SERVICES AUTHORIZATION #II ENGINEERING SERVICES AGREEMENT

THIS SERVICES AUTHORIZATION is made and entered into this d	lay of
, 20, by and between the City of Orlando, Florida, a mun	icipal
corporation existing under the laws of the State of Florida (CITY), and AECOM Tech	ınical
Services, Inc., doing business locally at 150 N. Orange Avenue, Suite 200, Orlando, F.	lorida
32801 (ENGINEER).	

WHEREAS, the CITY and the ENGINEER have previously entered into an agreement for the ENGINEER's professional services (Agreement) on November 26, 2012, concerning the Iron Bridge Regional Water Reclamation Facility Effluent Discharge Alternatives Evaluation Project (Project); and

WHEREAS, the Agreement was approved and authorized by the City Council and signed by the Mayor Pro Tem and City Clerk, as Documentary #121105I05; and

WHEREAS, the CITY and the ENGINEER wish to amend the Agreement as set forth herein; and

WHEREAS, the CITY and the ENGINEER now wish to memorialize their understanding for the ENGINEER's additional professional services for the Project.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual promises and covenants contained herein and given one to the other, the sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged, the parties agree as follows:

I. <u>SCOPE OF SERVICES</u>

The scope of services has been agreed to by the parties, and is attached hereto and incorporated herein, by reference, as EXHIBIT I.

II. <u>FEE</u>

The not to exceed fee of \$515,395.05 has been agreed to by the parties, as set forth on EXHIBIT I.

III. <u>TERM</u>

ENGINEER shall complete all work in accordance with the timeframes set forth in EXHIBIT I, if any, provided however, that all work and the term of the Services Authorization shall be completed by the end of business (5:00 p.m.) on July 26, 2016. It is also agreed that the CITY shall have an option for extension of this Services Authorization as necessary to complete the present scope of Services (Exhibit I) or to provide additional services.

IV. ENTIRE AGREEMENT

This Services Authorization supersedes all previous services authorizations, amendments, agreements, or representations, either verbal or written, heretofore in effect between the CITY and the ENGINEER that may have concerned the matters covered herein, except that this Services Authorization shall in no way supersede or amend the Agreement or other services authorizations or amendments except as specifically provided herein. No additions, alterations, or variations to the terms of this Services Authorization shall be valid, nor can the provisions of this Services Authorization be waived by either party, unless such additions, alterations, or waivers are expressly set forth in writing in a document duly executed by both parties. ENGINEER acknowledges and agrees that any proposals or proposed agreements from subconsultants attached to this SERVICES AUTHORIZATION are attached solely to reflect the scopes of work to be performed and the fees to be charged by such subconsultants. By executing this SERVICES AUTHORIZATION, the CITY does not become a party thereto or bound by the terms thereof.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this Services Authorization on the day and year first written above.

	City of Orlando, Florida	
	By: Mayor Pro Tem	
	Print Name:	
ATTEST:		
Celeste T. Brown, City Clerk		
, ,		(SEAL)
	APPROVE AS TO FORM AND LEGALITY for the use and reliance of the City of Orlando, Florida, only.	
	Michael S. O'Dowd Assistant City Attorney Orlando, Florida	-

Mark About (Print Name)
Title: Business Unit Leader
STATE OF FLORIDA }
COUNTY OF Palm Beach
authority, Mark Abbot , [well known to me or [] who has produced as identification, and known by me to be the before me that he/she executed the foregoing instrument on behalf of said corporation as its true act and deed, and that he/she was duly authorized to do so.
WITNESS my hand and official seal this 1st day of June, 2015.
DEBORAH L. WILLIAMS MY COMMISSION # FF 006778 EXPIRES: May 7, 2017 Bonded Thru Notary Public Underwriters My Commission Expires: My Commission Expires:

EXHIBIT I - SCOPE OF SERVICES

For

PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES

Iron Bridge RWRF Effluent Management Project

Service Authorization II

I. General

The following presents the tasks which will be performed as part of Amendment II to the Iron Bridge RWRF Effluent Management Project. The Tasks presented below are based on the results of previous investigations and include both services during construction and additional.

CONSULTANT will perform the following services for the CITY for the Iron Bridge Regional Water Reclamation Facility (RWRF) Effluent Management Project (Project):

II. Consultant's Scope of Services

Task Group 1.0 Project Management

CONSULTANT will continue to manage the project and communicate status and other key issues with the CITY. Project management tasks include the following:

- <u>Prepare Status Reports</u>: Monthly status reports will be prepared to advise the CITY on the progress of the Project. These status reports will be provided as part of the invoicing for this project. Monthly progress meetings will include the following information:
 - o Forecast of next month's work
 - Outstanding action items for either the CITY or CONSULTANT as applicable
- Manage Project Activities: The progress of the Project will be monitored and resources will be
 managed to achieve the schedule and budget goals of the Project. Communications with the
 CITY will be conducted under this task.

Task Group 2 — Construction Phase Services

Task Group 2 includes Construction Phase Services for the Iron Bridge RWRF Wetlands Pump Station Improvements Project to the Iron Bridge WRF. A 52 week construction period has been assumed for this task. The following tasks will be included.

- 1. Pre-Construction Meeting: Prepare for and attend a Pre-Construction Meeting.
- 2. Shop Drawing Review: This task includes maintaining a shop drawing submittal log, and the coordination and review of shop drawings in accordance with the Contract Documents. This

Exhibit I Iron Bridge RWRF Effluent Management Project May 2015
Exhibit I Scope Service Authorization II

coordination will include distribution and coordination of responses from IAG for selected shop drawings.

- 3. Respond to Requests for Information (RFIs): This task includes maintaining an RFI log based on RFIs provided by the CITY, coordination, review and response to RFIs from the CONTRACTOR and/or CITY staff for RFIs provided to the CONSULTANT.
- 4. Site Visits: This task includes twenty (20) site visits to observe that the work is proceeding in accordance with the Contract Documents. This will include four (4) visits from CONSULTANT's structural engineers. Site visits will be concurrent with construction progress meetings to the extent possible and include one substantial completion and one final completion inspection. Additional site visits by SUBCONSULTANTs are defined in the attached scopes of work. CONSULTANT shall be responsible for scheduling and coordinating the site visits of the SUBCONSULTANT.
- 5. Construction Progress Meetings: This task includes bi-weekly progress meetings for a 52 week period.
- 6. Record Drawings: This task includes preparing a set of reproducible record drawings showing those changes made during the construction process based on the marked-up prints, drawings and other data furnished by the CONTRACTOR. CONSULTANT will provide one signed and sealed copy of the record drawings as well as digital files of the record drawings on CD. This will include incorporation of the suitable digital survey files developed by the CONTRACTOR indicating the as-built locations of facilities.
- 7. O&M Manual Review: This task includes the coordination and review of manufacturer's equipment O&M Manuals in accordance with the Contract Documents.

Deliverables: Task Group 2 deliverables will generally consist of shop drawing and RFI logs and the associated responses required from the CONSULTANT as part of the shop drawing and RFI process. Record drawings as described in item 6 above are also included as a Task Group 2 deliverable.

Task Group 3 - Clarifier and Hydraulic Considerations

Previous investigations have identified hydraulic restriction between the discharge of the aeration basins and the secondary clarifiers. Within the past 12 months plant staff has experienced these restrictions during two high flow events. In addition to these hydraulic restrictions plant staff has indicated difficulties in controlling the flow splits between trains 1 and 2 and trains 3 and 4. Under this task CONSULTANT shall conduct the following analysis.

Task 3.1 - Hydraulic Evaluations:

- 1. The previous hydraulic analysis will be refined based on the most recent flow data including the high flow events resulting in shutdown of the mechanical aerators.
- 2. Flow equalization will be reevaluated based on the new flow data. This will include:

- a. Previous flow equalization analysis was based on extreme high flow events. At the CITY's request the CONSULTANT will evaluate equalization volumes required to manage less extreme flow events.
- b. The previously developed Excel spreadsheet flow model will be modified to consider the impacts of varying modes of operating equalization storage with respect to equalize in peak flows into the process basins.
- 3. Additional hydraulic analysis will be conducted with regard to operator observations that they were unable to control flow splits between the two process trains. This will consider the geometry and facilities currently available to the Iron Bridge operations staff to manage flows, current practices with respect to splitting flows to the process basins according to the number of basins in service at any given time and conceptual level alternatives available to the CITY to improve control of the flow splits.
- 4. As currently configured the Iron Bridge facility operates as two independent trains downstream of the grit removal process. Each group of two process train has access to a maximum of four clarifiers dedicated to specific carousels. The piping from the process trains to the clarifiers is independent from one another. In terms of hydraulics and clarification capacity it is desirable to be able to evenly split discharge from the biological processes to all eight clarifiers regardless of the number of carousels in service. The consultant will review yard piping and the elevations of critical control points between the discharge of the biological basins and the discharge of the clarifiers and evaluate the potential benefits of interconnecting the clarifier yard piping.
- 5. The results of the analysis described above will be submitted to the CITY as a draft technical memorandum for their review.
- CONSULTANT will schedule and attend the meeting with CITY staff to review the memorandum and receive comments. The technical memorandum will be finalized based on inputs received at this meeting.

