

**CITY MANAGER
MEMORANDUM**

To: The Honorable Mayor Kelley and City Commissioners
Through: Joyce A. Shanahan, City Manager
From: John E. Noble, P.E., City Engineer
Date: November 10, 2011
Subject: John Anderson Drive Roadway Improvements - Amendment No.1

Introduction: This is a request for the City Commission to approve Amendment No.1 to the Professional Services Agreement for the John Anderson Drive Roadway Improvements project to address a scope of services modification and associated additional costs requested by the Design Consultant, Gyhabi & Associates, Inc.

Background: On June 22, 2010 the City Commission awarded a professional services agreement for the engineering design of the John Anderson Drive Roadway improvements to Gyhabi & Associates for \$699,516.70. On April 21, 2011, Gyhabi & Associates, held a public meeting to update the community on the project. The meeting's purpose was to allow the public to see the 60% design plans and discuss the details of the project. Following the April 21st meeting it was evident that there were concerns among the public regarding the project. The major concerns identified at the public meeting were:

- Loss of trees due to roadway alignment and addition of sidewalk
- Sidewalks are not necessary or desired
- Sidewalks are needed for children and pedestrian safety
- This is a "Scenic Roadway" which requires tree planting in advance of improvements
- Proposed design will require drainage and sidewalk easements
- Proposed non-mountable curbs are not bicycle friendly
- Lack of traffic calming measures or decorative elements
- Proposed design will encourage speeding

After hearing the public's concern, the City Commission requested staff to bring the project back for discussion. Staff then asked its consultant to place the project's design on hold and review alternative designs to see how we might address the public's concerns. On July 19, 2011 Gyhabi & Associates presented to the City Commission the results of their alternative analysis and the commission also heard the public's comments on the project. At the conclusion of the discussion, the City Commission agreed to revise the design as follows:

1. Eliminate the sidewalk from the project,
2. Adjust the road lane width from 11 foot lanes to 10 foot lanes,
3. Keep the high back Type "F" curb in lieu of the low profile "Miami" curb style.

Discussion: Ghyabi & Associates has looked into the work effort required to modify their 60% design plans to incorporate the revisions requested by the City Commission and have presented Amendment No.1 to their professional services agreement for consideration. Amendment No.1 includes compensation to the consultant for efforts associated with the investigation of the design alternatives that were presented to the City Commission. In addition, the amendment also includes compensation for design services necessary to revise the plan set to include the modifications approved by the City Commission. This includes elimination of the sidewalk and reduction of the road lane widths from 11 feet to 10 feet. These modifications will require revisions to the drainage design and utility design plans. In addition, the Consultant will include traffic calming measures to include colored pavement at intersections with collector roads (Neptune Ave., Standish Dr., Amsden Dr., and Halifax Ave.) and consideration of the inclusion of stop signs at high traffic volume intersections. The consultant will also adjust the road alignment where required to provide adequate room for FPL utility relocations so that no easements are required and also adjust the road alignment where additional trees can be saved due to the deletion of the sidewalk.

Staff has met with the consultant and has negotiated the requested fee and feels the request is appropriate with regard to the level of service that has been performed in developing the design alternatives and is still required to incorporate the approved changes. The consultant has agreed to a fee of \$39,496.43 associated with Task 1 – Alternative Design Analysis Scope and a fee of \$85,858.12 associated with Task 2 – Design Revision I Scope.

Revisions to the design plans under Task 2 of this scope of work include:

Roadway Design

- Horizontal and vertical alignment adjustments necessary to avoid having to purchase easements for power poles, and if possible, to reduce tree impacts (due to the removal of the sidewalk from the design, except in areas where there is existing sidewalk which will be replaced).
- Effective travel lane widths will be reduced to 10' wide. The sidewalk will be removed except for where there is an existing sidewalk, which will be replaced.
- Modify all cross-sections as a result of the sidewalk removal (except in areas where there is existing sidewalk which will be replaced), the driveway profiles due to the removal of the sidewalk, the re-classification of "not impacted" trees (which will remove special grading and handrail features), and any required alignment changes.
- Incorporating traffic calming features to reduce the average speed through the corridor. To include the addition of stop signs and textured pavement at select intersections.
- Re-create curb return profiles at intersection where there are alignment changes.
- Modify the calculation of all plan quantities.
- Plan sheet re-labeling.

- Update signing and pavement marking plans; and traffic control plans as necessary to reflect other roadway changes.

