

**SECOND AMENDMENT TO PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT FOR
PREPARATION OF CONSTRUCTION PLANS, SPECIFICATIONS AND ESTIMATES
(PS&E) FOR PROJECT NO. 675 SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD WIDENING PROJECT
(City Council / RKA Consulting Group, Inc.)**

This SECOND AMENDMENT to that certain PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT FOR PREPARATION OF CONSTRUCTION PLANS, SPECIFICATIONS AND ESTIMATES (PS&E) FOR PROJECT NO. 675 SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD WIDENING PROJECT (“Amendment No. 2”), is entered into effective as of April 20, 2021 by and between CITY OF CARSON, a municipal corporation ("City") and RKA CONSULTING GROUP, a California corporation ("Engineer") (City and Engineer are referred to collectively as “parties” herein).

RECITALS

A. City and Engineer entered into that certain Professional Services Agreement for Preparation of Construction Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E) (“Agreement”), executed by and between the parties effective as of January 15, 2013, for Engineer to prepare certain construction plans, specifications and estimates (“PS&E”) for the City’s project for widening Sepulveda Boulevard from Alameda Street to the East City Limit (“Project”), for a Contract Sum of \$187,600; and

B. City and Engineer entered into that certain First Amendment to Professional Services Agreement for Preparation of Construction Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E) for Project No. 675 Sepulveda Boulevard Widening Project (“Amendment No. 1”), dated May 17, 2016, pursuant to which Engineer was to prepare certain expanded scope of PS&E for the City for an additional Contract Sum of \$244,693; and

C. Extensive work has been completed by Engineer on the Scope of Services required by the Agreement and Amendment No. 1, but because City lost its grant funding source, the Project was halted in 2017; and

D. In 2019, City was awarded a Measure “M” Multi-Year Sub-regional Program grant in the amount of \$6,019,999 for the completion of the PS&E and construction of the Project; and

E. The parties now desire that Engineer resume services to update the PS&E in order to be current with the updated codes and permitting requirements, which have been modified since the parties entered into Amendment No. 1; and

F. Accordingly, the parties desire to amend the Agreement to again expand the Scope of Services to be performed by Engineer, increase the total compensation to be paid by City to Engineer by an amount not to exceed \$223,950 thereby increasing the total Contract Sum to \$656,243, and amend the schedule of performance to clarify that the services to be provided by Engineer will not be completed unless and until City deems them to be complete and are accepted by City.

TERMS

1. **Recitals.** The foregoing recitals are true and correct and are incorporated herein by reference.

2. **Contract Changes.** The Agreement is amended as provided herein (new text in *bold italics* and deleted text in ~~strikethrough~~).

A. **Section 4, “Commencement and Completion of Work,” of the Agreement is hereby amended to read in its entirety as follows:**

“The execution of this Agreement by the parties does not constitute an authorization to proceed. The services of Engineer shall commence when the Owner, acting by and through its City Engineer, has issued a Notice to Proceed. The work described in Exhibit “A” shall be completed in accordance with ~~the project “estimated fee and schedule” section of~~ Exhibit “A” following Engineer’s receipt of the Notice to Proceed, exclusive of any review periods required by Owner, *and all work product is subject to review and acceptance by the City, and further, must be revised by the Engineer without additional charge to the City until found satisfactory and accepted by City.* Engineer shall have no claim for compensation for any services or work which has not been authorized by the Owner’s Notice to Proceed.”

B. **Section 9, “Compensation,” of the Agreement, is hereby amended to read in its entirety as follows:**

“Payment shall be made by Owner to Engineer for the services and work performed hereunder within thirty (30) days following receipt and approval by Owner of original invoices therefor. Engineer’s fees and charges for the services and work performed shall be invoiced monthly, or at such other intervals as may be mutually agreed upon, and said fees and charges shall in no event exceed *Six* ~~Four~~ Hundred *Fifty Six* ~~Thirty Two~~ Thousand Two Hundred *Forty* ~~Ninety~~ Three Dollars (~~\$656,243~~ *\$432,293*) as set forth in Exhibit “B” attached hereto and made a part hereof.”