Task 3.2 - Clarifier Evaluation:

- Evaluation of the historical performance of the existing eight (8) secondary clarifiers at the Iron Bridge RWRF. Solids and hydraulic loading versus effluent TSS concentrations will be compared. Historical SVI data will also be analyzed. Historical performance data will be provided by the CITY.
- Evaluation of the number of clarifiers required for 40 mgd of capacity based on typical solids and hydraulic loading rates from the literature. The predicted MLSS concentrations from previously developed partially calibrated BioWin model will be used.

- 3. Develop a conceptual level opinion of probable construction cost for the additional clarifier tanks, mechanisms and RAS pump/piping modifications required.
- 4. Perform a conceptual level evaluation of alternative methods to handle high flows/loadings including step feed in the process basins, chemically enhanced treatment in the secondary clarifiers, off-line solid storage during high flows and ballasted flocculation. Conceptual level opinion of probable construction costs will be developed for one option determined to be the most feasible for comparison with the cost of additional clarifiers.
- 5. Investigate the expected performance enhancement due to the LA-EDI with literature investigations and reference checks of existing facilities. The historical performance of Water Conserv II clarifiers (effluent TSS vs solids and hydraulic loading and SVI data) will be investigated during periods of 1 or 2 clarifiers being off-line which simulate higher than typical loading conditions.
- 6. Evaluate the modifications required to equip the existing spiral scraper clarifier mechanisms with the LA-EDI. Develop a conceptual level drawing for the retrofit of the LA-EDI into one existing clarifier.
- 7. Develop an opinion of probable construction cost to retrofit one existing clarifier for a full scale demonstration and the cost opinion to retrofit all eight (8) clarifiers. This would be similar to the previous full scale testing of spiral scrapers and EDIs used in advance of the Bardenpho improvements project.
- 8. Develop a draft memorandum summarizing the results of the evaluation for submittal to the CITY.
- 9. CONSULTANT will schedule and attend the meeting with CITY staff to review the memorandum and receive comments. This meeting will be held at in combination with the meeting referenced in task 3.1. The technical memorandum will be finalized based on inputs received at this meeting.

Task Group 4 - Evaluation of Diffuser Replacement Alternatives

Membrane type, high efficiency diffusers are relatively new to the municipal wastewater market. The CITY installed high efficiency Aerostrip diffusers as part of the Bardenpho improvements project completed in 2012. Actual experience with operating the high efficiency diffusers started approximately two years previous to final completion. The Aerostrip diffusers have not reached the end of their useful life but plant staff report increased repair/replacement requirements. Membrane failure is being attributed to exposure to UV and chlorine. These exposures occur when basins are taken offline for an extended period. The CITY has also experienced problems with the installation of EDI membrane to the diffusers at Conserv II. Under this task CONSULTANT will summarize CITY experience with high efficiency for membrane type diffusers as well as the experiences of other utilities using high efficiency diffusers. This will include an assessment of the longevity in failure modes of membrane aeration technology and the evolution of membrane diffusers to overcome these problems. A conceptual level

technical memorandum will be developed summarizing the results of these investigations. In addition the technical memorandum will summarize:

- Membrane replacement procedures and costs for the Aerostrip diffusers based on CITY experience.
- Comparison of Aerostrip refurbishment costs to replacement with alternate high efficiency membrane diffusers such as Sanitaire Gold Series which are similar to the Aerostrip units.
- Compare the strip-style diffusers to a grid of membrane discs (Sanitaire or Aquarius). The potential advantages of the disc style diffusers are no bumping required and proven long life.
- Recommend most cost-effective approach to restore the diffused aeration system and suggested timing to initiate replacement.
- Evaluate the feasibility of more efficient alternative grit removal maintenance practices in the design of diffuser systems.

CONSULTANT will schedule and attend the meeting with CITY staff to review the memorandum and receive comments. This meeting will be held at in combination with the meeting referenced in task 4.1. The technical memorandum will be finalized based on inputs received at this meeting.

Task Group 5 Subconsultant Services

CONSULTANT shall use the following subconsultant services as part of this project. Details on the work they will perform are provided in the SUBCONSULTANT PROPOSALS section.

•	Team	- services during construction related to stormwater
•	Milan Engineering	- services during construction for Mechanical/HVAC
•	Hazen and Sawyer	- clarifier capacity considerations
•	EPIC	- services during ERRWDS interconnect construction and additional hydraulic analysis
•	EDA	- services during construction for Electrical/Instrumentation
•	CPW	- services during construction
•	PMA	- Contractor's scheduling Review
•	Devo	- Construction materials testing.

III. Compensation

CONSULTANT shall be paid in accordance with Section 5 of the Agreement. A labor budget showing the estimated number of hours and associated fee for the tasks described within the Scope of Services and subconsultant fees is presented as Exhibit II. Exhibit II includes an estimated budget for all other project costs, which are expected to include outside copying costs, postage, and long-distance telephone calls all in compliance with current applicable City of Orlando requirements.

These budget estimates were used to determine the proposed not-to-exceed fee estimate of \$515,395.05. This includes an Owner Controlled Contingency fund of \$65,200.

IV. City's Responsibilities

The CITY shall be responsible for providing the following in a timely manner so CONSULTANT can complete its work and not delay the performance of services.

- 1. Promptly review, comment on, and return CONSULTANT's submittals.
- 2. Execute, process, and obtain all required permits and approvals.
- 3. Pay all permit and approval fees.
- 4. Promptly advise CONSULTANT when the CITY becomes aware of any defect, deficiency or changed condition.

VI. Deliverables (CONSULTANT)

Project deliverables are defined under the task items in which they will be developed.

VI. Services Not Included

Services to be provided under the scope of work are limited to those described above. Additional field investigations, preliminary and final design efforts are anticipated to be part of future Authorizations.

VII. Period of Service

Construction associated with this scope is estimated to require 60 weeks from the time the Bid Ready Documents are submitted to the CITY. Data collection and analysis efforts including submittals for City review will be completed within approximately 16 weeks of notice to proceed. The schedule does not in include permitting services.

For Iron Bridge RWRF Iron Bridge RWRF Effluent Management Project Service Authorization II

Company	Fe	e
AECOM (Labor Fee)	\$	144,946.00
Subconsultant Fees		
EDA	\$	111,490.42
Milan	\$	3,608.00
Hazen and Sawyer	\$	34,233.00
Team	\$	3,570.00
CPW	\$	25,660.32
EPIC	\$	39,762.76
Devo	\$	31,655.00
PMA	\$	19,113.00
Subconsultant Markup (10%)	\$	26,909.25
Other Direct Project Costs (AECOM)	\$	7,247.30
Owner Controlled Contingency	\$	67,200.00
Total Not to Exceed Project Fee	\$	515,395.05

Personnel Category	<u>\$/HR⁽¹⁾</u>
Principal	\$264.00
Senior Engineer II	\$150.00
Senior Engineer 1	\$130.00
Assistant ENgineer I	\$94.00
* 10010tttttt DT 1P111001 X	ψ> 1.00

CAD II \$124.00 Clerical \$85.00

(1) Labor costs are based on a raw labor multiplier of 3.0. Labor categories and rates used herein are for the sole purpose of estimating time and calculating the overall not to exceed amount. Invoicing will be based on the actual hourly wage/salary rates of the personnel utilized to accomplish the work of the scope of services and the agreed upon multiplier.

City of Orlando Iron Bridge RWRF Effluent Management Project Service Authorization II

eqisah4	Senior Engineer II	l 199nign& 10ins8	l rænignä inatrizeA	CAD II	Clerical	erneli late T	Тарог	ลรกครไขลกงวด์มชั	qush sM Instluencedus	9DC		Total Mon-Labor	[B90]T
Q,		-20	OI.	19		340) (S	301001	1,201.90	\$ 25.221.00
	Ľ	50	2	=	- 8	140 S		39	S			ļ	Ì
Task Group 2 Construction Phase Services Dec Construction Moneying			r		r	9	00 YUK			·	Ş	96.92	
		- 8	7 021		1 2	_					1515.50 12.50	-	05'528'11. \$
for information		8	8	R	R	_					_		, 14
• • •		\$	8	•	-						_		
Constitution progress meetings		<u>N</u> 9	Q 8	ç	ละ				-		_	9 8 60 8	
O&M Manual review		2 9	3 8	}	2.00	4 V3	7,198,00			n in	359.50	359 90	06/252/
						—	Ħ						
	•	£:	<u>਼</u>	3	Ħ.	29 20 20	90,704,00	<i>y</i> 1	и	va .	4,535.00 S	4,535,08	\$ 95,235.00
of diffuser replacement afternatives			;	-	;								
rivoraulic Evaluations		2	30	2	2	C?	5.798.65			4		289.90	
Ther Evaluation		4	2	i	eı .				() Ю (A	və	107.90 S	107 90	\$ 2,265.90
Subtrail		7	R :	9.	12	2	7,956,00	\$		S	397.80 S	397.80	\$ 8,353.80
roup 4 Evaluation of Diffuser Replacement Alternatives phasement estuator	·•·	9	. 8.	20	2	<u>s</u>				<u>.</u>	S 05.515.1	1,113.50	49
7.0		94	8	20	of	S 081	22,279,00	5	5	s		1,113.50	
Task Group 5.0 Subconsultant Services											_		
Fearn Milan Engineering								3,570,00	357,90	2 9	K KI	3,927.00	5 3,927,00
EDA								=	=	20	<u>~</u>	⋍	
Hazen & Sarayer										9 1	69 t		
Mac							-	39,762.76		2 2	<i>y</i> 6	43,739.03	, ·
Devid								\$ 31,655.00	3165.50	184	9 49 6		s . t s - c
Subtodal	Į,	ļ	ļ		1	•	,	1,,	1 6	2 5	4 4		n u
;							- 			ļ	<u> </u>		,
I ask Group & U Contringency. Ower Controlled Contrigency			,										\$ 67,200.00
Subrotal													S 67,200.0
Total Not to Exceed	Ц	250	w	901		1,178,15	144.946.00	5 269.092.50	\$ 26.909	П	7247.30 IS	303.249.05	\$ 515.395.05

Subconsultant Proposals

TEAM Engineering, LLC

January 29, 2015

Sent by Email

Mr. David Ammerman, PE Reuse National Practice Leader AECOM 150 N. Orange Avenue, Suite 200 Orlando, FL32801

RE:

Professional Stormwater Construction Services, Iron Bridge RWRF

TEAM Engineering, LLC, Proposal No. 2014-05 02

Dear David:

In accordance with your email, TEAM Engineering provides the following scope of services for stormwater construction oversight services during construction of the Electrical Building at Iron Bridge RWRF.