Drainage Revisions

- Review and evaluate new horizontal and vertical alignment.
- Attend initial meeting with Design Team to review and discuss changes and impacts to primary (roadway) and secondary (roadside) drainage systems. Meeting will be scheduled once alignment revisions are finalized.
- Update the drainage structure basin areas (both impervious and pervious areas) for deleting of sidewalks.
- Revise storm drainage pipe size calculations to reflect new drainage areas, new “C” factors, revised inlet locations, and pipe lengths.
- Revise the off-site treatment facility sizing calculations and revise SJRWMD Stormwater Management Report.
- Revise the sizing of the off-site treatment facility construction site plans to reflect the revisions to the sizing calculations.
- Attend review meeting with Design Team at the 90 percent stage of revision completion.
- Update drainage system quantities and opinion of probable cost.

Utility Revisions

Revisions will reflect adjustments to the potable water, sanitary force main, and reuse water facilities. The utility design revisions will consist of the following tasks:

- Review and evaluate horizontal and vertical alignment changes and revised typical roadway section for impacts on potable water, sanitary force main, and reuse water facilities.
- Review and evaluate revised drainage structure and storm drain pipe horizontal and vertical locations for impacts on potable water, sanitary force main, and reuse water utilities.
- Attend initial meeting with Design Team to discuss changes to utility relocation design resulting from alignment changes and changes to the primary and secondary inlet and pipe locations.
- Revisions to Plan and Profile on Utility Accommodation Plan sheets to reflect revised utility relocations due to roadway grades and storm drain locations.
- Attend review meeting with Design Team at the 90 percent stage of revision completion.

Exhibit 1A of Amendment No.1 includes a detailed scope of work for the two task items. The total cost associated with Amendment No.1 is \$125,354.55.

Budget Impact: Funding for Amendment No.1 is not included in the City’s budget. The additional cost will be appropriated from Fund 308-Transportation Fund (\$75,000) and Fund 107- Stormwater Fund (\$50,354.55). **If approved, a budget amendment will be necessary.**

Recommendation: It is requested that the City Commission approve Amendment No.1 for the John Anderson Drive Roadway Improvement project.

Reviewed by: _____/s/_____
Theodore S. MacLeod, P.E.
Assistant City Manager / Public Works Director

_____/s/_____
Kelly McGuire, Finance Director

Approved by: _____/s/_____
Joyce A. Shanahan, City Manager

RESOLUTION NO. 2011-171

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF AN AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY AND GHYABI & ASSOCIATES, INC. REGARDING THE JOHN ANDERSON DRIVE ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT; AUTHORIZING PAYMENT THEREFORE; AND SETTING FORTH AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the City and Ghyabi & Associates, Inc. are parties to a Professional Services Agreement dated June 22, 2010, and

WHEREAS, the parties desire to amend the aforestated agreement for the limited purpose of amending the Scope of Services and additional costs associated therewith, and

WHEREAS, the City Manager has certified that \$125,354.55 for the additional Scope of Work will be appropriated in the Transportation Fund and the Stormwater Fund through a budget amendment and will not be appropriated for any other purpose, now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ORMOND BEACH, FLORIDA, THAT:

SECTION ONE. The Mayor and the City Manager are hereby authorized and directed to execute Amendment No. 1 to Agreement between the City of Ormond Beach and Ghyabi & Associates, Inc. for the limited purpose of amending the Scope of Services and additional costs associated therewith. A copy of said Amendment No. 1 is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

SECTION TWO. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

APPROVED AND AUTHENTICATED this 15th day of November, 2011.

ED KELLEY
Mayor

ATTEST:

JOSHUA FRUECHT
City Clerk

AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO AGREEMENT

THIS AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT is entered by and between the **City of Ormond Beach, Florida** (hereinafter referred to as "City"), and **Ghyabi & Associates, Inc.**, (hereinafter referred to as "Engineer") for the purposes stated herein, as follows:

WHEREAS, the City and Engineer are parties to an Agreement dated June 22, 2010, and

WHEREAS, the City and Engineer desire to amend the subject Agreement for the limited purpose of amending the Scope of Services and increasing the additional costs associated therewith; now therefore,

Paragraph 1 of that certain Professional Services Agreement between the City and Engineer is hereby amended to read as follows:

1. SCOPE OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

A detailed description of the scope of professional services to be provided is provided in Exhibit "A" and Exhibit 1A.

All other terms and conditions of the subject Agreement shall remain in full force and effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this amendment to be executed by the undersigned officials as of the date listed below.

DATED: _____, 2011.

