

Consulting Engineers & Surveyors

January 24, 2001

Pomeroy's Responses to Additional False Statements made by Irene White

#### Irene White's False Statement:

"I was not against the alley behind Valleyview Drive being maintained. This is what the mayor had ask council to OK. They did. Fine. Alternates are to be done if there is enough money in the scope of the project for that specific contract, not to go back and fix mistakes from previous projects. Then I got a copy of the bids for Resurfacing. The best and longer lasting job for our streets was Alternate C. The best job was NEVER put into the bid. Alternate A was the Alley. The mayor intended to use the \$15,000+contingency for OUR STREETS to reconstruct the alley behind his house. So Ohio Public Works took the money away from the Village because Russolillo lied in the application. The alley was supposed to be maintained not reconstructed. He told council that since Shelly had already contracted to do the work we could get sued. So council took it out of your money. Why does he lie on applications? Then we get money taken away."

#### The Truth:

This statement concerns the street and alley resurfacing project that was completed this summer. It is a shame that someone is trying to distort the facts about this successful project. This project involved the resurfacing of about 9,900' of streets and most of the alleys. Our inspector received numerous positive comments from residents about this badly needed project.

Irene White's comments seem to revolve around the contract "Alternate A" which involved resurfacing the alley between Elliot and Valleyview Drive and between Hague and Harris Avenue from Elliot to Dibblee Avenue. The length of this alley is about 2,100' and provides access for about 50 residents including the Mayor. It seems ridiculous that this part of the project was constructed solely for the Mayors benefit as she claims.

Some facts about this project are:

This summer the Ohio Public Works Commission approved a loan for up to \$173,363 for resurfacing the Villages streets and alleys. The loan was justified in a funding application submitted by the Village in 1999 as follows:

Construction work \$143,631
Engineering and Inspection \$15,732
Contingency \$14,000

Total \$173,363

Conceivably \$157,631 (\$143,631 + \$14,000) could be used for construction work.

January 24, 2001 Pomeroy's Responses to Additional False Statements made by Irene White Page Two

When the project plans and specifications were prepared for bidding, there was uncertainty concerning the price of asphalt do to recent increases in oil prices and how much work could be accomplished with the fixed funding amount. It was decided to prepare a set of bid documents that contained a base bid for work that could reasonably be expected to be accomplished for under \$157,631. In addition, three alternates were provided to try and take advantage of any favorable bid prices. The alternates would only be performed if funding was available and the bids were low enough.

The alternates consisted of:

Alternate A: Resurface the alley between Elliot and Valleyview Drive and between Hague and Harris Avenue from Elliot to Dibblee Avenue.

Alternate B: Adjust the catch basin to grade at the intersection of Warren and Dibblee Avenue.

Alternate C: Provide an alternate to crack sealing and tack coating the existing streets by providing an asphalt membrane. This alternate would only be performed if it was cheaper than crack sealing and tack coating. As it turned out the contractor bid \$37,198 for this alternate and \$12,837 for crack sealing and tack coating so alternate C was rejected as being too expensive. In our opinion, the benefit of having the membrane was not worth the additional cost.

The project was advertised and bid in July and the Village received bids from four contractors (see enclosed tabulation of the bids). The lowest bid was submitted by the Shelly Company as follows:

Base construction work	\$144,992.80
Alternate A	\$ 14,514.80
Alternate B	\$ 1,270.00
Alternate C \$ 37,198.00	(Not Performed)
	,
Total	\$160,776.60

After the bids were received, the Mayor submitted The Shelly Company bid to OPWC for approval and requested that Alternates A and B be included for funding (even though they were not included in the original funding application) to take advantage of the favorable bid prices. OPWC declined to include the alternates however, in August, the Village Council determined that it would be wise to take advantage of the contractor's unit prices based on this large project and voted to authorize Village funding for Alternates A and B.

January 24, 2001 Pomeroy's Responses to Additional False Statements made by Irene White Page Three

Contrary to Irene White's false statement, public records indicate that no one ever lied on an OPWC funding application and the OPWC has never taken money away from the Village.

## Irene White's False Statement:

"There are other things on the resurfacing contract that are to correct problems from other jobs that were disallowed by OPWC. Do you know that we paid \$10,000 for those little white no parking signs that blew in your yards? \$90 a piece for the 8 stop lines painted at the stop signs at Valleyview Dr. and at Hague Ave."

## The Truth:

The Shelly Company bid includes a bid item number 614 "maintaining traffic" for \$10,000 (see the bid tabulations). According to the project specifications, this item includes all work necessary to maintain vehicle and pedestrian traffic including signage, directing traffic, paying for the services of a police officer, etc. The Village awarded this contracted based on the <u>lowest</u> total bid and is not at liberty to create a composite bid made up by picking the lowest unit price from each contractor. **Either Irene White is ignorant of this process or is purposefully distorting the facts**.