C. **The project schedule of Exhibit “A,” “Scope of Services,” of the Agreement is hereby deleted from the Agreement.**

D. **Exhibit “A,” “Scope of Services,” of the Agreement is hereby amended by adding to the end thereof the professional services attached hereto as Exhibit “A-1” (“Amendment No. 2 Scope of Work”).**

E. **The Hourly Rate Schedule of Exhibit “B,” “Professional Fees and Rates,” of the Agreement is hereby amended to add the following which shall apply only to the Amendment No. 2 Scope of Work:**

“HOURLY RATE SCHEDULE

Project Principal	\$170/hr
Project Manager	\$140/hr
Project Engineer	\$125/hr
Design Engineer	\$115/hr
Engineering Technician	\$75/hr”

3. Continuing Effect of Agreement. Except as amended by this Amendment No. 2, all provisions of the Agreement shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect. From and after the date of this Amendment No. 2, whenever the term “Agreement” appears in the Agreement, it shall mean the Agreement, as amended by this Amendment No. 2 to the Agreement.

4. Affirmation of Agreement; Warranty Re Absence of Defaults. City and Consultant each ratify and reaffirm each and every one of the respective rights and obligations arising under the Agreement. Each party represents and warrants to the other that there have been no written or oral modifications to the Agreement other than as provided herein. Each party represents and warrants to the other that the Agreement is currently an effective, valid, and binding obligation.

Consultant represents and warrants to City that, as of the date of this Amendment No. 2, City is not in default of any material term of the Agreement and that there have been no events that, with the passing of time or the giving of notice, or both, would constitute a material default under the Agreement.

City represents and warrants to Consultant that, as of the date of this Amendment No. 2, Consultant is not in default of any material term of the Agreement and that there have been no events that, with the passing of time or the giving of notice, or both, would constitute a material default under the Agreement.

5. Adequate Consideration. The parties hereto irrevocably stipulate and agree that they have each received adequate and independent consideration for the performance of the obligations they have undertaken pursuant to this Amendment No. 2.

6. Authority. The persons executing this Amendment No. 2 on behalf of the parties hereto warrant that (i) such party is duly organized and existing, (ii) they are duly authorized to execute and deliver this Amendment No. 2 on behalf of said party, (iii) by so executing this Amendment No. 2, such party is formally bound to the provisions of this Amendment No. 2, and (iv) the entering into this Amendment No. 2 does not violate any provision of any other agreement to which said party is bound.

[SIGNATURES OF FOLLOWING PAGE]

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused their duly authorized representatives to execute this Amendment No. 2 as of the date first written above.

“CITY ”

CITY OF CARSON, a municipal corporation

By: _____
Lula Davis-Holmes, Mayor

ATTEST:

By: _____
Joy Simarago, Deputy City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

ALESHIRE & WYNDER, LLP

By: _____
Sunny K. Soltani, City Attorney
[rjl]

“ENGINEER”

RKA CONSULTING GROUP,
a California corporation

By: _____
Name: Dominic Milano
Title: President/CEO

By: _____
Name: David Gilbertson
Title: Vice President/Secretary
Address: 398 Lemon Creek Drive, Ste E
Walnut, CA 91789

Two corporate officer signatures required when Consultant is a corporation, with one signature required from each of the following groups: 1) Chairman of the Board, President or any Vice President; and 2) Secretary, any Assistant Secretary, Chief Financial Officer or any Assistant Treasurer. CONSULTANT’S SIGNATURES SHALL BE DULY NOTARIZED, AND APPROPRIATE ATTESTATIONS SHALL BE INCLUDED AS MAY BE REQUIRED BY THE BYLAWS, ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION, OR OTHER RULES OR REGULATIONS APPLICABLE TO CONSULTANT’S BUSINESS ENTITY.

CALIFORNIA ALL-PURPOSE ACKNOWLEDGMENT

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy or validity of that document.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

On _____, 2021 before me, _____, personally appeared _____, proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose names(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature: _____

OPTIONAL

Though the data below is not required by law, it may prove valuable to persons relying on the document and could prevent fraudulent reattachment of this form.

