take behavioral science into Philly’s streets and neighborhoods to test out and refine new litter reduction strategies before going city-wide,” said Zero Waste and Litter Director Nic Esposito. “We are taking what we learned from these studies and directly applying it to the work of our Cabinet to create a litter-free city for all,” he concluded.

The first study on trash receptacle quantity will help the ZWL Cabinet make the economic and operational justification (based on litter reduction and reduction in staff hours picking up litter) to increase the number of publicly accessible waste receptacles in commercial corridors, parks, recreation centers and other highly trafficked streets. The ZWL Cabinet will also plan for future strategic placement of receptacles in public spaces and work with commercial businesses to increase trash cans along commercial corridors to decrease litter.

Additionally, the ZWL Cabinet intends to use the outcomes from the second study on recycling bins to craft policy and regulation on increasing recycling bin distribution locations through a strategic partnership with the Streets Department and the Department of Parks and Recreation, implementing city-wide composting, and on piloting larger recycling bins with lids.

About GovLabPHL

GovLabPHL is a multi-agency team led by the Mayor's Policy Office focused on developing innovative and evidence-based practice in city government. The team is comprised of City employees with expertise across policy, operations, technology, and financial disciplines.

In closing, I did verify that the requirement is still in effect today in Philadelphia (City Code Section 10-704(2)) so I presume it must be considered effective. I would note that this is a standard code requirement in Philadelphia and is not tied to their Zoning ordinance.

This will be presented at an upcoming I&R meeting for such discussion as the Committee desires. I wanted to get this to the membership in advance to see if there was any other information that might be desired. If anyone is up for a genuine cheesesteak sandwich I guess we could take a field trip to speak to their Solid Waste staff on this matter.

Thanks.

SW

cc: John DuBose, County Attorney
Jeff Catoe, Public Services Director

Agenda Item Summary

Ordinance # / Resolution#:	Discussion Item
Contact Person / Sponsor:	Jeff Catoe
Department:	Public Services
Date Requested to be on Agenda:	December I&R

Issue for Consideration:

Amending commodities we accept for recycling.

Points to Consider:

As you can see from the attached new stories we are facing significant problems in recycling. The market for most materials has cratered and rather than making money on most commodities we are having to pay to recycle materials. We can still make money on certain materials, such as metals and cardboard, if the load is uncontaminated.

Many localities are suspending recycling until the market recovers. We will be ending comingled recycling and returning to single stream for select commodities. At this time all other materials will be diverted to the landfill, including items that can be recycled such as plastics and glass as there is simply no market currently for these materials.

We will monitor the market and add commodities to recycling if the market rebounds.

Unless Council objects we will make this transition administratively.

Funding and Liability Factors:

If we continue to recycle all current materials we will have to increase the budget.

Currently the tipping fee at the landfill is \$28 per ton. Our most recent price per ton of comingled recyclable materials is \$95 per ton.

Council Options:

Absent an objection from Council we will make this change administratively.

Staff Recommendation:

Adjust our recycling efforts to fit current market conditions.

Committee Recommendation:

To be determined.

Recycling stories from Axios and USA Today

1 recycle thing

Now that we're heading into holiday gift season, it's going to be a lot harder to recycle this year's gift boxes. USA Today reports.

- **Why? Because China** has gotten way more strict about what recyclable materials it will accept for processing.
- **"China's decision left recyclers** without a market, causing recyclables to pile up and prices to plummet. Their value fell by about half from pre-crisis levels, making it much more expensive to recycle glass, plastic and paper, according to Waste Management, the trash-hauling giant that bills itself as the nation's largest residential recycler ... "
- **"After years of conditioning** Americans to throw all their reusable containers and paper in bins, cities across the U.S. are now imposing higher collection fees, eliminating items they are willing to pick up, or in a few cases, weighing whether to curtail recycling altogether."

Thanks, China.

Go deeper: America has a recycling problem — and China is making it worse (Axios Video)

Will those holiday gift boxes actually get recycled? Um, maybe

Chris Woodyard, USA TODAY Published 3:24 a.m. ET Nov. 23, 201

As millions of holiday deliveries head to doorsteps around the country, it's becoming clear that some of this year's gift boxes may not necessarily become next year's gift boxes.