Scope of Services

 During construction, provide up to 42 hours to attend pre-construction meeting (if requested), review stormwater related shop drawings (if requested) and perform on-site construction oversight related to modification and maintenance of the stormwater management system.

Deliverables

Construction support services, as requested.

Fees

Services outlined in this Scope of Services will be performed at an hourly rate of \$85.00 per hour. The total not-to-exceed cost for Professional Services is \$3,570.00.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit this proposal for continued work with AECOM. Please call if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Susan M. Woodbery, PE P.O. Box 560833

Lucan M Woodberg

Orlando, FL 32856

407.491.1624

swoodbery@gmail.com



Professional Services Proposal & Agreement

Client Information:

(hereinafter called "client)

Mr. David Ammerman

AECOM

150 N. Orange Avenue, Suite 200. Orlando, FL 32801

Date:

March 2, 2015

Project Name:

AECOM Iron Bridge RWRF Effluent Management Project Service Authorization II, Iron Bridge Wetlands Pump Station

CA Phase

Project Description:

Construction Administration Services associated with the design of

the IB Pump Station HVAC System.

Engineering Consultant:

(hereinafter called "MEI")

Milan Engineering, Inc

925 South Semoran Blvd, Suite 100

Winter Park, Florida, 3279

DESCRIPTION OF SCOPE

1. Attend three (3) Job Site Meeting

2. Perform three (3) Job Site Visits and create report to verify the installation process.

3. Verification of Test and Balance report.

4. Review of shop drawings and submittals for the project HVAC systems.

5. Review and response to RFI's during construction.

Milan Representative:

21/4

(Signature)

Witesh K. Smart, President

Mechanical Electrical Plumbing Fire Protection Technology 925 S Semoran Blvd | Suite 100 Winter Park, Fl 32792 t: 407.678.2055 f. 407.678.2088

Precise Solutions with Prompt Response

Exhibit II: CA PHASE FEE ESTIMATE
Project Name: AECOM Iron Bridge RWRF Effluent Management Project Service Authorization II, Iron Bridge Wetlands Pump Station
Name of Firm: Milan Engineering, Inc

	Serie	Serior Engineer	9	Englieer	ă	Designer	OI	Clerica		
Labor Rates	"	\$55.00		\$27.00	S.	\$23.00	G	\$15.00		
Baling Rates		\$151.25		\$74.25		\$63.25	*	541.25		
TASKS	Man Hrs	Cost	Man Hrs	Cost	Man Hrs	Çest	Man Hrs	Cost	S Amount	Manhas by Activity
Construction Administration			-							
Job Site Meeting (3)					9	\$379.50			\$379.50	Ð
Job Site Visit with report (3)					12	\$759.00			\$759.00	52
Verification of T&B			2	\$148.50					\$148.50	8
Review Shop Drawings			8	\$594.00	91	\$1,012.00	2	\$82.50	\$1,688,50	26
Review RFIs			4	\$297.00	. *	\$253.00	2	\$82.50	\$632.50	9
							-			
Total Not To Exceed			14	\$1,039.50	88	2403.5	4	\$165:00	\$3,608.00	56

	\$379.50

TOTAL COST NOT TO EXCEED FEE BREAKDOWN BY TASK

\$379.50	00.8578	\$148.50	51,688.50	\$632.50		3,608.00
						Total Not To Exceed

riew Shop Draw iew RFIS

% Total

100%





EXHIBIT "A-1"

SUBCONSULTANT'S PROPOSAL FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES

AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO TASK ORDER NO. 1

Between
AECOM Technical Services, Inc.
and
Hazen and Sawyer, P.C.
for

City of Orlando Iron Bridge RWRF Effluent Management Project Service Authorization II

The evaluation of the Iron Bridge RWRF conducted under the initial authorization (Task Order No. 1) identified a number of treatment processes that are expected to exceed typical loading rates within the next five (5) to eight (8) years. These increased loading rates are largely due to the planned shutdown of the Water Conserv I WRF and the transfer of flows to the Iron Bridge RWRF. The clarifiers for Iron Bridge were found in this analysis to have higher than typically hydraulic and solids loading at the 20 year planning flow and the 40 mgd build out capacity.

AECOM Technical Services, Inc. (CONSULTANT) desires assistance from Hazen and Sawyer (SUBCONSULTANT) to evaluate the number of clarifiers required for 40 mgd of capacity. The predicted MLSS concentrations from previously developed partially calibrated BioWin model will be used in this analysis. Historical performance records of the clarifier will also be evaluated. SUBCONSULTANT will develop a cost opinion for the additional clarifier tanks, mechanisms and RAS pump/piping modifications required. As an alternative to adding additional round clarifiers similar to the existing units, SUBCONSULTANT will investigate alternative methods to handle high flows/loadings including step feed in the process basins, chemically enhanced treatment, offline solid storage and ballasted flocculation. Conceptual level cost opinions will be developed for the most feasible of the options listed to compare with the cost of additional clarifiers.

AECOM will evaluate eliminating existing hydraulic restrictions in the existing piping and the modifications necessary to accommodate additional clarifiers (flow splitting and other work outside of the clarifier tanks and RAS pumps). AECOM will develop a cost opinion for this portion of the work.



SUBCONSULTANT will also evaluate the modifications required to equip the existing spiral scraper clarifier mechanisms with the LA-EDI. SUBCONSULTANT will develop a cost estimate to retrofit one existing clarifier for a full-scale demonstration as well as the cost to retrofit all eight (8) clarifiers. SUBCONSULTANT will investigate the expected performance enhancement due to the LA-EDI with literature investigations as well as reference checks of existing facilities. The historical performance of Water Conserv II will be investigated during periods of 1 or 2 clarifiers being offline which simulate higher than typical loading conditions.

AECOM will also complete an evaluation of the operation and maintenance issues of the existing aeration diffusers at the Iron Bridge RWRF and investigate diffuser replacement alternatives for the facility. SUBCONSULTANT will provide a summary of historical operation and maintenance information from up to three of SUBCONSULTANT's high efficiency diffuser design installations. Operations staff will be contacted at these facilities to confirm performance and operation and maintenance concerns. SUBCONSULANT will also perform a QA/QC/technical review of AECOM's technical memorandum and provide comments.

SCOPE OF SERVICES

SUBCONSULTANT will furnish professional services to CONSULTANT in accordance with this Scope of Services.

Task 1 - Clarifier Evaluation:

- 1. Evaluation of the historical performance of the existing eight (8) secondary clarifiers at the Iron Bridge RWRF. Solids and hydraulic loading versus effluent TSS concentrations will be compared. Historical SVI data will also be analyzed. Historical performance data will be provided by the City of Orlando.
- Evaluation of the number of clarifiers required for 40 mgd of capacity based on typical solids and hydraulic loading rates from the literature. The predicted MLSS concentrations from previously developed partially calibrated BioWin model will be used.
- Develop a conceptual level opinion of probable construction cost for the additional clarifier tanks, mechanisms and RAS pump/piping modifications required.
- 4. Perform a conceptual level evaluation of alternative methods to handle high flows/loadings including step feed in the process basins, chemically enhanced treatment in the secondary clarifiers, off-line solid storage during high flows and ballasted flocculation. Conceptual level opinion of probable construction costs will be developed for one option determined to be the most feasible for comparison with the cost of additional clarifiers.



- 5. Investigate the expected performance enhancement due to the LA-EDI with literature investigations and reference checks of existing facilities. The historical performance of Water Conserv II clarifiers (effluent TSS vs solids and hydraulic loading and SVI data) will be investigated during periods of 1 or 2 clarifiers being off-line which simulate higher than typical loading conditions.
- Evaluate the modifications required to equip the existing spiral scraper clarifier
 mechanisms with the LA-EDI. Develop a conceptual level drawing for the retrofit of the
 LA-EDI into one existing clarifier.
- 7. Develop an opinion of probable construction cost to retrofit one existing clarifier for a full scale demonstration and the cost opinion to retrofit all eight (8) clarifiers.
- 8. Develop an internal draft memorandum summarizing the results of the evaluation and have one (1) meeting with AECOM to review and revise.
- SUBCONSULTANT will incorporate AECOM's comments on the internal memorandum and provide and updated draft memorandum for submittal to the CITY. SUBCONSULTANT will send one staff member to the draft memorandum review meeting with the CITY to receive comments.
- 10. SUBCONSULTANT will incorporate comments from the review meeting with the CITY and submit a final technical memorandum summarizing the results of the evaluation.