CITY OF ORMOND BEACH, FLORIDA

BY: _____
Ed Kelley, Mayor

ATTEST: _____
Joyce A. Shanahan, City Manager

DATED: _____, 2011.

GHYABI & ASSOCIATES, INC.

BY: _____
Name: _____
Title: _____

ATTEST: _____
Name: _____
Title: _____

EXHIBIT 1A

Ghyabi and Associates

TASK 1 – ALTERNATIVE DESIGN ANALYSIS SCOPE

On April 21, 2011, Ghyabi and Associates presented the 60% design to the public in a Public Information Meeting held in the City Commission chambers. There was much discussion and opinions from the public, pro and con, concerning the design.

On May 4, 2011, the City decided to place a hold on the project to allow time for additional analysis to occur concerning some of the issues raised by the public, and by City Staff and Commissioners. This Scope and Fee represents what was requested of Ghyabi and Associates, and the effort expended in the performance of the additional analysis and PowerPoint presentation preparation requested by the City.

The following items demonstrate our understanding of the additional evaluation that was required, in preparation for presenting additional design options to the Ormond Beach City Commission.

From the meeting held on 05/19/11 between City staff and the Consultant, The Consultant was asked to prepare an updated PowerPoint presentation that would essentially address the following components:

- Determine % of existing roadway (<11' wide) that is being widened in the proposed design (currently 11' wide).
- Determine % of existing profile that is being raised in the proposed design.
- Identify extent of road where alignment has been shifted.
- Breakdown tree impacts resulting from the proposed design into the same 2 categories named in the PD&E study, with those categories being either palms or hardwoods (hardwoods being all trees that are non-palms).
- Remove Sago palms from our list of impacts.
- Breakdown tree impacts into 2 additional categories: good quality trees and poor quality trees. This will only affect the hardwoods since those are the only trees evaluated as such by our arborist.
- Determine the number of trees we are counting that are < 6" and remove them from the list of impacts.
- Demonstrate by way of an aerial map what the difference will be in potential flooding between raising the profile and not raising the profile.
- Determine the difference in impacts between using Type F barrier curb and the flatter Miami curb. Impacts will differ due to changes in the clear zone (measured from the edge of pavement) being 5' for Type F curb and 10' for Miami curb.

From Commissioner Stowers' email to City Manager Shanahan, dated 05/19/11:

Evaluate tree impacts for the following:

- Sidewalk included in proposed design with all needed easements being granted.
- Sidewalk included in proposed design with no needed easements being granted.
- Proposed design but without sidewalk.
- Proposed design but with narrower lane widths (~~9'~~ 10') and without sidewalk.

From City Manager Shanahan's email to City Commission, dated 05/20/11:

Evaluate tree impacts for the following:

- Proposed design but at existing roadway's elevation (no change in profile due to groundwater table).
- Reconstructing the roadway in its existing footprint (10' minimum lane widths); no profile change).
- Proposed design but without sidewalk.
- Effects of changing from barrier curb (Type F face) to Miami curb.

We have modified two of the above scope items to provide 10' minimum lane widths, since constructing the road at the existing narrow lane width does not meet any standards.

We are not including attendance at the individual meetings to be held with the Mayor and the City Commissioners. Attendance at a July City Commission meeting to present the design alternatives will replace our attendance at a 2nd Public Information Meeting that was included in the original contract.

The fee for Ghyabi and Associates to provide the above reference services is based on actual hours spent, and is reduced by the effort that Ghyabi was previously contracted to perform to prepare for and attend a 2nd Public Information Meeting. The fee is based on time spent meeting with City staff, time spent analyzing the design based on the scope elements, and time spent in meetings.

Task 1 - Alternative Design Analysis Fee Breakdown:

Principal	28.0 hours	
Project Manager	68.9 hours	
Project Engineer	147.5 hours	
Engineer Intern	3.5 hours	
Designer	37.0 hours	
Admin	<u>10.0</u> hours	
Sub-Total	294.9 hours @ \$101.92/hour (avg) =	\$30,056.21
+ Expenses (actual)		106.87
- 40 hours prep from original contract @ \$101.92/hour =		(4,076.80)
- City Commission Mtg attendance 7/19/11 12.5 hours @ \$101.92/hour =		<u>(1,274.00)</u>
Ghyabi Fee Total		\$24,812.28
McKim and Creed Fee Total		12,784.15
Advance Tree Care Fee Total		<u>1,900.00</u>
Task 1 - Alternative Design Analysis Fee Total		\$39,496.43

TASK 2 – DESIGN REVISION I SCOPE

On April 21, 2011, Ghyabi and Associates presented the 60% design to the public in a Public Information Meeting held in the City Commission chambers. There was much discussion and opinions from the public, pro and con, concerning the design.

