

BEFORE THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
OF THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE) RESOLUTION NO. 88-978
HAY PURCHASE CONTRACT WITH WARD)
RUGH, INC. FOR METRO THE WASHINGTON) Introduced by the
PARK ZOO) Executive Officer

WHEREAS, In 1987, staff followed correct Metro bidding procedures for the procurement of Timothy Hay; and


WHEREAS, The current contract states that "subject to satisfactory performance of this contract and mutual agreement to terms of payment and contract sum, this contract may be extended for up to two additional years;" and

WHEREAS, The Zoo staff is very pleased with the quality of product and service received in the past from the current vendor; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

That the contract with Ward Rugh, Inc. for Timothy Hay be extended one year, increasing the total contract cost by \$28,000 for a maximum amount of \$55,000.

ADOPTED by the Council Internal Affairs Committee of the Metropolitan Service District on this 8th day of September, 1988.


Mike Ragsdale, Presiding Officer

Metro Contract No. 87-6-349-Z

Metro Budget No. 20-02-00-7470-00000

CONTRACT AMENDMENT NO. 1

This is an amendment by and between the Metropolitan Service District (Metro) and the contractor (Ward Rugh Inc.).

The contract termination date shall change to June 30, 1989.

The contract amount shall increase by \$28,000 for a maximum sum payable of \$55,000.

All other terms and conditions of the contract shall remain the same.

METRO

WARD RUGH, INC.

By _____

By _____

Date _____

Date _____

STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 88-978 FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING A CONTRACT FOR THE PURCHASE OF TIMOTHY HAY FOR METRO WASHINGTON PARK ZOO

August 24, 1988

Presented by: Dennis Pate

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

The current timothy hay contract includes the option to renew annually up to three years; last year we went through the formal bid process. Ward Rugh Inc., our current hay contractor, has quoted \$140 per ton this year, due to the large quantities of timothy hay going to Japan and the high prices the Japanese are paying for it. The number of farmers selling exclusively to the Japanese and the devaluation of the dollar are driving the price up. The hay situation will also undoubtedly be affected by the drought in the midwest states.

We do feel the contract renewal, with the \$5 per ton increase, is justifiable for the following reasons:

1. The increase amounts to less than 5% of the total contract amount of \$28,000. Ward Rugh, Inc. has not raised their price since 1986, at which time it was also a \$5 increase. Prior to that it had been the same price for five years.
2. The Ward Rugh people have given us excellent service, accommodating our needs due to construction and scheduling problems.
3. It has been our experience that other hay suppliers in this area are not able to supply the same quality of hay in the quantities required.

This contract is budgeted for in the Animal Management animal food line item.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends approval of this resolution.



METRO

2000 S.W. First Avenue
Portland, OR 97201-5398
503/221-1646

Memorandum

Agenda Item No. 1.2

Date: September 1, 1988

Meeting Date Sept. 8, 1988

To: Internal Affairs Committee

From: Marie Nelson, Clerk of the Council

Regarding: RESOLUTION NO. 88-978, Amending the Hay Purchase
Contract with Ward Rugh, Inc. for the Metro
Washington Park Zoo

The Council Zoo Committee will be meeting on September 6 to consider the above resolution. The written committee report and the committee's recommendation will be available at the September 8 Internal Affairs Committee meeting.



GRANT/CONTRACT SUMMARY

METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

GRANT/CONTRACT NO. 87-6-349-Z BUDGET CODE NO. 20 02 00 7470 00000
 FUND: ZOO DEPARTMENT: An. Mgmt. (IF MORE THAN ONE) _____
 SOURCE CODE (IF REVENUE) _____

INSTRUCTIONS

- OBTAIN GRANT/CONTRACT NUMBER FROM CONTRACTS MANAGER. CONTRACT NUMBER SHOULD APPEAR ON THE SUMMARY FORM AND ALL COPIES OF THE CONTRACT.
- COMPLETE SUMMARY FORM.
- IF CONTRACT IS —
 - SOLE SOURCE, ATTACH MEMO DETAILING JUSTIFICATION.
 - UNDER \$2,500, ATTACH MEMO DETAILING NEED FOR CONTRACT AND CONTRACTOR'S CAPABILITIES, BIDS, ETC.
 - OVER \$2,500, ATTACH QUOTES, EVAL. FORM, NOTIFICATION OF REJECTION, ETC.
 - OVER \$50,000, ATTACH AGENDA MANAGEMENT SUMMARY FROM COUNCIL PACKET, BIDS, RFP, ETC.
- PROVIDE PACKET TO CONTRACTS MANAGER FOR PROCESSING