This holiday season collides with what has become known as the great recycling crisis. Earlier this year, China, which for years has been America's go-to nation for processing recyclables into new boxes, started rejecting all but the cleanest, purest loads.

China's decision left recyclers without a market, causing recyclables to pile up and prices to plummet. Their value fell by about half from pre-crisis levels, making it much more expensive to recycle glass, plastic and paper, according to Waste Management, the trash-hauling giant that bills itself as the nation's largest residential recycler.

"The economics aren't in our favor anymore," said Brandon Wright, spokesman for the National Waste and Recycling Association.

The shift doesn't bode well for the future of recycling. After years of conditioning Americans to throw all their reusable containers and paper in bins, cities across the U.S. are now imposing higher collection fees, eliminating items they are willing to pick up, or in a few cases, weighing whether to curtail recycling altogether.

It's isn't good news for the environment. Roughly 35 percent of the U.S.' total waste is diverted to recycling from the overall solid waste stream. That's millions of tons of materials that can be reused rather than having to use virgin materials. It also saves on the energy and effort required to make new items from scratch.

At holiday time, recycling bins can overflow with mountains of leftover packaging, not to mention soft-drink cans and New Year's champagne bottles. UPS alone forecasts its crews will deliver 800 million packages this season, up from 762 million at the same time last year. Add another 400 million or so for FedEx if its total matches last year's volume.

No longer accepted

The online retailing revolution -- and home delivery -- have forced big changes in recycling. More cardboard boxes now go to homes rather than businesses, complicating pickup.

Normally, discarded holiday gift boxes and other recyclables would be put out for recycling in tiny Bosque Farms, New Mexico. But this year, the enclave's private trash hauler is no longer accepting recyclables because it's too costly.

To deal with dwindling revenue, city leaders in Dothan, Alabama, are thinking of suspending curbside pickup of recyclables and instead creating one or two recycling centers where people can take cans, bottles, paper and more.

In Sacramento County, California, recycling goes on, but the economic toll is adding up. Mixed paper was worth \$85 to \$95 a ton to recyclers a year ago. Lately, it's been fetching \$6.50 to \$8.50. Lesser-quality plastics were worth \$45 a ton. Now it costs \$35 to get it recycled. Cardboard prices fell, too.

"For a long time, China was taking all of our waste paper and we were feeling pretty good about it," said Dave Vaccarezza, who heads the family-owned Cal-Waste Recovery Systems in Galt, California, which handles recyclables for Sacramento and three other counties. "Now they've shut that down."

Waste Management, which has about 100 recycling processing facilities around the nation, says the cost of processing recyclables was once \$85 a ton. Now the sorted loads collectively only bring in about \$65 a ton. Instead of receiving a check for their recyclables, cities are now being asked to pay to have them taken away, said Brent Bell, the company's vice president of recycling.

The good news, he said, is that his company has managed to find markets for recycled materials other than China, but they are in India and other South Asian nations where it can cost more to ship.

Recycle this, not that

Selling recycled materials is supposed to be a profit center for communities, offsetting the cost of collecting them. Recycling is big business, accounting for 757,000 jobs in the U.S., the Environmental Protection Agency estimates.

But with China pulling out of the market, the recycling industry, or the private haulers and processors locked into contracts with cities and counties to sort and find markets for the materials, now either needs to demand extra compensation or lose money fulfilling their obligations.

The problem, in large measure, surrounds how Americans recycle. City dwellers love the convenience of piling all their cans, bottles, paper and other items into a single bin. But the mixing also creates issues when it comes to sorting.

Amazon boxes are environmentally friendly and completely recyclable, but not if they become saturated with battery acid or Thanksgiving turkey gravy. Paper is fine to recycle, but not if it's a grease-smeared pizza box.

Bins are also contaminated with junk that shouldn't be there at all, like spent garden hoses, broken-down lawn chairs, dead car batteries or the industry's top bugaboo, grocery bags made of plastic film. Waste Management said the overall contamination rate of recycled materials is about 25 percent.

The mixing of waste materials has led to recycling bin inspections, which can lead to either warnings from the haulers or the city about putting the wrong items in bins or refusal to pick up loads until the homeowner eliminates the problem.