On May 4, 2011, the City decided to place a hold on the project to allow time for additional analysis to occur concerning some of the issues raised by the public, and by City Staff and Commissioners.

On July 19, 2011, the additional analysis was presented to the City Commission at a regularly scheduled City Commission meeting. There was much discussion among the Commissioners, along with comments from citizens. Following the discussion, a vote was held on what changes should occur to the design. It was decided that the design lane widths should be reduced from 11 feet to 10 feet wide; that Type F type curb should continue being used, and that the sidewalk should not be included (it was later determined that in areas where there is existing sidewalk, it should be replaced). The intent was that the current design horizontal and vertical alignments should be used, except where adjustments should/could be made to better accommodate the new power poles, or to save additional significant trees. It was also decided by staff that trees that were previously classified as “potential impacts”, but were not “direct impacts”, would now be classified as “not impacted”. The use of handrails was also eliminated.

This scope and fee is based on making the design and associated plan modifications identified by the City Commission and by City staff, and includes the following:

Roadway Design

- Horizontal and vertical alignment adjustments necessary to avoid having to purchase easements for power poles, and if possible, to reduce tree impacts (due to the removal of the sidewalk from the design, except in areas where there is existing sidewalk which will be replaced).
- Modifications to the Typical Sections for lane widths and curb and gutter widths will not be required since the actual pavement width will remain at 22', but only the effective travel lane widths will be reduced to 10' wide. The sidewalk will be removed except for where there is an existing sidewalk, which will be replaced.
- Modify all cross-sections as a result of the sidewalk removal (except in areas where there is existing sidewalk which will be replaced), the driveway profiles due to the removal of the sidewalk, the re-classification of “not impacted” trees (which will remove special grading and handrail features), and any required alignment changes.
- Incorporating traffic calming features to reduce the average speed through the corridor. To include the addition of stop signs and textured pavement at select intersections.
- Re-create curb return profiles at intersection where there are alignment changes.
- Modify the calculation of all plan quantities.
- Plan sheet re-labeling.
- Update signing and pavement marking plans; and traffic control plans as necessary to reflect other roadway changes.

Drainage Design

- Re-evaluate and make all necessary adjustments to the roadway drainage design resulting from the changes to the typical section elements.
- Re-evaluate and make all necessary adjustments to the roadside drainage design resulting from the change in roadside grading due to the removal of new sidewalk from the design (except in areas where there is existing sidewalk which will be replaced) and the removal of special grading features.
- For detailed scope, see Attachment 1.

Utility Design

- Evaluate and revise the utility adjustments Plan and Profile sheets to accommodate the modifications made to roadway, roadside, and drainage elements of the project. Revisions will reflect adjustments to the potable water, sanitary force main, and reuse water utilities.
- For detailed scope, see Attachment 1.

General

- Arborist to provide additional design recommendations and to provide modifications to the Tree Report.
- Prepare for, attend and present the revised design at a town hall meeting following the submittal of the 90% plans.
- It is anticipated that an additional 3 months will be required to revise the design and plans.

Fee Breakdown

See detailed Fee Schedule on page Exhibit 1A-5.

AMENDMENT 1 TIME FOR COMPLETION

The services to be rendered by Engineer for work included in Amendment 1 will require 257 days to complete. Task 1 - 167 days (May 4, 2011 - October 18, 2011), Task 2 - 90 days (October 18, 2011 - January 16, 2012). This time will be added to the design time frames stated in the original agreement.

AMENDMENT 1 COMPENSATION AND METHOD OF PAYMENT:

Lump sum payment will be made for satisfactory completion of the work. Fees are as follows:

Task 1	\$39,496.43
Task 2	\$85,858.12

Amendment 1 Total: \$125,354.55

TASK 2
Design Revision 1 Fee Breakdown

Staff Classification	Chief Engineer	Project Manager	Senior Engineer	Project Engineer	Senior Designer	Engineer Intern	Staff Hours By Activity	Salary cost By Activity	Average Rate Per Task
	\$190.00	\$170.00	\$140.00	\$125.00	\$100.00	\$80.00			
Project General & Common Tasks	8	24	0	24	10	15	81	\$10,800.00	\$133.33
Roadway Analysis	9	22	9	81	49	54	224	\$26,055.00	\$116.32
Roadway Plans	4	4	4	30	28	30	100	\$10,950.00	\$109.50
Total Ghyabi Staff Hours	21	50	13	135	87	99	405		
Total Ghyabi Staff Cost	\$3,990.00	\$8,500.00	\$1,820.00	\$16,875.00	\$8,700.00	\$7,920.00		\$47,805.00	\$118.04