<p>CAPACITY CLAIMED BY SIGNER</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> INDIVIDUAL</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> CORPORATE OFFICER</p> <p>_____</p> <p align="center">TITLE(S)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> PARTNER(S) <input type="checkbox"/> LIMITED</p> <p> <input type="checkbox"/> GENERAL</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> ATTORNEY-IN-FACT</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> TRUSTEE(S)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> GUARDIAN/CONSERVATOR</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> OTHER _____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>SIGNER IS REPRESENTING: (NAME OF PERSON(S) OR ENTITY(IES))</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>DESCRIPTION OF ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>_____</p> <p align="center">TITLE OR TYPE OF DOCUMENT</p> <p>_____</p> <p align="center">NUMBER OF PAGES</p> <p>_____</p> <p align="center">DATE OF DOCUMENT</p> <p>_____</p> <p align="center">SIGNER(S) OTHER THAN NAMED ABOVE</p>
---	--

CALIFORNIA ALL-PURPOSE ACKNOWLEDGMENT

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy or validity of that document.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

On _____, 2021 before me, _____, personally appeared _____, proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose names(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature: _____

OPTIONAL

Though the data below is not required by law, it may prove valuable to persons relying on the document and could prevent fraudulent reattachment of this form.

<p>CAPACITY CLAIMED BY SIGNER</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> INDIVIDUAL</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> CORPORATE OFFICER</p> <p>_____</p> <p align="center">TITLE(S)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> PARTNER(S) <input type="checkbox"/> LIMITED</p> <p> <input type="checkbox"/> GENERAL</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> ATTORNEY-IN-FACT</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> TRUSTEE(S)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> GUARDIAN/CONSERVATOR</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> OTHER _____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>SIGNER IS REPRESENTING: (NAME OF PERSON(S) OR ENTITY(IES))</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>DESCRIPTION OF ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>_____</p> <p align="center">TITLE OR TYPE OF DOCUMENT</p> <p>_____</p> <p align="center">NUMBER OF PAGES</p> <p>_____</p> <p align="center">DATE OF DOCUMENT</p> <p>_____</p> <p align="center">SIGNER(S) OTHER THAN NAMED ABOVE</p>
--	--

EXHIBIT "A-1"

AMENDMENT NO. 2 SCOPE OF WORK

(INCLUDES PROJECT HISTORICAL BACKGROUND)

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF SCOPE OF SERVICES

In 2017 design on the project went on hold due to lack of funding to construct the project. The design was approximately 95% complete, and Engineer was in the process of obtaining approval from various governmental agencies. The City now has funding to construct the project and has now approved Engineer to complete the design, obtain all required approvals, and provide engineering support during construction.

A significant change to Engineer's team is the previous structural engineering firm, KEC is no longer in business. The structural engineer assigned to the project by KEC has also retired, so a new structural engineering firm, PacRim Engineering has been selected to join the project.

Task 1 – Finalize Civil Engineering Plans, Incorporate City Comments, Update Plans and Specifications to Current Standards, Obtain LA County Approvals on storm drain and street lighting

The currently designed Civil plans were at 95% design completion when put on hold. The plans and specifications need to be updated to current SPPWC (Greenbook) and Caltrans Standards and Specifications. The construction cost estimate will be reviewed and updated to reflect current unit rate costs based on similar projects. It is assumed that Engineer will submit the plans at the 100% level for one round of review by the City.

Approvals from the County are required for the storm drain improvements and the street lighting. Both were close to approval when the project went on hold. It is assumed that there will be two rounds of reviews prior to approval from the County.

Task 2 –Utility Workshop and Utility Coordination

The project has been on hold long enough that the utility coordination will need to re-start from the beginning. Utility notices will be sent out to all utility agencies, and as-builts will be obtained. Due to the complexity of all of the oil lines in the roadway and the lack of detail on most utility as-builts, it is assumed that the current utility plans are mostly accurate. The only changes to be made will be in areas that will be impacted by underground work at the bridge and storm drains and areas that will be impacted by the relocation of the SCE transmission poles on the south side of the street.

Significant coordination with SCE will be necessary to relocate the transmission line. Since the project went on hold in 2017 SCE has since relocated and replaced some poles, making the previously designed work partially obsolete.

