

**CITY OF HIGHLAND HEIGHTS
MINUTES OF A COUNCIL MEETING
AS A COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
HELD: DECEMBER 13, 2011**

President of Council Mills presiding.

PRESENT: Mayor Coleman; Councilmen Hargate, Legan, Lombardo, Mastrangelo, Mills, Murphy, Stickan; Clerk of Council Buchak; Service Director Evans; Building Commissioner Grabfelder; Assistant City Engineer Mader; Law Director Paluf;

Municipal Lighting Improvement Project

Service Director Evans reported bid opening for this project was December 7th. Three contractors submitted bids for this work. The low bid was submitted by a company called Asphalt Services, Inc. out of Twinsburg. Total bid for all of the alternates was \$231,268.82.

Mr. Evans reviewed the alternates and the budget process. URS Consultants did the design work on this and they also did an energy audit for the City. They came upon two areas where they knew the work was going to affect the budget in a significant way. The first was the Community Center. In the Highland Room which is the largest room there, the overhead lighting is out-dated, antiquated and does not function well. Re-lamping it was not a good alternative; it still would have been a bad lighting system. So at Mr. Evans' direction, the contractor put in specifications to replace the lighting completely in the Highland Room and they put it in as an alternate so the cost can be identified and a decision can be made on whether or not they want to move forward and do that. It was not practical to try to just re-lamp with energy efficient lighting.

The other area where they ran into problems was with the parking lot lighting. The original intention was to re-lamp and to use a more energy efficient lamp in the fixtures but on inspection the fixtures on the top of the poles are in pretty poor condition and need to be replaced. So again at his direction they put that in as an alternate to identify the specific costs of that and make a decision on whether or not to award that work.

The third alternate was to replace the parking lots lights in their entirety. The Contractor estimated that to be around \$13,000. As you can see by the bid results nobody agreed with our consultants. The prices were significantly more expensive. Mr. Evans advised, in discussion with URS, they don't feel it is necessary to replace those poles. The cost is obviously significant. The existing parking lot poles can be reused. They may need a coat of paint at some point.

Mr. Evans advised, what they would like to consider for award is the base bid, plus alternate 1 and alternate 2, and the discretionary allowance. That is \$193,515, about 7% over the consultant's estimate. In the consultant's opinion and he agreed, that is not a significant amount to be over their estimate. However, this does put the project over the budget for this project. Council originally budgeted \$140,000 for this work. Some of those funds were expended in hiring the consultant. This puts the City short as far as being able to award this by the end of

CITY OF HIGHLAND HEIGHTS
MINUTES OF A COUNCIL MEETING AS A COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
HELD: - DECEMBER 13, 2011 - PAGE 2 OF 2

this year. In discussions with the Mayor and with the Finance Director they think it is probably best to take no action this evening and push it into the New Year and let the new L&F Committee look at this and review the alternates so they can make a decision on which parts of this they want to award. This business can be taken up the first thing in the New Year. The bid opening was December 7th so they have 60 days from the date of the bid opening to make an award.

Mr. Evans reviewed the grant awards for this project. A \$26,000 award was received from the Cuyahoga County Planning Commission which was actually Federal Stimulus dollars. That paid for the audit in its entirety. The actual audit cost was something under that \$26,000 grant. An \$81,000 grant was received from NOPEC, The Northern Ohio Public Energy Council. The City has already begun to receive payments on that. NOPEC made the first of four payments to us, approximately \$20,000. They will make an additional payment once award of the project is made and the remainder will come once the project is completed. Additionally our consultant identified additional dollar savings through a rebate program through First Energy. We don't know the exact dollar value of that but it will probably be more than \$10,000 in rebates that we will be able to apply for with First Energy so as soon as the project is awarded, and a contractor is on board, the contractor will have to give us their shop drawings on the exact products they intend to use. As part of URS services to us they will calculate our exact energy savings based on those products and that will define the rebate from First Energy. It should be significant.

Mr. Mastrangelo's asked if the quotes covered all fourteen concerns on the energy audit. Mr. Evans advised no this was lighting only. The energy audit identified additional energy savings beyond lighting such as some boiler and HVAC possibilities. This project was strictly lighting -- at least 10 of the 14 recommendations were for lighting.

Mr. Mastrangelo asked why the bids were that much off. Mr. Evans advised, with the exception of the alternate for the pole lighting, the base bid and two other alternates were 7% higher than the engineer's estimate. They felt the 7% was within reason.

ADJOURNMENT: A motion was made by Mr. Lombardo and seconded by Mrs. Murphy to adjourn the meeting at 7:54 p.m. Ayes all; motion carried.