Ghyabi Salary Related Costs:	\$47,805.00
Expenses (4%)	\$1,912.20
Ghyabi Total Fee	\$49,717.20

McKim and Creed Fee	\$33,640.92
Advance Tree Care Fee	\$2,500.00

TOTAL TASK 2 FEE: \$85,858.12

Attachment 1

Sub-Consultant Scope Of Services

McKim And Creed

General:

McKim & Creed has provided utility and stormwater design services to Ghyabi & Associates for the John Anderson Drive Roadway Improvements project in the City of Ormond Beach. A meeting was held on May 19, 2011 with City staff, Ghyabi & Associates, and McKim & Creed. The City has requested supplemental evaluations necessary for presentation of material to City of Ormond Beach Commissioners; the list of Supplemental Evaluations requested by City staff is included in Exhibit 1A. These supplemental evaluations are outside our original Scope of Services. Per the list of Supplemental Evaluations, McKim & Creed will supply the following item (the remaining items on the list will be supplied by Ghyabi & Associates):

TASK 1: ALTERNATIVE DESIGN ANALYSIS

Our Scope of Services for these additional services is as follows:

- Demonstrate by way of an aerial map what the difference will be in potential flooding between raising the profile and not raising the profile. (The remaining items listed in Exhibit 1A will be supplied by Ghyabi & Associates.)
- Quality Control Review: McKim & Creed will conduct an internal review of the calculations and deliverables prior to submission to Ghyabi & Associates.

McKim & Creed's analysis will utilize the following methodology/assumptions:

1. The two profiles provided by Ghyabi & Associates on May 31, 2011 will be utilized to develop a preliminary drainage collection system. The two profiles are:
 - (1) 60% Vertical Profile based on the proposed 60% horizontal alignment adjusted to better match existing grade; and

- (2) A new profile based on the existing roadway centerline which essentially utilizes the existing centerline grade with adequate slope for gutter drainage.
2. The storm drainage calculations (Rational Method, Excel Format) developed for the 60% Design will be modified to provide preliminary Hydraulic Grade Line (HGL) for the two provided profiles.
3. Storm Frequency will be in accordance with City of Ormond Beach Development Standards (5-year frequency for pipe hydraulics).
4. Gutter/grate elevations will be calculated based on roadway cross-section of 11' lanes at a 2% cross-slope, 18" F-curb and a 5' sidewalk on the east side as shown in the 60% design.
5. Based on the newly calculated gutter/grate elevation, an approximate flooding depth will be estimated using the HGL.
6. Utilizing the vertical profiles provided, the longitudinal flooding distance from the inlet will be estimated for use in graphical purposes.
7. A small sample area (approximately one set of inlets or approximately 300' of roadway) will analyzed to quantify the flooding benefits of a reduced amount of runoff if smaller 10' lanes are utilized.

Deliverables

McKim & Creed, Inc. will provide to Ghyabi & Associates PowerPoint slides depicting potential flooding based on the roadway centerline in the 60% plan submittal profile and on a lowered roadway centerline profile.

COMPENSATION:

McKim & Creed is proposing to complete the Scope of Services for a Lump Sum Fee of **\$12,784.15**. A Services Fee Matrix is attached on the following page.

TASK 1 ALTERNATIVE DESIGN ANALYSIS FEE PROPOSAL

TASK NO.	DESCRIPTION	Title: Senior Project Manager		Designer II		Sr. Project Administrator		Direct Expenses	TOTAL PER TASK
		RATE:							
		\$150.21		\$80.71		\$54.02			
		HOURS	TOTAL	HOURS	TOTAL	HOURS	TOTAL		
1	Additional Design Services - Presentation to Commissioners	30	\$4,506.30	25	\$2,017.75	5	\$270.10	\$5,990.00	\$12,784.15
TOTAL TASK 1									\$12,784.15

TABLE A			
DIRECT EXPENSES			
No. of Items	Description	Unit Price	Total Price
	J&M Engineering (Drainage Calculations)		\$5,990.00
TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES			\$5,990.00

TASK 2: DESIGN REVISION 1

General:

McKim & Creed has provided utility and stormwater design services to Ghyabi & Associates for the John Anderson Drive Roadway Improvements project in the City of Ormond Beach. Based on numerous meetings with City Staff as well as City Commissioners, a proposal has been requested for design changes which include elimination of sidewalks, and adjustments to accommodate the new power poles or to save additional significant trees. This additional work is outside our original Scope of Services.