# Irene White's False Statement:

"They have had Brad Smith, owner of Pomeroy Engineering, and Solicitor Ed Kirk ridicule and portray me as someone who is unstable and a trouble maker."

### The Truth:

Though the claims Irene White makes are completely unfounded and have no basis in fact, I do not know Irene White well enough to comment on her mental stability.

Bidder; <u>Strawser Paving Co., Inc.</u> 1595 Frank Rd. Columbus, Chio 43223-3737	\$ 0.80 \$ 1,982.40 \$ 34.90 \$ 7,004.00 \$ 1.50 \$ 372.00 \$ 100.00 \$ 100.00 \$ 0.61 \$ 1,511.58	\$10,969.98	\$ 50.00 \$ 750.00 \$ 100.00 \$ 100.00 \$ 7.00 \$ 175.00	\$1,025,00		1.61 \$ 37,430.89	
Bidder: The Shelly Co. 80 Park Dr. Thorrylle, Otho 43076	\$ 2.00 \$ 4,956.00 \$ 38.00 \$ 7,628.00 \$ 0.50 \$ 124.00 \$ 1,486.80	\$14,514.60	\$ 50.00 \$ 800.00 \$ 120.00 \$ 120.00 \$ 10.00 \$ 250.00	\$1,270.00		\$ 1.60 \$ 37,198.40 \$	
Bidder: McDaniel's Construction Corp., Inc. 1069 Woodland Avenue Columbus, Ohlo 43219	\$ 3.00 \$ 7,434.00 \$ 40.00 \$ 8,240.00 \$ 150 \$ 372.00 \$ 80.00 \$ 60.00 \$ 0.75 \$ 1,658.50	\$17,984.50	\$ 150.00 \$ 2,250.00 \$ 80.00 \$ 80.00 \$ 10.00 \$ 250.00	\$2,580.00		\$ 2.50 \$ 58,122,50	
Bidder: Decker Construction Company 3040 McKinley Avenue Columbus, Chio 43204	\$ 3.50 \$ 8,673.00 \$ 44.00 \$ 9,084.00 \$ 3.25 \$ 806.00 \$ 280.00 \$ 280.00 \$ 0.70 \$ 1,734.60	\$20,527.60	\$ 35.00 \$ 525.00 \$ 500.00 \$ 500.00 \$ 3.00 \$ 75.00	\$1,160.00	CRACKSEAL	\$ 1.80 \$ 41,848.20	
		TOTAL ALTERNATE A BID I OF WARREN AND C:BBLEE	SY 15 EACH 1 SY 25	TOTAL ALTERNATE B BID	AYER IN LIEU OF TACK COAT AND	ER SY 23249	
(JOB 1330) DATE: 3 AUGUST 2000 OPWC PROJECT NO. CC12D STREET RESURFACING PROJECT	ALTERNATE A: RESURFACE ASPHALT ALLEYS, AS PER PLAN 254 PAVEMENT PLANING, BITUMINOUS 404 ASPHALT CONCRETE, AC-20 407 TACK COAT 604 CATCH BASIN ADJUSTED TO GRADE 825 CRACKSEAL, TYPE III	TOTAL ALTERNATE / ALTERNATE B: ADJUST CATCH BASIN AT INTERSECTION OF WARREN AND D:BBLEE	253 PAVEMENT REPAIR, AS PER PLAN 604 CATCH BASIN ADJUSTED TO GRADE 659 SEEDING AND MULCHING, AS PER PLAN		ALTERNATE C: STRESS ABSORBING MEMBRANE INTERLAYER IN LIEU OF TACK COAT AND CRACKSEAL	SPECIAL STRESS ABSORBING MEMBRANE INTERLAYER	