It is assumed the utilities that are currently attached to the bridge can be protected in place.

The City will host a Utility Coordination Workshop with all of the utility agencies on Sepulveda Boulevard. Engineer will prepare exhibits, attend the meeting, coordinate relocations with the utility companies, and update the plans to reflect the changes.

Task 3 –Project Management

Throughout the project, Engineer will work weekly with the City, Structural Engineer, Environmental Consultant, and County to develop a schedule, track design and approval progress, coordinate design issues, and ensure that the project will be ready for bidding in early fall 2021.

Task 4 –Environmental Clearances

Chambers Group will prepare and obtain permits to allow the work to be done within the channel. This proposal includes tasks to prepare a permit package for the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) in coordination with Engineer and on behalf of the City of Carson. This proposal assumes the Nationwide Permit (NWP) Verification Letter from US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is currently valid. Chambers Group will coordinate with Engineer to develop a reasonable schedule to prepare the permits identified in this scope of work to be completed prior to bidding. It is assumed that CE issued for the project remains accurate and no project changes will be made that would require an additional CEQA document.

Task 4a – Application for RWQCB Section 401 Water Quality Certification

Chambers Group will coordinate with RWQCB on behalf of the City. The permit application must be accompanied by an application or filing fee, to be provided by the City, based on the total project cost, project type, and/or project area and will be determined by Chambers Group during the application preparation period.

Chambers Group will prepare and submit a new application for Water Quality Certification (WQC) pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act to the Los Angeles RWQCB. Chamber Group will prepare and submit the necessary documentation to the RWQCB for its review of the project pursuant to water quality certification.

The application package will contain copies of the permit applications for the 404 NWP and 1602 Streambed Agreement. The deliverables summary below provides details for the permit application package. Chambers Group will provide Engineer with an electronic copy of the draft permit application.

This cost estimate includes incorporation of one round of comments, not requiring further investigations or study, from Engineer into the permit applications within one week of receiving comments. Upon completion, Chambers Group will provide two (2) copies each of the individual permit applications to Engineer. The cost estimate for coordination with the agencies after permit application submittal is assumed to include requests for additional information that is readily available at the time of the request and would not require a substantial modification to the existing project description and would not require additional work, such as biological surveys or jurisdictional delineations (to be conducted as requested, as identified in Task 4d of this scope of work).

Each application will contain up to 30 pages of text and 150 pages of appendices and 6 graphics. The graphics for the applications will include a site vicinity map, site location map, and a series of site photographs and/or figures. Additional hard copies may be requested at an additional cost. The application fee is provided for informational purposes based on the 2020-2021 fee schedule; however, RWQCB may request additional fees. Chambers Group will coordinate the Project fees with RWQCB prior to the City providing a check to accompany the application package. This task does not include permit compliance activities once the permit authorization is received from RWQCB.

Task 4b –Application for RWQCB Section 401 Water Quality Certification

The Project received a letter from CDFW that the project may proceed without an Agreement with the condition that the Project must be conducted as described and completed within the proposed term and work period. The original Project term ended October 31, 2019; therefore, a new notification will need to be submitted. Chambers Group will assist Engineer/City with the preparation of the new permit amendment submittal package for the CDFW Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement (LSAA). Chamber Group will provide Engineer/City with an electronic copy of the draft and final permit amendment submittal packages, including any requested documentation that is readily available, as requested and/or required by CDFW for the LSAA. This task will include the preparation of application form and necessary appendices (e.g., location maps, updated facility list tables, etc.). The application package will contain copies of the permit applications for the 404 NWP and 401 Water Quality Certification. Chambers Group will provide Engineer/City with any associated fee schedules for the permit notification. This task assumes the preparation of the permit amendment package will be able to utilize many, if not all, of the same information and supporting documentation that were used in the original notification package.

The application is assumed to contain up to 30 pages of text and 150 pages of appendices and graphics. The graphics for the application will include at a minimum a site vicinity map, map showing location of all facilities, a location map for each additional facility, and additional site photographs or figures, as appropriate. This task assumes two rounds of comments/revisions from Engineer/City. The application fee is provided for informational purposes based on the 2021 fee schedule; however, CDFW may request additional fees. Chambers Group will coordinate the Project fees with CDFW prior to the City providing a check to accompany the application package. This task does not include permit compliance activities once the permit authorization is received from CDFW.