McKim & Creed's Scope of Services for these additional services on this project would include the following tasks:

DESIGN PHASE

Design Documents at the 60 percent stage were submitted to the City. Design had proceeded past the 60 percent stage at the time of work stoppage. The 90 percent design submittal will be revised to incorporate the changes requested by the City staff. The technical specifications will also be revised, if necessary, in addition to the plans and opinions of probable cost. The design modifications shall include the following:

TASK 2.1: DRAINAGE DESIGN

McKim & Creed will provide drainage design services with the assistance of a subcontractor. The following additional drainage design services will be provided:

Revise roadway drainage design resulting from changes to alignment and typical sections elements. Revise roadside drainage design resulting from grade changes due to elimination of new sidewalk from project. The drainage design revisions will consist of the following tasks:

1. Review and evaluate new horizontal and vertical alignment provided by Ghyabi & Associates.

2. Attend initial meeting with Design Team to review and discuss changes and impacts to primary (roadway) and secondary (roadside) drainage systems. Meeting will be scheduled once alignment revisions are finalized.
3. Update the drainage structure basin areas (both impervious and pervious areas) for deleting of sidewalks.
4. Revise storm drainage pipe size calculations to reflect new drainage areas, new "C" factors, revised inlet locations, and pipe lengths.
5. Revise the off-site treatment facility sizing calculations and revise SJRWMD Stormwater Management Report.
6. Revise the sizing of the off-site treatment facility construction site plans to reflect the revisions to the sizing calculations.
7. Attend review meeting with Design Team at the 90 percent stage of revision completion.
8. Update drainage system quantities and opinion of probable cost.

TASK 2.2: UTILITY DESIGN

McKim & Creed will provide design services to revise the utility design to accommodate the modifications made to roadway, roadside, and drainage elements of the project. Revisions will reflect adjustments to the potable water, sanitary force main, and reuse water facilities. The utility design revisions will consist of the following tasks:

1. Review and evaluate horizontal and vertical alignment changes and revised typical roadway section for impacts on potable water, sanitary force main, and reuse water facilities.
2. Review and evaluate revised drainage structure and storm drain pipe horizontal and vertical locations for impacts on potable water, sanitary force main, and reuse water utilities.
3. Attend initial meeting with Design Team to discuss changes to utility relocation design resulting from alignment changes and changes to the primary and secondary inlet and pipe locations.

4. Revisions to Plan and Profile on Utility Accommodation Plan sheets to reflect revised utility relocations due to roadway grades and storm drain locations.
5. Attend review meeting with Design Team at the 90 percent stage of revision completion.

COMPENSATION

McKim & Creed is proposing to complete the Scope of Services for Lump Sum Fees as listed below. A Services Fee Matrix is attached on the following page.

The fee estimate breakdown is as follows:

Task 2.1 – Drainage Design	\$14,007.63
Task 2.2 – Utility Design	\$19,633.29
TOTAL Tasks 2.1 – 2.2	\$33,640.92

TASK 2 DESIGN REVISION 1 FEE PROPOSAL

TASK NO.	DESCRIPTION	Title: Senior Project Manager		Project Engineer		Designer II		Sr. Project Administrator		Direct Expenses	TOTAL PER TASK
		RATE:									
		\$150.21		\$103.00		\$80.71		\$54.02			
		HOURS	TOTAL	HOURS	TOTAL	HOURS	TOTAL	HOURS	TOTAL		
2.1	Drainage Design	2	\$300.42	4	\$412.00	27	\$2,179.17	2	\$108.04	\$11,008.00	\$14,007.63
2.2	Utility Design	24	\$3,605.04	33	\$3,399.00	152	\$12,267.92	6	\$324.12	\$37.21	\$19,633.29
TOTAL TASK 2.1 - TASK 2.2											\$33,640.92

TABLE A				
DIRECT EXPENSES				
No. of Items	Description		Unit Price	Total Price
22	Mileage		\$0.555	\$12.21
20	24"x36" Copies		\$1.25	\$25.00
J&M Engineering (Drainage Calculations)				\$11,008.00
TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES				\$11,045.21