Task 2 – Aeration Evaluation

- 1. SUBCONSULTANT will provide a summary of historical operation and maintenance information from up to three of SUBCONSULTANT's high efficiency diffuser design installations. Phone interviews of operations staff will be conducted.
- 2. SUBCONSULANT will also perform a QA/QC/technical review of AECOM's Aeration Evaluation Technical Memorandum and provide comments.

DELIVERABLES

Task 1:

- 1. Draft internal review memorandum in Microsoft Word format.
- Draft and final technical memorandum for submittal to the CITY in Microsoft Word and pdf formats.



 Conceptual level drawing for retrofit of the LA EDI into one existing Iron Bridge RWRF clarifier. (AutoCAD and pdf formats). AECOM will provide CAD files of As-Builts of the existing clarifiers.

Task 2:

- 1. Summaries of the historical operation and maintenance information from up to three of SUBCONSULTANT's high efficiency diffuser design installations in Microsoft Word format (for inclusion in AECOM's Aeration Evaluation Technical Memorandum).
- 2. QA/QC/technical review comments on AECOM's Aeration Evaluation Technical Memorandum.

COMPENSATION

SUBCONSULTANT proposes to undertake this work on a time and materials basis with an upper limit of \$34,233 as shown in the following **Fee Breakdown**. The upper limit will not be exceeded without written approval of CONSULTANT. Monthly invoices will be issued for work completed in the previous month,

SCHEDULE

The schedule for these services will be based on the schedule developed by CONSULTANT for this project.



Hazen and Sawyer, P.C. 919 Lake Baldwin Lane, Suite A Orlando, Florida 32814

City of Orlando - AECOM - Iron Bridge RWRF Effluent Management Project Service Authorization II

Engineer Engineer Sign			Vice	Senior Associate	Associate	Senior Principal	Principal Enoineer	Assistant	Draften/Grap frics	Admin/Supp	Task Hours	Estimated Task Cost
to the cutions each (to account to the form) of country, The guidatest ALSS country developed partials or the branch to the cution of the cutions each (to account the cutoff country). The guidatest ALSS country developed partials or the cutoff country, The guidatest ALSS country developed partials or the cutoff country of the cutoff cutoff country of the cutoff cuto	28		\$235	\$199	\$168	\$140	\$120	\$102	\$122	\$75		
red desirion required for the formed of capacity. The practicated MLSS constrained which remain valid by the propyleting constrained and the first manufactured and the first manufactured constrained as the propyleting constrained as the propyleting constrained as the propyleting constrained constrained as the first manufactured constrained as the first constrained					8		8				14	\$1,965.61
The branch take the branch take the branch takes and RAS purpojeting The branch take the branch take the branch takes the br	71	Evaluation of the number of charitars required for 40 mgd of concentrations from previously developed partielly cathraned		2	8		8				81	\$2,698.43
to the breaken by front-dependent building building and fortunism Conjourd by the congruence with the case of the process of the congruence with the congruence with the congruence with the congruence of the LA-EDI with librator interchipation with the congruence of the LA-EDI with librator interchipation with the congruence of the LA-EDI with librator interchipation with the congruence of the LA-EDI with librator interchipation with the congruence of the LA-EDI with librator interchipation with the congruence of the LA-EDI with librator interchipation with the congruence of the LA-EDI with librator interchipation and the cost to congruence of the LA-EDI with librator interchipation and the cost to congruence of the LA-EDI with librator interchipation and the cost to congruence of the LA-EDI with librator interchipation and the cost to congruence of the LA-EDI with librator interchipation and the cost to congruence of the LA-EDI with librator interchipation and the cost to congruence of the LA-EDI with librator interchipation and the cost to congruence of the LA-EDI with librator interchipation and the cost to congruence of the congruence of the LA-EDI with librator interchipation and the cost to congruence of the LA-EDI with librator interchipation and the cost to congruence of the congr	69			2	8		16		An		93	\$3,658.43
recipited facilities. The between performance of Water Consers H with the matter the between performance of Water Consers H with the matter higher than typical bacing. The constant of the 2 clarifiers their performance of Water Consers H with the matter higher than typical bacing. The constant is a clarifier to a fall scale demonstration and the cost to the CLIY 2 4 8 22 2 48 The constant is a clarifier than the cost to the CLIY 2 4 8 22 2 48 The constant is a clarifier than the cost to the CLIY 2 4 8 22 2 48 The constant is a clarifier than the cost to the CLIY 2 4 8 22 2 48 The constant is a clarifier than the cost to the CLIY 2 4 8 22 2 48 The constant is a clarifier than the cost to the CLIY 2 4 8 22 2 48 The constant is a clarifier than the cost to the CLIY 2 4 8 22 2 48 The constant is a clarifier than the cost to the CLIY 2 4 8 22 2 48 The constant is a clarifier than the cost to the CLIY 2 4 8 22 2 48 The constant is a clarifier than the cost to the CLIY 2 4 8 22 2 48 The constant is a clarifier than the cost to the CLIY 2 4 8 22 2 48 The constant is a clarifier than the cost to the CLIY 2 4 8 22 2 48 The constant is a clarifier than the cost to the CLIY 2 4 8 8 22 2 48 The constant is a clarifier than the cost to the CLIY 2 4 8 22 2 48 The constant is a clarifier than the cost to the CLIY 2 4 8 2 22 2 48 The cost than the clarifier than the cost to the CLIY 2 4 8 2 22 2 28 The cost than the cost to the CLIY 2 4 48 The cost than the cost to the CLIY 2 4 48 The cost than the cost to the CLIY 2 4 48 The cost than the cost than the cost to the CLIY 2 4 48 The cost than the cost to the CLIY 2 4 48 The cost than the cost to the CLIY 2 4 48 The cost than the cost to the CLIY 2 4 48 The cost than the cost to the CLIY 2 48 The cost than the cost to the CLIY 2 48 The cost than the cost to the CLIY 2 48 The cost than the cost to the CLIY 2 48 The cost than the cost to the CLIY 2 48 The cost than the cost than the cost to the CLIY 2 48 The cost than the cost to the CLIY 2 48 The cos	4	Evaluate alternative methods to hardle high flows/loadings in obsernably enhanced meanners, office sold storage and balk opinizer will be developed for one option determined to be the loss of additional learings.	2		00		24	v			¥	\$4,690.49
The counterful to case the existing spiral sensitor charkfort methodisms with the properties level drawing for the credit of the LAEDI are one existing to concerning elactifier for a fall scale demonstration and the cost to far. The condition of the control is one existing the cost to far. The condition of the internal review meeting and the review neeting with the cost to give the evaluation. The condition and maintenance information from up to three off the condition and maintenance information from up to three off the condition and maintenance information from up to three off the condition and maintenance information from up to three off the condition and maintenance information from up to three off the condition and maintenance information from up to three off the condition and maintenance information from up to three off the condition and maintenance information from up to three off the condition and maintenance information from up to three off the condition and maintenance information from up to three off the condition and maintenance information from up to three off the condition and maintenance information from up to three off the condition and maintenance information from up to three off the condition and maintenance information from up to three off the condition and maintenance information from up to three off the condition and maintenance information	ιΩ				4		98				8	\$2,590,41
Part	9	Evaluate the modifications required to equip the existing spiral LA-EDI. Develop a conceptual level drawing for the retrosit clarifier.			8		9 1		ø,		SS.	\$3,991.85
we draft and final technical memorandom to provide to the CLIY 2 4 8 32 32 48 16 16 of the evaluation: we (2) ancecings - the internal review traceing with the contraction and maintenance a	7				4		80	,			21	\$1,630.41
16 16 16 17 17 10 17 10 16 16 16 17 10 17 17	®		23	7	80		æ			2	48	\$6,596.09
## 10 First including the protection and maintenance information from up to three of high efficiency diffuser design installations. Interviews of operations staff 2 4 19 72 0 149 0 6 2 2 218	Ф	Prepare for and attend two (2) meetings - the internal review the CITY			RO .		60				16	\$2,300.81
f. bistories of potentian and maintenance automation from up to these of high efficiency diffuser design installations. Interviews of operations said 2 4 10 5 2	Ě	k 2 - Aeration Evaluation										
misel review of AECOM/s Aeration Technical Memorandum and 3 6 2 2 218 4 13 72 0 148 0 6 2 218 8 2 25.585 512.067 50 512.760 50 6 2 2 218 8 2 2 25.585 512.067 50 512.760 50 6 2 2 218 8 5 <t< td=""><td></td><td>Provide a summary of historical specifican and mainten SUBCONSULTANT's high efficiency diffuser design inst will be conducted.</td><td></td><td>2</td><td>4</td><td></td><td>10</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>\$2,268.03</td></t<>		Provide a summary of historical specifican and mainten SUBCONSULTANT's high efficiency diffuser design inst will be conducted.		2	4		10					\$2,268.03
\$359.36 \$2.585 \$12.067 \$0 \$17.760 \$0 \$6 2 218 \$139.36 \$2.585 \$12.067 \$0 \$17.760 \$0 \$2731 \$150	ν.	Provide a QAQChechnical review of AECOM's Aeration provide comments.		69	6	:	N			-		\$1,842.04
03.2 15.75 02 17.760 UP 18.60 18.00 17.760 UP 18.60 18.00 18				ş	F	,	9		,			
\$639 \$2,585 \$12.067 \$0 \$517.60 \$0 \$731 \$160	15	reated Total Cost	\$339.38	2 288	\$12.067	8	\$17.760	2	\$731	\$150	9	534.233
\$839 \$2 885 \$12.067 \$0 \$51.760 \$0 \$7731 \$150												
\$939 \$2,565 \$0 \$17,760 \$0 \$731 \$150	ā	er direct costs										-
\$5939 \$2,865 \$12,067 \$0 \$17,760 \$0 \$7731 \$150												
\$339 \$12.067 \$0 517.76 <u>0</u> \$0 577.76		Insted Total ODC										S
	ō	if Nerts Not to Exceed	\$939	\$2,585	\$12.057	8	517,760	8	5731	\$150		\$34,233