Task 4c –Application for USACE Section 404 Nationwide 14 Permit Extension

The Project received a permit verification letter (SPL-2017-00147-JMV) dated May 26, 2017. The permit is contingent upon the issuance of a Section 401 Water Quality Certification (WQC) from the RWQCB. A copy of the WQC must be submitted to the USACE within 2 weeks of receipt to comply with the permit conditions. Since the Project will not be complete by March 18, 2022 (expiration date), the City may request an additional 12 months to complete the Project under the current NWP terms and conditions. Chambers Group will assist Engineer/City with the request for the extension of the NWP. The extension package may include an extension request form, supporting technical documentation, and copies of the permit applications for the 401 Water Quality Certification and 1602 Streambed Agreement. This task assumes requested materials for the extension are readily available or included in a separate task in this proposal (e.g., Optional Task

4d). This task does not include permit compliance activities once the permit authorization is received from USACE.

Task 4d –Jurisdictional Delineation and Biological Resources Update

A Jurisdictional Delineation (JD) was prepared for the Project in September 2016 and a Natural Environment Study (Minimal Impacts, NESMI) was prepared for the Project in November 2016. If the regulatory agencies request an update to information in either or both of these reports, Chambers Group will conduct the literature review update of resources recorded since 2016, conduct a brief field survey to confirm conditions at the site are similar to those documented in the original documents, and prepare a brief memo documenting the findings. This task assumes the information in the original JD and NESMI are still relevant and provide a basis for the update.

This task will not be needed if no update is requested for either the JD or NESMI.

Task 5 –Structural Design

PROJECT UNDERSTANDING AND APPROACH

The proposed widening is a four-span Precast/Prestressed (PC/PS) concrete I-girders. The total bridge length is approximately 240' measured along the Sepulveda Boulevard centerline with a constant superstructure width of 96'-0". Spans 1 and 4 are 58'-2" and spans 2 and 3 are 59'-0". The superstructure depth varies between 4'-2" and 4'-3 1/2", with a minimum Depth to Span ratio of 7%. The final configuration of the structure will accommodate an overall roadway width between curbs of 84'-0" and sidewalks on both sides of the bridge. The total width of the widened bridge will be 96'-0". Concrete Type 26 concrete barriers are called out along both deck overhangs.

The project was put on hold during the 90% submittal that was provided to the County for review. Since then, the City has been working with the County to finalize the bridge design and gain the final approval from the County. Pending receipt of the County's review comments, Engineer has requested PacRim to finalize the bridge design PS&E with City and County's approval as its new Structural Engineer of Record.

Based on Engineer's cursory review of the Sepulveda Blvd Bridge documents and discussions with the City of Carson, Engineer has identified the following:

1. The current status of the County review is near completion. Multiple rounds of County comments were provided to the structural engineer and Engineer assumes that those comments have previously been addressed. It is not clear at this time if the County would provide its final review comments upon the PS&E 90% submittal, which has several years of time lapse or if the County would request an updated 90% design PS&E submittal to incorporate latest codes and practices before resume reviewing the package. The City has attempted to coordinate with the County and is expecting its input.
2. Constructability of the battered driven prestressed concrete piles at the bents will be considered in the re-analysis of the bridge structure to take into account of potential conflict with existing bridge operation during construction.
3. The existing bridge structure is widened but is also retrofitted at the abutments and bent caps. Addition of internal shear keys are provided as part of the retrofit of the existing structure. The internal shear keys may or may not be permitted by the County according to

the current bridge practice. It appears that new CIDH piles are used for the bridge abutment foundations whose compatibility with existing driven piles at abutments should be considered.