BID TABULATION
VILLAGE OF VALLEYVIEW
STREET RESURFACING PROJECT

	(JOB 1330)			Bidder:			Bldder:		Bldder:		Blåder:		
凝凝	DATE: 3 AUGUST 2000 OPWC PROJECT NO. CC12D STREET RESURFACING PROJECT			Decker Construction Company 3040 McKinley Avenue Columbus, Chio 43204	action Compa	Nua.	McDanlel's Construction 1069 Woodland Avenue Columbus, Ohlo 43219	McDanlef's Construction Corp., Inc. 1069 Woodland Avenue Columbus, Ohle 43219	The Shelfy Co. 80 Park Dr. Thornviis, Ohlo 43076	076	Strawzer Paving Co., Inc., 1563 Frank Rd. Columbus, Ohio 43223-3737	ving Co., in td. tho 43223-3	1737
ITEM NO.	DESCRIPTION	UNIT	ESTIMATED QUANTITY	UNIT COST	TOTAL	TOTAL COST	UNIT COST	TOTAL COST	UNITCOST	TOTAL COST	r UNIT COST		TOTAL COST
	EXCAVATION	Շ	100	\$ 25.00	69	2,500.00	\$ 40,00	\$ 4,000,00	\$ 27.00	2 700 00	' اد		2 600.00
	LINEAR GRADING, AS PER PLAN	5	4684	1.60	49	7,494.40	1.50		ĺ		•		44 DE2 DO
	PAVEMENT REPAIR, AS PER PLAN	λ	96	\$ 35.00	69	1,050.00	\$ 130.00		1		+   #	•   •	1 500 00
	PAVEMENT PLANING, RITUMINOUS	S≺	12588	\$ 1.20	69	5,105.60	1	~	\$ 0.85	=	»   «	. [ c	10.070.40
	AGGREGATE BASE	ò	90	\$ 20.00	•	1,200.00	\$ 43.00	\$ 2,580,00	1"		-   u	. [	3.000.00
	ASPHALI CONCRETE, AC-20	TONS	2194	\$ 34.50	\$	75,693.00	\$ 38.00	\$ 83,372.00	\$ 32.00	\$ 70,208.00	. 69		74,596.00
	THE STATE OF THE S	GAL	2425	\$ 1.70	€9	4,122.50	\$ 1.50	\$ 3,637,50	\$ 0.50	\$ 1,212,50	50 \$ 1.50	 	3,637.50
	PRIME COAT, AN PER FLAN	GAL	2156	\$ 1.80	₩.	3,890,80	\$ 2.25	\$ 4,851.00	\$ 1.25	\$ 2,695.00		<b>.</b> ,	4,312,00
	SEAL CUA!, RS-2, AS PER PLAN	GAL.	5930	\$ 2.20	\$	13,046,00	\$ 1.10	\$ 6,523.00	\$ 2.00	\$ 11,860.00		69	11.860.00
	SEAL COAT COVER AGGREGATE #57	Շ	8	\$ 38.00		3,420.00	\$ 120.00	\$ 10,800.00	\$ 70.00	\$ 6,300.00		,	6.750.00
	SEAL COVER AGGREGATE#8	Շ	26	\$ 38.00	69	2,128.00	\$ 120.00	\$ 6,720.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 4,480.00	4,5		4 200 00
	MANHOLE ADJUSTED TO GRADE	EACH	8	\$ 90.00	65	1,800.00	\$ 80.00	\$ 1,600.00	\$ 75.00	\$ 1,500.00	-	1 -	2,000,00
	CATCH BASIN ADJUSTED TO GRADE	EACH	٨	\$ 250.00	-	1,750.00	\$ 80.00	\$ 560.00	\$ 130.00		.   •		200 002
	CATCH BASIN RECONSTRUCTED TO GRADE	EACH	23	\$ 650.00	₩	00:005,1	\$ 800.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 400.00	\$ 800,00		,	1,100,00
	MAINTAINING TRAFFIC	LUMP	LUMP	\$ 2,700.00	49	2,700.00	\$ 11,000,00	\$ 11,000.00	\$ 10.069.00	\$ 10,000,00	.   5	1	3 000 00
	STOP LINES	<b>5</b>	06	\$ 6.00	<b>5</b>	540,00	\$ 10.00	00'006	1 S	00 022	!	'	0,000,00
	VALVE BOX ADJUSTED TO GRADE, AS PER PLAN	EACH	80	\$ 800.00	9	- W 00 84	2000	90 908	;		• :	, إ	020.00
SPECIAL	CRACK SEALING, TYPE III, AS PER PLAN	×	23240	1		on'nou's	4 100.00	١	\$ 120.00	\$ 960.00	∓    ÷	••	800.00
SPECIAL	PROJECT SIGN 4" BY R" AS PER PLAN		, .	ľ		15,949.40	0.60	\$ 13,949.40	3.50	\$ 11,624.50	0 \$ 0,54	<b>5</b>	12,554.46
SPECIAL	AGGREGATE #2 STOME	EACH	- (	`	<b>~</b>	400.00	\$ 4,000.10	\$ 4,000.10	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	00.009 \$ 600.00	••	600.00
		ວ່	ıõ	40.00		200.00	\$ 29.00	\$ 145.00	\$ 120.00	\$ 600.00	00.00	₩	450.00
		i	,										
		<u>o</u>	TOTAL BASE BID		\$ 158	158,679.70		\$ 193,140.00		\$ 144,992,80		<b>.</b>	157,912.36
									•		ī		