March 3, 2015

David Ammerman, P.E. Reuse National Practice Leader AECOM 150 N. Orange Avenue, Suite 200 Orlando, Florida 32801

Subject:

City of Orlando

Proposal for Professional Engineering Services - Amendment II

Iron Bridge RWRF Effluent Management Project ERRWDS/Wetlands Transmission Interconnect

Construction Phase/Services

Dear Mr. Ammerman:

In accordance with your request, EPIC Engineering & Consulting Group, LLC (EPIC) has prepared a proposal to assist AECOM with Construction Phase Services for the ERRWDS/Wetlands Transmission Interconnection portion of the referenced project.

The scope of services, compensation and schedule are presented below.

SCOPE OF SERVICES

The scope of services is divided into the following major tasks:

- Task Group 1.0 Project Management
- Task Group 2 Construction Phase Services

Our scope of services is based on the overall scope developed by AECOM; consequently, the tasks of the overall scope are listed below and EPIC's proposed services are identified for each task.

Task Group 1.0 Project Management

Under this Task, EPIC will provide information for project progress reports and outstanding action items.

Task Group 2 - Construction Phase Services

EPIC support during the construction phase is limited to the scope of improvements associated with the ERRWDS/Wetlands Transmission Interconnection. Services shall include review/response to Requests for Information and Change Orders, site inspections, interpretation/clarification of contract documents, attendance of selected meetings, substantial/final Inspections and review of O&M manuals. Please note that EPIC services

511 E State Road 434, Ste. 3033, Winter Springs, FL 32708 • Telephone 407.381.EPIC (3742) • www.epicgrouplic.com

are <u>not proposed</u> for FDEP Clearance Requests or for Contractor's Schedule or Pay Request activities.

The fee estimate is based on a maximum construction period of 10-months and in some cases a maximum number of meetings or "reviews". Should additional construction time be required or additional meetings or reviews be required, in excess of the quantities stated herein, EPIC may be entitled to additional compensation, upon approval of AECOM and the CITY,

1. Pre-Construction Meeting

EPIC Services

Under this task, EPIC will attend a pre-construction conference.

2. Shop Drawing Review

EPIC Services

Review drawings and other data submitted by the Contractor in accordance with the Contract Documents. No more than two reviews are anticipated for each submittal item or piece of equipment. The budget is based on review of 6 submittals and re-submittals (approximately 3-hour each).

3. Respond to Requests for Information (RFIs)

EPIC Services

When requested, EPIC will review, evaluate and respond to RFI's. The budget is based on review of 5 RFI's (approximately 2-hour each).

When requested, EPIC will review Change Orders (COs) generated by either the Contractor or the CITY. The budget is based on one (1) CO (approximately 5-hours each, including meetings to discuss the proposed COs).

4. Site Visits

EPIC Services

When requested, EPIC will perform periodic site visits regarding design issues and to observe construction progress, quality of the work, and conformance with the general intent of the Contract Documents. The budget is based on 2 site visits (approximately 2-hour each). Site visits will be concurrent with construction progress meetings to the extent possible

Completion inspections include one (1) substantial completion review inspection, preparation of a punch list of corrective work items that were observed during site visits and one (1) final completion review to assess the status of the punch list items.

5. Construction Progress Meetings

EPIC Services

When requested, EPIC will attend periodic progress meetings regarding design issues, coordination, and conformance with the general intent of the Contract Documents. The budget is based on attendance of 2 progresses (approximately 2-hour each).

6. Record Drawings

EPIC Services

EPIC will prepare reproducible record drawings showing those changes made during the construction process based on the marked-up prints, drawings and other data furnished by the CONTRACTOR. EPIC will provide one signed and sealed copy of the record drawings as well as digital files of the record drawings.

7. O&M Manual Review

EPIC Services

This task includes the review of manufacturer's equipment O&M Manuals in accordance with the Contract Documents. The budget is based six (6) hours of review time.

PROJECT SCHEDULE

EPIC will provide the above-listed services over a 10-month period to meet the schedule established by City of Orlando and AECOM.

COMPENSATION

EPIC will be compensated for the services described herein on a not to exceed basis in the amount of \$12,881.18. The fee estimate for the scope of services is enclosed as Attachment A.

We sincerely appreciate the opportunity to assist AECOM in providing professional engineering services to the City of Orlando. If you have any questions or require additional information, please call me at 407-721-6954.

Sincerely,

Richard Wilson, P.E.

Project Manager

EPIC Engineering & Consulting Group, LLC

cc: Prasad Chittaluru, Ph.D., P.E., EPIC



Iron Bridge RWRF Effluent Management Project ERRWDS/Wetlands Transmission Interconnection - Construction Phase Services

EPIC NOT-TO-EXCEED LABOR BUDGET

		Senior Project	Š				Total Raw	Total	
		Manager	Professional I	Tech III	Admin II		Labor Cost	Billing	
Task	Task Name	F3	P3	T3	A2	Total Hours	8	Labor Cost	
	Hourly Rate	\$61.20	\$43.40	\$25.00	\$22.30	efan.	!		
_	Project Management	4	0	0	7	9	\$289.40	\$853.73	
7	Construction Phase Services	23	=	60	r -	82	\$4,077.10 \$12,027.45	\$12,027.45	
	Total, Not-To-Exceed	57	11	60	6	85	\$4,366.50 \$12,881.18	\$12,881.18	
	I shor Militalier	306							



March 3, 2015

David Ammerman, P.E. Reuse National Practice Leader AECOM 150 N. Orange Avenue, Suite 200 Orlando, Florida 32801

Subject:

City of Orlando

Proposal for Professional Engineering Services - Amendment II

Iron Bridge RWRF Effluent Management Project
Task Group 3 - Clarifier and Hydraulic Considerations

Dear Mr. Ammerman:

In accordance with your request, EPIC Engineering & Consulting Group, LLC (EPIC) has prepared a proposal to assist AECOM with additional hydraulic analysis and considerations regarding the referenced project.

The scope of services, compensation and schedule are presented below.

SCOPE OF SERVICES

Our scope of services is based on the overall scope developed by AECOM; consequently, the tasks of the overall scope are listed below and EPIC's proposed services are identified for each task.

Task Group 3 - Clarifler and Hydraulic Considerations

Previous investigations have identified hydraulic restrictions between the discharge of the aeration basins and the secondary clarifiers. Within the past 12 months, plant staff has experienced the impact of these restrictions during two high flow events. In addition, plant staff has indicated difficulties in controlling the flow split through the biological processes. CONSULTANT shall

<u>Task 3.1 – Hydraulic Evaluations:</u>

- 1. The previous hydraulic analysis will be refined based on the most recent flow data including the high flow events resulting in shutdown of the mechanical aerators.
- 2. Flow equalization will be reevaluated based on the new flow data. In addition, previous flow equalization analysis was based on extreme high flow events.
 - a. At the city's request a consultant will evaluate equalization volumes required to manage less extreme flow events.

511 E State Road 434, Ste. 3033, Winter Springs, FL 32708 • Telephone 407.381.EPIC (3742) • www.epicgroupllc.com

- b. The previously developed excel spreadsheet flow model will be modified to consider the impacts of varying modes of operating equalization storage with respect to equalizing peak flows into the process basins.
- 3. Additional hydraulic analysis will be conducted with regard to operator observations that they were unable to control flow splits between the two process trains. This will consider the geometry and facilities currently available to the IBRWRF operations staff to manage flows, current practices with respect to splitting flows to the process basins according to the number of basins in service at any given time and conceptual level alternatives available to the City to improve control of the flow splits.
- 4. As currently configured the Iron Bridge facility operates as two independent trains downstream of the grit removal process. Each group of two process train has access to a maximum of four clarifiers dedicated to specific carousels. The piping from the process trains to the clarifiers is independent from one another. In terms of hydraulies and clarification capacity, it is desirable to be able to evenly split discharge from the biological processes to all eight clarifiers regardless of the number of trains in service. The consultant will review yard piping and the elevations of critical control points between the discharge of the biological basins and the discharge of the clarifiers, identify improvement options and evaluate the potential benefits of interconnecting yard piping.
- 5. The results of the analysis described above will be submitted to the City as a draft technical memorandum for their review.
- 6. CONSULTANT will schedule and attend the meeting with city staff to review the memorandum and receive comments. The technical memorandum will be finalized based on inputs received at this meeting.