4. The City indicated that the County sought validation of the two inconsistent approaches of simple support spans versus continuous span provided within the design calculations.
5. Updates to the Foundation Report may be similarly required to reflect the latest codes and practice such as the seismic ground motion analysis. New soil borings are not expected. Updating foundation report is not part of RKA's responsibility.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF SCOPE OF SERVICES

The scope of our services comprises preparing Final documents for the Sepulveda Blvd Bridge structure, which will obtain approval by the County and create Ready To Issue Construction documents. In order to achieve this, Engineer will perform a focused re-analysis and new set of calculations for the structure and updating the 90% PS&E for the re-submittal to the County based on updated foundation report and in compliance with latest codes and standards as the Structural Designer of Records. Engineer assumes that there will not be any funding, planning/environmental, property and utility rights issues that may affect the finalization of the bridge design. PacRim will sign the final PS&E submittal.

Our scope of services will include the following:

1. Project Administration. PacRim will perform project management and administration including correspondences, progress reports, monthly invoices and bi-weekly meetings for the Project.
2. Collect and Review Data. Some information from the Sepulveda Blvd Bridge design has been provided and cursorily reviewed. PacRim will review existing calculations and pursue additional pertinent information such as updated foundation report, updated civil plans, and any additional information from City/County and conduct a thorough review.
3. Meeting with the County. It is important to conduct a meeting with the County to gain an understanding of its review status and their perspective of the requirements going forward in finalizing the bridge design. The meeting will help to refine and confirm PacRim's proposed scope of work. PacRim will attend one project meeting with the City of Carson and County with the project team to review the project objectives, expectations, deliverables and schedule. The City will be responsible to set up the meeting.
4. Kick-off meeting with City/Engineer. PacRim will attend a meeting with the City and Engineer to discuss information from County and City's expectations for the Project and reach a consensus on the path forward and refine the scope of work. Engineer will review the project objectives, expectations, communication procedures, deliverables and schedule. Engineer will be responsible to set up the meeting. A site review will be conducted by PacRim staff at this time.
5. Coordination with Soil Engineer and Research Code standards. The team with soil engineer will review the latest code and standards in comparison with the information shown on the plans and structural calculations and provide City a brief summary of issues and items to be updated and coordinate with the City on a decision to proceed with all or part of the recommended updates. PacRim will also coordinate with the soil engineer to concur on the required updates and soils design recommendations expected from the foundation report update.

6. Perform Re-Analysis/Calculations. Upon availability of the above, PacRim will develop the re-analysis documents which are acceptable to the team. This re-analysis may include the development of a basis of design to be issued to the County summarizing the standards to be followed as previously discussed, re-modeling and re-analysis of the bridge structures based on latest code loads and updated seismic loads and soils design parameters from soil engineer, compilation of a new set of structural calculation package with new calculation additions and applicable information from original calculations. The original structural calculation will be provided to PacRim by the City. We will not rely on the original structural models and any calculation spreadsheets. The structural analysis and calculations will undergo internal QAQC review.
7. Develop Updates to 90% Plans. PacRim will take the findings of the re-analysis to provide any updates required to the 90% Plans. PacRim will re-visit the drawings from the perspective of constructability and make updates accordingly. Any standards which will require updates, such as Caltrans Standard Plans, will also be re-visited based on the Kick-off meeting expectations provided to the design team. We assume the electronic CAD files of the bridge plans and reference files will be provided to PacRim in appropriate CAD versions, free of bugs and corruption. PacRim will utilize the CAD files (not starting anew) and advance the plans into the updated 90% Plans. The structural plan updates will undergo internal QAQC review.
8. Develop Updates to 90% Quantities and Estimate. Any changes due to the re-analysis may cause changes to the quantities. The current General Plan provides approximate bridge quantities and final pay quantities which may require updates should the re-analysis identify any modifications to the structure. Quantity and estimate will reflect the current construction cost data consistent with Caltrans bridge cost database and our experience.
9. Update the Specification. Engineer assumes that it will provide the word file of the bridge sections to PacRim to update, and be responsible to update the entire Project Specification accordingly. PacRim will review Caltrans bridge latest SSPs to be incorporated into the updated bridge sections of the Specification.
10. Quality Assurance Documents. Whether internally or required by the project, Quality checks will be provided to the plans, estimates and calculations prior to issuing any documents to the City and County.
11. Coordination with City and County on 90% re-submittal and addressing review comments. PacRim will coordinate with Engineer and City first to “over-the-shoulder” review the bridge updated 90% PS&E acceptable for submitting to the County. We anticipate the City will set up a meeting to brief the County of the submittal to gain their review commitment and address their initial questions the County staff may have. After receiving and reviewing comments from the County, Engineer will prepare a response table to their comments and anticipate the City will set up a meeting to discuss our responses to the 90% review comments to agree on the directions. Engineer will then address the comments and make design changes accordingly, and then prepare the draft Final PS&E package on a similar procedure as described above. Engineer assumes the review comments from all parties such as City and County will be compiled by the City and provided to PacRim once before Engineer acts on them.
12. Coordination with City and County on Draft Final PS&E submittal and addressing review comments. Engineer will work with the City to compile the draft Final PS&E package on a similar procedure as described to submit the County. Engineer anticipates the City will set up a meeting to discuss Engineer’s draft Final submittal with the County to gain their review commitment and address their initial questions the County staff may have. After receiving