Vermont's Agency of Natural Resources is going further, with public-service ads "to encourage residents and businesses to recycle right," said Josh Kelly, the agency's material management section chief.

The state also recently enacted a law amending the state's landfill disposal requirements allowing the agency to issue a waiver that let mixed paper -- typically catalogs, junk mail and alike -- be sent to landfills instead of being recycled if there are no markets for it. So far, Kelly said, it hasn't been needed.

While the China ban is expected to lead to the building of more plants to process recycled paper and plastic back to raw materials in the U.S., "those in the recycling industry expect it will take at least a few years before a true market rebound is felt," he said.

Recycling robots

Until then, recycling firms have hired more workers to painstakingly reduce the contamination rate by separating materials. Some save on labor by investing millions in recycling "robots," giant machines that can carefully separate materials that came from single residential bins.

Almost three-quarters of American households have some form of curbside pickup of recyclables, the Sustainable Packaging Coalition found in a study. Other communities still cling to having residents separate their trash and bring it to a single collection point.

In Teton County, Wyoming, -- home to Jackson Hole -- government officials say they are able to reduce contamination and cut the volume of trash they would otherwise send to its landfill about 100 miles away in Idaho by having residents sort their own waste.

Having the landfill so far away is expensive, said Heather Overholser, the county's superintendent of Solid Waste and Recycling. "Therefore recycling makes a lot of economic sense as well as environmental sense."

Most cities are just anxious for some sort of resolution to the crisis.

Because recycling is in so much turmoil, "we would like to get it solved," said Gretchen Olsen, solid waste manager for Stockton, California.

Agenda Item Summary

Ordinance # / Resolution#:

Contact Person / Sponsor: Jeff Catoe

Committee: I&R

Department: Public Services

Date Requested to be on Agenda: December 11, 2018

Issue for Consideration:

Inspections of newly constructed roads

Points to Consider:

Newly constructed roads to be platted in Lancaster County are privately maintained. The question continues to arise from both staff and the development community if the County is obligated to perform a series of inspections on the roads, whether private or not, to assure roads are built to standards. Staff has concerns on the roads without a County representative present conducting satisfactory inspections before, during, and after construction. Legal counsel also has questions and may offer an opinion.

Funding and Liability Factors:

A Lancaster County employee(s) will conduct and have final say in the inspections, or the developer will supply documentation from the project engineer.

Committee Options:

Information only

Recommendation:

Advise staff after discussing and hearing legal counsel.

Agenda Item Summary

Ordinance # / Resolution#:

Contact Person / Sponsor: Nicholas Miller

Department: Procurement

Date Requested to be on Agenda: I&R Committee (12/11)

Issue for Consideration:

Discussion regarding final bids for Animal Shelter and additional considerations for bid phase completion

Points to Consider:

Restrictive marketplace factors, value engineering opportunities

Funding and Liability Factors:

Requesting evaluation of project budget and additional funding to proceed

Council Options:

Consensus to accept responsive low bid received and proceed to notice of award; or, rebid project; or, suspend project until further notice

Recommendation:

Recommendation from County Administrator and staff is to increase project budget subsequent to marketplace factors and to proceed to notice of award with County Council's approval of additional funding release

Lancaster Animal Shelter
Total Estimated Project Budget

8.17.18

I. TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COST

\$2,350,788

A.1 Building Construction	\$1,894,728
A.2 Sitework	\$456,060

Construction cost does NOT include Add Alternate kennel wings
Vetted with 2 GCs, a site contractor, and 5 additional subcontractors
Construction cost with 10% contingency = \$2,585,867
(Contingency added to full cost below)

II. TOTAL ESTIMATED FF&E (Fixtures, Furnishings and Equipment D.1 - E.9)

\$160,000

D.1 Animal Equipment	\$150,000
D.2 Furniture	\$0
D.3 Signage	\$5,000
E.1 Building Security System	\$0
E.2 Telephone System	\$0
E.3 Voice & Data Cabling	\$5,000
E.4 Audio Visual Equipment	\$0
E.5 Computer Hardware & Software	\$0
E.6 Other	\$0

Reuse existing

Construction cost includes rough-in only

Construction cost includes rough-in only

Budget assumes that all office, medical, and cleaning equipment will move to the new facility.