EPIC Services

EPIC was responsible for some of the previous investigations and development of the spreadsheet model. As a result, EPIC will have primary responsibility for the Task 3. EPIC will perform the following activities:

- 1. <u>Review Operations and Flow Splitting</u> Meet with City staff to review the current operation of equalization system and alternative modes of operation, as well as details regarding flow splitting between the process trains.
- 2. <u>Re-Evaluate Flow Equalization</u> Update and revise the flow equalization analysis to incorporate additional flow data, the impact of varying operational modes and less extreme flows.
- 3. <u>Investigate Flow Splitting</u> Conduct investigations to identify flow splitting improvements (as referenced above).
- 4. <u>Investigate Clarifier Interconnect</u> Conduct the investigations referenced above to identity interconnect options and benefits.

- 5. <u>Draft Technical Memorandum</u> Prepare a draft technical memorandum.
- 6. Review Meeting and Final Memorandum Participate in one review meeting with City staff and finalize the Memorandum based on City input.

<u>Task 3.2 - Clarifier Evaluation:</u>

EPIC Services

No Services are proposed

PROJECT SCHEDULE

EPIC will provide the above-listed services to meet the schedule established by City of Orlando and AECOM.

COMPENSATION

EPIC will be compensated for the services described herein on a not to exceed basis in the amount of \$26,881.58. The fee estimate for the scope of services is enclosed as Attachment A.

We sincerely appreciate the opportunity to assist AECOM in providing professional engineering services to the City of Orlando. If you have any questions or require additional information, please call me at 407-721-6954.

Sincerely,

Richard Wilson, P.E.

Project Manager

EPIC Engineering & Consulting Group, LLC

cc: Prasad Chittaluru, Ph.D., P.E., EPIC



ATTACHMENT A

City Of Orlando
Iron Bridge RWRF Effluent Management Project
Task Group 3 - Clarifier and Hydraulic Considerations

EPIC NOT TO EXCEED LABOR BUDGET

									Total
			Senior Project	Şr.			-	Total Raw	Billing
			Мападег	Professional I	Tech III	Admin II	Total	Labor Cost Labor Cost	Labor Cost
Task	Task Name		P8	P3	13	A2	Hours	8	3
3.1	T	Hourly Rate	\$61.20	\$43,40	\$25.00	\$22.30	ŀ	-	!
_	Review Operation and Flow Splitting		6	0	0	. 2	11	\$595.40	\$1.756.43
7	Re-Evaluate Flow Equalization		24	81	0	0	42	\$2,250.00	\$6,637.50
en.	Investigate Flow Split		25	0	œ	0	ĸ	\$1,730.00	\$5,103.50
4	Investigate Clarifier Interconnect		- 5e - 5e	0	90	٥	য়	\$1,791.20	\$5,284.04
'n	Draft Technical Memorandum	•	88	20	91	4	4	\$1,938.00	\$5,717.10
•	Review Meeting and Final Memorandum	•	90	খ	₹	7	82	\$807.80	\$2,383.01
	Total Not to Exceed Fee	xceed Fee	110	30	36	00	184	\$9,112.40	\$26,881.58
	Labor	abor Multiplier	2,95						



February 12, 2015

Electrical Design Associates

Mr. David Ammerman, P.E. AECOM 150 N. Orange Avenue, Suite 200 Orlando, FL 32801

Re:

Iron Bridge RWRF Effluent Management Project - Amendment 1 Additional Services

Orlando, Florida

Dear Mr. Ammerman;

We are pleased to submit our proposal for additional electrical engineering services for the above project. The following serves to provide an overview of the engineering services Electrical Design Associates, Inc. (EDA) intends to furnish on the above referenced project to AECOM Technical Services, Inc., (AECOM). This letter contract represents an overview of the work and provides the fee amounts. Your signature on this agreement will serve as your letter of intent. EDA shall perform the following services for the CITY for the Iron Bridge Regional Water Reclamation Facility (RWRF) Rerating project (Project). Our additional services are defined as follows:

- Additional coordination with IAG in the development of the CoO standard for Variable Frequency Drives larger than 400 HP, including meetings with AECOM and IAG.
- Redesign of the electrical building based on the newly developed VFD standard for drives larger than 400 HP.

Services not specifically defined are not included. Additional services can be provided under separate Scope of Service(s) or by an amendment to this Scope of Services. Services performed will be on an asdirected basis in accordance with a written Notice to Proceed. Services will be performed hourly with a not to exceed value. Travel to and from the site and other direct costs are included in the overhead rate and will not be billed as a separate line item. Our cost not to exceed fee for this work shall be as follows:

	Pri	ncipal	Cadd	Technician	Cleri	cal/Admin		
Description	Hourly Rate	\$199.41	Hourly Rate	\$80.92	Hourly Rate	\$63.58		Totals
Design	man-hours	Total	man- hours	Total	men-	Total	man- hours	Total
Coordination/ Meetings	20	\$ 3,988,20	10000	\$ -		\$ -	20	\$ 3,988.20
Redesign	16	\$ 3,190.56	16	\$ 1,294.72	4	\$ 254.32	36	\$ 4,739.60
Total Not to Exceed:	36	\$ 7,178,76	16	\$ 1,294,72	4	\$ 254.32	56	\$ 8,727.80

Very truly yours,		
Lingan Meyes, P.E.		
ACCEPTED	DATE	
AEC-15-002D.REVI.doc		



Electrical Design Associates

March 10, 2015

Mr. David Ammerman, P.E. AECOM
150 N. Orange Avenue, Suite 200
Orlando, FL 32801

Re: Iron Bridge RWRF Effluent Management Project Authorization II

Orlando, Florida

Dear Mr. Ammerman;

We are pleased to submit our revised proposal for electrical engineering services for the above project. The following serves to provide an overview of the engineering services Electrical Design Associates, Inc. (EDA) intends to furnish on the above referenced project to AECOM Technical Services, Inc., (AECOM). This letter contract represents an overview of the work and provides the fee amounts. Your signature on this agreement will serve as your letter of intent. EDA shall perform the following services for the CITY for the Iron Bridge Regional Water Reclamation Facility (RWRF) Rerating project (Project):

Construction Phase Services

- 1. Pre-Construction Meeting EDA shall attend the Pre-Construction Meeting.
- 2. Shop Drawing Review Review and approve (or take other appropriate action in respect of) Shop Drawings and samples, the results of tests and inspections and other data which each Contractor is required to submit, but only for conformance with the design concept of the Project and compliance with the information given in the Contract Documents (but such review and approval or other action shall not exceed to means, methods, sequences, techniques or procedures of construction or to safety precautions and programs incident thereto); and receive and review (for general content as required by the Specifications) maintenance and operating schedules and instruction, guarantees, bonds and certificates of inspection which are to be assembled by Contractor(s) is in accordance with the Contract Documents.
- 3. Issue Clarifications Issue all instructions of OWNER to Contractor(s); issue necessary interpretations and clarifications of the Contract Documents; have authority, as OWNER's representative to require special inspection or testing of the work; act as initial interpreter of the requirements of the Contract Documents and judge of the acceptability of the work thereunder, and make decisions on all claims of OWNER and Contractor(s) relating to the acceptability of the work or the interpretation of the requirements of the Contract Documents pertaining to the execution and progress of the work. The ENGINEER shall render all interpretations or decisions in good faith and in accordance with the requirements of the Contract Documents.

AEC-15-001G.Rev1.doc

- 4. Site Visits Make visits over the construction period to the site at periods appropriate to the various stages of construction to observe, as an experienced and qualified professional, the progress and quality of the executed work of Contractor(s) and to determine in general if such work is proceeding in accordance with the Contract Documents. Prepare trip reports to document observations made during these inspections. ENGINEER shall not be responsible for the means, methods, techniques, sequences or procedures of construction selected by Contractor(s) or the safety precautions and programs incident to the work of Contractor(s). ENGINEER's efforts will be directed toward providing a greater degree of confidence for OWNER that the completed work of Contractor(s) will conform to the Contract Drawings, but ENGINEER shall not be responsible for the failure of Contractor(s) to perform the work in accordance with the Contract Drawings. During such visits and on the basis of on-site observations, ENGINEER shall keep OWNER informed of the progress of the work, shall endeavor to guard OWNER against defects and deficiencies in such work and may disapprove or reject work failing to conform to the Contract Documents.
- 5. Resident Services EDA shall make weekly visits to the project site and serve as a resident inspector to oversee construction above and beyond the site visits budgeted in item 4. For purposes of this task EDA shall budget 8 hours per week for a period of 52 weeks plus management at 2 hours per week for a period of 52 weeks.
- As-Built Drawings Preparation of Asbuilt drawings based on changes made during the
 construction process based on the marked-up prints, drawings and other data furnished by
 the CONTRACTOR.
- O&M Manual Review: EDA shall review O&M Manuals as prepared and submitted by others.

Services not specifically defined are not included. Additional services can be provided under separate Scope of Service(s) or by an amendment to this Scope of Services. Services performed will be on an as-directed basis in accordance with a written Notice to Proceed. Services will be performed hourly with a not to exceed value. Our cost not to exceed fee for this work shall be \$102,762.62. Travel to and from the site and other direct costs are included in the overhead rate and will not be billed as a separate line item.