1. PURPOSE OF GRANT/CONTRACT Purchase of timothy hay for Zoo animals

2. TYPE OF EXPENSE PERSONAL SERVICES LABOR AND MATERIALS PROCUREMENT
 PASS THROUGH AGREEMENT INTER-GOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT CONSTRUCTION
 OTHER

OR

TYPE OF REVENUE GRANT CONTRACT OTHER

3. TYPE OF ACTION CHANGE IN COST CHANGE IN WORK SCOPE
 CHANGE IN TIMING NEW CONTRACT

4. PARTIES Ward Rugh, Inc.

5. EFFECTIVE DATE 7/1/87 TERMINATION DATE 6/30/89
 (THIS IS A CHANGE FROM 6/30/88)

6. EXTENT OF TOTAL COMMITMENT:	ORIGINAL/NEW	\$ <u>27,000.00</u>
	PREV. AMEND	<u>-0-</u>
	THIS AMEND	<u>28,000.00</u>
	TOTAL	\$ <u>55,000.00</u>

7. BUDGET INFORMATION

A. AMOUNT OF GRANT/CONTRACT TO BE SPENT IN FISCAL YEAR 1988-89 \$ 28,000.00
 B. BUDGET LINE ITEM NAME Animal Food AMOUNT APPROPRIATED FOR CONTRACT \$ 28,000.00
 C. ESTIMATED TOTAL LINE ITEM APPROPRIATION REMAINING AS OF July 1, 1988 \$ 110,000.00

8. SUMMARY OF BIDS OR QUOTES (PLEASE INDICATE IF A MINORITY BUSINESS ENTERPRISE)

SUBMITTED BY _____	\$ _____	<input type="checkbox"/> MBE
	AMOUNT	
SUBMITTED BY _____	\$ _____	<input type="checkbox"/> MBE
	AMOUNT	
SUBMITTED BY _____	\$ _____	<input type="checkbox"/> MBE
	AMOUNT	

9. NUMBER AND LOCATION OF ORIGINALS 3

10. A. APPROVED BY STATE/FEDERAL AGENCIES? YES NO NOT APPLICABLE
 B. IS THIS A DOT/UMTA/FHWA ASSISTED CONTRACT YES NO
11. IS CONTRACT OR SUBCONTRACT WITH A MINORITY BUSINESS? YES NO
 IF YES, WHICH JURISDICTION HAS AWARDED CERTIFICATION _____
12. WILL INSURANCE CERTIFICATE BE REQUIRED? YES NO
13. WERE BID AND PERFORMANCE BONDS SUBMITTED? YES NOT APPLICABLE
 TYPE OF BOND _____ AMOUNT \$ _____
 TYPE OF BOND _____ AMOUNT \$ _____
14. LIST OF KNOWN SUBCONTRACTORS (IF APPLICABLE)
- | | | |
|------------|---------------|------------------------------|
| NAME _____ | SERVICE _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> MBE |
| NAME _____ | SERVICE _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> MBE |
| NAME _____ | SERVICE _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> MBE |
| NAME _____ | SERVICE _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> MBE |
15. IF THE CONTRACT IS OVER \$10,000
 A. IS THE CONTRACTOR DOMICILED IN OR REGISTERED TO DO BUSINESS IN THE STATE OF OREGON?
 YES NO
- B. IF NO, HAS AN APPLICATION FOR FINAL PAYMENT RELEASE BEEN FORWARDED TO THE CONTRACTOR?
 YES DATE _____ INITIAL _____
16. COMMENTS:

GRANT/CONTRACT APPROVAL

INTERNAL REVIEW

CONTRACT REVIEW BOARD
(IF REQUIRED) DATE _____

COUNCIL REVIEW
(IF REQUIRED)

DEPARTMENT HEAD

1. _____
COUNCILOR

DATE

FISCAL REVIEW

2. _____
COUNCILOR

BUDGET REVIEW

3. _____
COUNCILOR

LEGAL COUNSEL REVIEW AS NEEDED:

- A. DEVIATION TO CONTRACT FORM _____
- B. CONTRACTS OVER \$10,000 _____
- C. CONTRACTS BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AGENCIES _____