III. TOTAL ESTIMATED PROFESSIONAL COMPENSATION (F.1 - F.5)

\$134,053

F.1 Pre Design Services	
a. Road Map	\$0
b. Existing Facility Assessments	\$0
c. Existing Facility Documentation	\$0
d. Programming	\$16,689
e. Community Meetings (1 for each location)	\$0
F.2 Architecture and Engineering Basic Design Services	
a. Arch, MEP, Structural and Civil Engineering	\$117,364
F.3 FF&E Design Services	
a. Not Included	\$0
F.4 Additional Services	
a. Sustainability Consulting	\$0
b. Landscape Architecture	\$0
c. Cost Estimating	\$0
e. Acoustic Consultant	\$0
e. Lighting Consultant	\$0
f. A/V, Technology, Low Voltage Consultant	\$0
g. Security Consultant	\$0
h. Other	\$0

Actual cost

Actual cost

IV. TOTAL ESTIMATED OWNER'S EXPENSES (G.1 - G.3)

\$19,000

G.1 Pre-Design Phase Expenses	
a. Land Acquisition Cost	\$0
b. Site Survey	\$0
c. Environmental Studies	\$0
d. Hazardous Material Assessments & Abatement	\$0
e. Commissioning Agent	\$0
f. Other	\$0
G.2 Design & Construction Phase Expenses	
a. Geotechnical Testing	\$4,000
b. Special Inspections Req'd by IBC	\$15,000
c. Erosion Control Inspections if Req'd by County	\$0
d. Other	\$0
G.3 Post Construction Expenses	
a. Moving Costs	\$0
b. Other	\$0

Actual cost

V. SUBTOTAL ESTIMATED PROBABLE PROJECT COST

\$2,663,841

VI. DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION CONTINGENCY

10% of I.

\$235,079

Contingency applied to Construction Cost only

VII. TOTAL ESTIMATED PROBABLE PROJECT COST

\$2,898,919

CONTRACTORS	Southern Builders			Southside Constructors				
Mandatory Pre-Bid Attendance	Y			Y				
Acknowledgment of 5 Addenda	Y			Y				
Total Base Bid	\$ 2,992,944			\$ 3,295,500				
Alternate #1	\$ 428,000			\$ 349,000				
SUB-CONTRACTOR BREAKDOWN FOR BASE BID								
General Conditions	\$196,453.60			\$169,534.00				
Overhead and Profit	\$182,152.66			\$318,658.00				
Concrete	\$217,868.75			\$190,784.00				
Masonry	\$118,000.00			\$176,000.00				
Metals	\$75,529.00			\$86,400.00				
Woods and Plastics	\$5,000.00			\$22,220.00				
Thermal and Moisture Protection	\$40,000.00			\$65,400.00				
Openings	\$80,954.00			\$74,300.00				
Finishes	\$142,146.00			\$206,900.00				
Specialties	\$3,337.00			\$4,100.00				
Furnishings	\$10,000.00			\$0.00				
Special Construction / Pre-Engineered Building	\$241,285.00			\$200,600.00				
Plumbing	\$322,000.00			\$329,875.00				
Mechanical	\$532,501.00			\$579,093.00				
Electrical	\$241,983.00			\$251,208.00				
Earthwork	\$236,782.00			\$305,575.00				
Exterior Improvements	\$261,627.00			\$241,013.00				
Utilities	\$85,325.00			\$73,840.00				
Total (Should match above)	\$2,992,944			\$3,295,500				

CONTRACTORS	Southern Builders			Southside Constructors				
Mandatory Pre-Bid Attendance	Y			Y				
Acknowledgment of 5 Addenda	Y			Y				
Total Base Bid	\$ 2,992,944			\$ 3,295,500				
Major Subcontractors								
Concrete	NDB Construction			Southside Constructors				
Masonry	Division Four Contracting			Southside Constructors				
Roofing	Pickens Roofing			Piedmont Commerical (Roofing)				
Plumbing	Action Mechanical			Action Mechanical				
HVAC	LL John's			Perrigo Heaating and Air				
Electrical	Brilin Electric			Walker Electrical				