Very truly yours,		
ACCEPTED	DATE	
Enclosure		·

Efectrical Design Associa	Hourt Rate	Associates Remopal S199.41	Hau Hau	Fidge RWRSF Effluer General Ser C C Estimate Estimate Senior Engineer Street Serior Engineer Total	ent Management rvices during Cc Orlando, Florida te of Work Effor Designes Rate Rate France Trans-Tr	Bridge RWRG Effluent Management Project Authprization II General Services during Construction Orlando, Florida Serior Engineer Serior Engineer Rate Rate Rate Total T	Authpriz	ization III	Houry Fate Rate hours	Codd Technician	Hourty Rease man- Rours	Serical/Admit	Date:		3/16/2015 ctals
Pre-Con Meeling Shop Drawing Review Issue Custifications Progress meetings/She Visits Actodiss/OSM	* 3 5 1 m	3 197,54 5 9,571,58 5 9,190,56 5 9,774,04 5 1,595,28				\$ 2,496.95 \$ 1,248.48 \$ 824.24	* 88°	\$ 369,92 \$ 1,849,60 \$ 8,670,08 \$ 739,94	<u>ā</u> ā	5 1,294.72 5 1,294.72 5 1,294.72	us 60 3	537.90 59.54 508.64	a 23 35 55 85	மை , மேம்	1,167.58 12,386.54 8,082.00 17,852.12 4,254.08
subtotal: Resident Services	120 men-	\$ 23,929.20 Total	O GREAT-	\$;	22 Friegri Frours	\$ 4,369,68 Total	128 FRBIT- hours	\$ 11,837.44	32 mary hours	\$ 2.589.44 Total	13 Tilan Tours	\$ 626.54 Total	22. -TESTR FROM	u	43,552,30 Total
8 Ins per week for S2 woeks plus management subtotal	5 3	\$ 20,736,64	\$ 10 Zero \$40 Zero \$40 Zero	uz sg			416	\$ 36,471,68		. , ,		, , ,	88	i, va va	59,210,32 59,210,32
Total Not to Exced	22		0	,	8	\$ 4,359.60	3	\$ 50,308.12	25	17 SES.44	<u> </u>	\$ 826.54	<u> </u>	40	102,762.62



March 9, 2015

David Ammerman, P.E. AECOM 150 N. Orange Avenue, Suite 200 Orlando, FL 32801

Re:

Proposal for City of Orlando

Construction Services - Iron Bridge RWRF Effluent Management Project

Dear David:

Per your request, please accept this proposal for CPWC, Inc. to provide services for the above referenced project. The Scope of Services and Project Budget is attached.

I look forward to working with you and providing services for The City of Orlando. Please call me at 321.436.0822 or email me at charlyn.watts@earthlink.net at your convenience should you require additional information.

Very truly yours,

Charlyn P. Watts

P. Data

President

Enclosures



SCOPE OF SERVICES and PROJECT BUDGET

LABOR ESTIMATE

City of Orlando Iron Bridge RWRF Effluent Management Project

		Projec	Project Manager
	Task Description	\$130.92	田/
		Hrs.	S
Task Group 2	Task Group 2. Construction Administation (CA) Services		
7.1	Attend Preconstruction Conference. Conducting meeting, recording, and distributing summaries by others.	4	\$523.68
4.	CPWC will periodically visit the project during the active construction period to observe the progress and content of the work and to assess whether the work is preceding in general accordance with the Contract Documents. This construction observation is intended to observe, document, and report information concerning the construction progress. Observation of work at the project site shall not make CPWC responsible for the work performed by another party; the means, methods, techniques, sequences, or procedures selected by another party; nor the safety precautions or programs of another party. Identified construction concerns will be discussed with the design engineer and City on-site RPR and representatives. Eighteen (18) site visits.	ĸ	\$9,426.24
2.4	When requested, conduct substantial and final completion inspections with the City's RPR of the project and prepare the "punch lists" of items to be addressed by the Contractor.	컩	83,142.08
2.5	Attend bi-weekly progress meetings for twelve (12) months. Conducting, recording, and distributing summaries by others.	96	\$12,568.32
TOTAL NOT T	TOTAL NOT TO EXCRED SERVICES	196	\$25,660.32

Ship. Production



March 6, 2015

Mr. David Ammerman, PE AECOM 150 N. Orange Avenue, Suite 200 Orlando, Florida 32801

Subject:

City of Orlando - City Of Orlando Iron Bridge Wetlands Pump

Station Project

Dear Mr. Ammerman:

PMA Consultants, (PMA) is pleased to provide the following proposal to AECOM to provide scheduling services for The City of Orlando, Iron Bridge Wetlands Pump Station Project. The proposal has been prepared at the request of AECOM to provide Project Controls support to assist the City's construction management and field staff with project schedule evaluation services. These services shall consist of, but not be limited to:

TASK 1 – Baseline Project Schedule Review –PMA will use Primavera P6 software to evaluate and analyze the construction schedule. PMA will attend the pre-construction meeting. PMA will perform walk-throughs at the site in concert with the RPR to gain knowledge of the site conditions and validate the contractor's proposed approach to planning. The evaluation will address the requirements of contract specification 01310, including scheduled task start/end logistics and critical path management. PMA will perform an initial review primarily intended to determine whether the scope of work is accurately defined in the schedule without bias.

- Review the Summary Milestone Construction Schedule submitted by the contractor. PMA will study the plans and specification for the project to gain knowledge and verify the contractor's methodology. PMA will create an outline of the major activities and logic constraints that should be included in the schedule.
- 2. PMA will analyze the schedule submitted after the first Application for Payment and prepare a report for the City and AECOM and, with the concurrence of the stakeholders; PMA will forward the comments to the contractor for implementation and corrections to the schedule, if necessary. PMA will continue to review subsequent submittals until the base schedule is accepted.

TASK 2 – Monthly Schedule Update reviews – PMA will request monthly correspondence as it relates to the project meeting minutes and electronic copies of the project schedule. PMA will work in concert with the RPR to validate the contractors reported progress on a monthly basis. PMA will provide a report to either accept or request the contractor to correct the schedule.

FEE ESTIMATE

Total estimated fee for this assignment is \$19,113. Attachment A provides the estimated hours and PMA's fees for the anticipated services at the Iron Bridge Wetlands Pump



Station Project. The fee proposal is based on 20 hours to review contract documents and review the initial schedule and approximately 6.5 hours a month (12) to review each update.

TERM

The scope of services is anticipated to extend over a 12-month period, commencing on the Notice to Proceed date. Attachment A provides the estimated hours and PMA's fees for the individual tasks described above. The standard fee rates for tasks during the initial design phases are based on a cost plus profit multiplier basis of 2.75 and are good through 2016. These rates were used to develop our proposed not-to exceed fee based on the level of effort described here and quantified by PMA Attachment A.

Task budget amounts proposed represent project budgets only. PMA will not be held to individual task amounts as long as the total amount for tasks awarded to PMA is not exceeded.

PMA will proceed with this effort only after receipt of written Authorization to Proceed. For services rendered, PMA will submit monthly invoices based on percentage completion of the tasks proposed and authorized. Payment for the monthly invoices is due within thirty (30) calendar days from the day the invoice is received by the Client or within 5 calendar days after the Client receives payment from the Owner, whichever occurs earlier. Payment to PMA is in no way conditioned upon Client's receipt of payment from any third party or source. PMA reserves the right to charge a 1% interest fee on any invoices past due over forty five (45) calendar days. Direct expenses for travel, express mail, etc. will be billed at cost. Please remit payment to: PMA Consultants LLC, 226 W. Liberty, Ann Arbor, MI 48104, Attn: Accounting. Questions or clarifications concerning any invoice or contract issues may be referred to Ms. Theresa Langlois by phone at 734-418-7912.

PMA appreciates you're considering us for these services and we look forward to working with you on this project. Please let us know if our proposal meets your needs and is acceptable. If you have any questions or comments please contact Mr. Fernando Villanueva (407-509-7351) at your convenience.

We look forward to continuing work with AECOM and City of Orlando on this project. Please let us know if our proposal fits your needs and is acceptable.

Sincerely.

Richard L. Johnson, PE, DEE, CVS

Managing Director

CC:

FILE tod

Ken VanderJagt, PMA Fernando Villanueva, PMA

PMA ATTACHMENT A

Y PMA Consultants

FOR SCHEDULING EVALUATION SERVICES DURING CONSTRUCTION FOR CITY OF ORLANDO WASTEWATER RECLAMATION FACILITIES WETLANDS FUMP STATION PROJECT PMA CONSULTANTS PROPOSAL TO AECOM

		1	Estimated Hours	d Hours		Total Hours	Fee
Task	Description	Senior Principal	cipal	Senior Engineer	Technical Assistant		

							, a fee fee fee fee fee fee fee fee fee f
	Construction Administration Services:	1					
-	Review Baseline Construction Schedule		92			20	\$3,850
2	Schedule Management; Review monthly updates	.9	72			78	\$15,263
				~•			
						The state of the s	
	Sub-task total					86	\$19,113
	Totals	9	92	0	0	986	\$19,113
	Rates per Agreement Billing Rate Schedule	\$233.75	\$192.50	\$135.00	\$71,50		
. !	Proposed fee amount	\$1,403	\$17,710	80	0\$	8	\$19,113
	Proposed Not-to-Exceed Fee						\$19,113
			-				



Date: March 11, 2015 (Revised April 9, 2015)

Devo's Project No: 14-895.01

To:

AECOM

150 N. Orange Avenue

Suite 200

Orlando, FL 32801

Ph: 407.513,8213 C 407.808.9156 <u>david.ammerman@aecom.com</u>

attention:

David Ammerman - Reuse National Practice Leader

Re:

Proposal for Construction Materials Testing Services For ...

IRON BRIDGE RWRF WETLANDS PUMP STATION IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT

City Of Orlando, Orange County. Florida

Dear Mr. Ammerman:

Further to your request, we are pleased to submit this proposal for construction materials testing for the Iron Bridge RWRF Wetlands Pump Station Improvements Project.

Background Information

AECOM is involved in the design and construction of the Iron Bridge RWRF Wetlands Pump Station Improvements Project for the City of Orlando and require a proposal for construction materials testing pertaining to earthwork and concrete structures associated with this project.

Reference is made to the following drawings from the 100% plan set which was made available for our review:

- ► C 104: Site Plan Civil
- ► C 201: ERRWDS Interconnect Modifications And Site Plan Notes
- C 202: ERRWDS Interconπect Modifications And Details
- S 201 through S 502: Structural Drawings

Key construction elements of the project are as follows:

- Pumping station within the existing pump station facility.
- New flow meter.
- Connection to the existing wetlands transmission main.
- New electrical building to house new electrical gear to serve the new pumps and associated instrumentation and controls.
- Yard piping and civil work as specified and/or shown on the drawings.
- Covering the deep bed filter and chlorine contact basins as specified and/or shown on the drawings.
- Improvements to the ERRWDS/wetlands transmission pipeline interconnection including the installation of a flow meter.
- Refurbishment of the pressure regulating valve, and installation of a gate valve as specified and/or shown on the drawings.
- The addition of a weir wall in the South Chlorine Contact Basin and replacement of the drain valves as specified and/or shown on the drawings.
- Improvements to the post aeration basin pump and return line and replacement of the post aeration basin drain valves as specified and/or shown on the drawings.
- Permitting, MOT, As-Built Survey, and all other work specified and/or shown on the drawings.

The construction schedule has not yet been finalized, although the preliminary information provided indicates a construction schedule of 52 weeks from NTP. Based on a preliminary review of the plans, these are the components of work (and approximate durations), which are likely to warrant earthwork and concrete (Portland cement and asphalt) materials testing:

- ➤ Site work on Plant: Week 4 to 14
- ➤ Deep bed filters CCC improvements, etc: Week 9 to 28
- Site work at the ERRWDS Interconnect: Week 13 to 24
- New electrical building, wetlands pump stations, etc: Week 22 to 33
- Wetlands discharge piping: Week 37 to 44

We expect that the scope of work would consist of the following:

- 1. Attendance to Pre-Construction/Kick Off Meeting.
- 2. Review of the contractor's schedule and coordination.
- Sampling and testing of earthwork and trench backfill materials: Tests will consist of laboratory Proctor tests, gradation tests and field compaction tests.
- Sampling and testing of pavement materials: Tests will consist of laboratory Proctor tests, gradation tests, LBR tests and field compaction tests, asphaltic concrete testing (Marshall Method), asphalt extraction and gradation.
- 5. Sampling and testing of concrete for the substructures and superstructures: This will consist of molding of specimens, slump tests on fresh concrete, air tests and cylinder crushing strength on cured specimens.
- 6. Molding, curing and testing of grout prisms, if needed.
- 7. Preparation of interim materials testing reports.
- 8. Meetings and coordination with Prime Consultant.

Preparation of completion report at the end of the construction period.

We assume that we will be performing on-site and off-site testing only and that the Engineer of Record will be retained by the City to inspect and approve the completed work presented on the plans and specifications.

Based upon review of the plans and specifications, the work limits comprise of relatively small areas with many different construction activities. An hourly basis for the technician is therefore most appropriate for density testing activities for open trenching and backfill, demolition and backfilling, pavement replacement construction, concrete pouring (assumed ready mix plant will be utilized). The daily hours will include travel time, because the density testing will require the nuclear gauge (which must be stored each evening in an approved storage facility). The hourly rate for the technician should apply for verifying the age of the truck load of material and corresponding temperature (required if the load needs to be rejected) monitoring water added, obtaining truck tickets, and measuring slump.

The following tasks and associated manhours are anticipated based on the preliminary construction schedule and productions rates for the principal earthworks activities.

Task 1: - Attend Kick Off Meeting

Attend the kick off meeting (at City Of Orlando offices and/or the site or AECOM Offices) and assist in AECOM in responding to questions from City Of Orlando Staff and the City's selected Contractor. This task entails:

- Document review and preparation for and kick off meeting.
- 2. Attendance at the kick off meeting.
- 3. Discussion of issues which could come up at the meeting with City's Staff and/or the Contractor and review the construction schedule.
- Assist AECOM with responses to questions from the contractor.

Summary of Estimated Manhours for Task 1:

Senior Engineer
 Senior Geotechnical Engineer
 6 hr

Task 2: - Quality Control Testing

Perform quality control testing as specified in the contract documents for:

- Field compaction and laboratory Proctor densities to compare with the Contractors testing on pipe trench and structure backfill.
- Sampling of concrete, molding of specimens and compressive strength testing for structural concrete.
- 3. Concrete testing will performed by sets. A set will consist of a slump test, an air test, molding and compressive strength testing of four cylinders.

The estimated costs for laboratory testing is presented in our itemized Table 1, while the professional services costs for field testing and engineering supervision and coordination is included in our fee itemization in Table 2.

Estimated Manhours for Task 2:

Senior Technician: 8 hr/wk for 30 wks = 240 hr
 Senior Geotech Eng: 4 hrs/wk for 10 wks = 40 hr

Summary of Estimated Manhours for Task 2:

Senior Geotechnical Engineer
 Senlor Engineering Technician
 40 hr
 240 hr

Task 3: - Quality Control Review & Prepare Interim Testing Reports

Review the quality control reports and provide AECOM with interim quality assurance report and email updates during the execution of the work.

Estimated Manhours for Task 3:

Senior Engineer
 Senior Geotechnical Engineer
 4 hr

Task 4: - Completion Report

Review the contractor's report, all previous data and prepare a completion report for the project. The report will be prepared in hard copy and also electronically for submittal to the City and AECOM.

Estimated Manhours for Task 4:

\mathcal{O}	Senior Engineer	2 hr
②	Senior Geotechnical Engineer	8 hr
3	Senior-level CADD/GIS	8 hr
$^{\textcircled{4}}$	Administrative Manager	2 hr
(5)	Cierical/Technical Secretary	4 hr

Estimated Not to Exceed (NTE) Fee

Our estimated NTE budget for these services is \$31,655, as itemized in Tables 1 and 2.

TABLE I. ITEMIZATION	of Fees Fo	R LABORATORY TI	STS	
DESCRIPTION OF WORK ITEM	Unit	UNIT COST	QUANTITY	TOTAL
Modified Proctor Tests	each	\$110.00	10	\$1,100.00
LBR for Subgrade Soils	each	\$375.00	. 5	\$1,875.00
Asphalt Concrete Testing (Marshall Method)	each	\$250.00	5	\$1,250.00
Concrete Cylinders (set)	each	\$75.00	10	\$750.00
Grout Prisms	set	\$110.00	10	\$1,100.00
Not to Exceed Total				\$6,075.00

DESCRIPTION OF WORK ITEM	UNIT	Unit Cost	QUANTITY	TOTAL
Senior Engineer	hr	\$115.00	12	\$1,380.00
Senior Geotechnical Engineer	hr	\$100.00	78	\$7,800.00
Senior Engineering Field Technician	hr	\$65.00	240	\$15,600.00
Senior-level CADD/GIS	hr	\$65.00	8	\$520.00
Administrative Manager	hr	\$60.00	2	\$120,00
Clerical/Technical Secretary	hr	\$40.00	4	\$160.00
Not to Exceed Total				\$25,580.00

We trust that this proposal is sufficiently comprehensive in scope to cover the construction materials testings for the project. Please contact us if there are any questions regarding this proposal. We look forward to working with AECOM on this project.

Claudia Callahan Claudia Callahan, B.Sc Senior Administrative Assistant

Authorization

To authorize this proposal, please complete the information requested and return by mail or fax.

AUTHORIZATION OF OFFER	
This offer is authorized only when signed below otherwise it should be considered a draft.	
Authorization signature:	
Devo perseam	
Devo Seereeram, Ph.D., P.E. Owner	
To authorize this work, please complete the information below and return a copy of the authorization to:	executed
Devo Seereeram, Ph.D., P.E., LLC (d/b/a Devo Engineering) 5500 Alhambra Drive Orlando, FL 32808 Phone: 407-290-2371; Fax: 407-298-9011 e-mail: devo@devoeng.com	

	AUTHORIZATION BY CLIE	NT	
Proposal Authorized on this	day of	2015	
Authorized Signature		hpiasūs apagykas akti (rojja pūjagvosias) lūti pysdans	
Print Name & Title	abėrtąžbėtūs (tidaus, cosperados por 1964; spidetė (1964)		
Company name	diorniaspeceroctarbiitpassidpiasbiadovabanterrepresinate	.* 	
Company address	***************************************		

Company phone #		ra suggesta styrados estas i sud actual que se los sos sos sos sos sos sos sos sos sos	
Company fax #	•		
Cellular/mobile phone #	*********************		
E-mail address		Ancistanter anti-anabasher ga'i bi age 1004 494 bheal éar t	