CONTRACTORS	Southern Builders
Mandatory Pre-Bid Attendance	Y
Acknowledgment of 5 Addenda	Y
Total Base Bid	\$ 2,992,944
Alternate #1	\$ 428,000
SUB-CONTRACTOR BREAKDOWN FOR BASE BID	
General Conditions	\$196,453.60
Overhead and Profit	\$182,152.66
Concrete	\$217,868.75
Masonry	\$118,000.00
Metals	\$75,529.00
Woods and Plastics	\$5,000.00
Thermal and Moisture Protection	\$40,000.00
Openings	\$80,954.00
Finishes	\$142,146.00
Specialties	\$3,337.00
Furnishings	\$10,000.00
Special Construction / Pre-Engineered Building	\$241,285.00
Plumbing	\$322,000.00
Mechanical	\$532,501.00
Electrical	\$241,983.00
Earthwork	\$236,782.00
Exterior Improvements	\$261,627.00
Utilities	\$85,325.00
Total (Should match above)	\$2,992,944

	Budget	Difference b/w Budget and Low Bidder	
1			Combined w/ Item #2 below
2	\$263,929.55	114,676.71	
3	\$209,817.91	8,050.84	
4	\$223,600.00	(105,600.00)	
5	\$110,290.55	(34,761.55)	
6	\$13,057.96	(8,057.96)	
7	\$45,702.86	(5,702.86)	
8	\$82,628.18	(1,674.18)	
9	\$154,107.51	(11,961.51)	
10	\$13,057.96	(9,720.96)	
11	\$30,252.73	(20,252.73)	
12	\$305,038.77	(63,753.77)	
13	\$186,800.00	135,200.00	
14	\$231,957.96	300,543.04	
15	\$233,057.96	8,925.04	
16	\$341,792.96	156,616.04	
17			Combined w/ Item #16 above
18	\$140,383.00	(55,058.00)	
	\$2,585,475.85	\$407,468.16	
	\$2,585,475.85 math check (should match above)		



December 3, 2018

Nicholas Miller
Director of Procurement
101 N Main Street
Lancaster, SC 29720

Nicholas,

After a thorough and collaborative design process for the new Animal Shelter, we share in the County's disappointment with the bid results. That said, unfortunately we can't say we were surprised. Our firm subscribes to several market conditions reports in an effort to stay informed on construction costs, and these have consistently indicated sharply climbing costs for the construction industry over the past two years. Many clients and colleagues have shared in recent budget struggles reflective of this and it has been an unfortunate trend across many projects.

For that reason, we solicited more advice than is typical during design from industry partners, including two General Contractors, a Site Contractor, Metal Building Supplier, and several major subs including Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing, and Masonry. Several of these partners, along with a third-party Cost Consultant, warned that contractors are extremely busy, labor is in short supply, and material costs are rising unpredictably. Even with this advice roughly three months prior to bidding, we unfortunately still missed the mark of where we'd hoped costs would come in. Off-target specifically were mechanical, plumbing, sitework, and contractor fees.

We were hopeful during bidding with interest in the project from up to 11 General Contractors requesting drawings directly from MPS, along with several public plan rooms who also made drawings available. We received a good level of interaction through questions and substitution requests, and we vetted and approved all substitutions received within the allotted timeframe to allow GCs to bid alternatives to our specified products if they had more cost-effective options.

Just the morning of the bid opening, a contractor in Greenville shared with me that every project they were currently pricing has come in over budget and that they hoped competition would work in our favor for the shelter. It was especially unfortunate that bids were received from only two contractors. It is our opinion that contractors and the subs they depend on are simply covered up with work. Of the 11 showing interest during bidding, Southern Builders and Southside Constructors submitted bids, with Southern as the apparent low bidder. Our firm has not worked directly with Southern, however their bid package along with other requested materials were complete and timely. While disappointing that the bid amount is higher than hoped, we have no reason to withhold our recommendation to the County to award the project to Southern.

Thank you for the trust you have placed in MPS. We value our work together and we remain committed to navigating this challenging product alongside the County.

Best,

Cary Perkins, AIA
Associate Principal

400 augusta street, suite 200, greenville, sc 29601
o. 864 242 2033 f. 864 242 2034

mcmillanpazdansmith.com