the review comments from the County, Engineer will prepare a response table to their comments and anticipate the City will set up a meeting to discuss our responses to the draft Final review comments to agree on the directions. Engineer will then address the comments and make design changes accordingly, and then prepare the Final PS&E package on a similar procedure as described above. Engineer assumes the review comments from all parties such as City and County will be compiled by the City and provided to PacRim once before Engineer acts on them.

13. Final PS&E submittal. Engineer will work with the City to compile the Final PS&E package on a similar procedure as described to submit the County.

DELIVERABLES

1. Updated 90% Bridge Plans and Bridge Quantities/Cost Estimate; Updated Bridge Spec section
2. Re-analysis/Structural Calculations
3. Basis of Design Narrative prepared in MS Word and pdf format.
4. Draft Final Bridge Plans, Bridge Quantities/Cost Estimate; Bridge Spec section; Response matrix to 90% review comments.
5. Final Bridge Plans, Bridge Quantities/Cost Estimate; Bridge Spec section; Response matrix to draft Final review comments.

ASSUMPTIONS/EXCLUSIONS

1. Base map and electronic CAD files for the current Sepulveda Bridge Project is given to PacRim.
2. Raw files from the design calculations and quantities will not be given to PacRim.
3. Specification word file is given to PacRim.
4. The plans will only be updated for Ready To issue document level.
5. Design Quality Management Plan will follow PacRim's Quality Management plan unless provided otherwise.
6. Confirming County expectations in line with Engineer's assumptions including one set of new calculation revisions and a separate independent design check not required.
7. The retaining wall does not require design documents by PacRim.
8. Architectural renderings are excluded.
9. Construction Administration is per T&M.

Task 6 –Provide Civil Engineering Support During Construction

Engineer will provide engineering support during construction. A separate consultant will be hired to provide Construction Management. The budgeted hours equate to approximately 3 hours/week for the Civil Engineer, and an additional 2 hours/week for project management and coordination.

1. Review and respond to Contractor's RFIs. Issue drawing revisions, if needed.
2. Provide guidance and clarification to the City on design issues
3. Review and approve material submittals and shop drawings
4. Construction observation/site visits. The Civil Structural Engineer will perform site visits once a month for 12 months during construction.
5. It is assumed construction will last approximately 12 months.

6. Provide as built based on legible redlines from the Contractor and modifications made due to RFI responses.

Task 7 –Provide Structural Engineering Support During Construction

Construction Administration. PacRim will provide structural construction support services as requested by the City on a time and material basis. The typical activities may include reviewing bidder's RFI's, issuance of addenda (if necessary), reviewing shop drawings, reviewing construction RFI's, performing monthly site visits for 12 months, and providing as-builts based on the contractor's redlines and any revisions made due to RFIs. A budgetary estimate is included in the proposal. The actual level of efforts may vary pending upon City's directions.

Exclusions

- Additional topographic survey. A field walk has been performed, and the only observed changes were to the existing SCE transmission poles. Field measurements have been taken to locate the new pole locations.
- Updates to the Geotechnical Foundation Report and Geotechnical Pavement Design Report. All geotechnical investigations and reports were contracted through the City, not Engineer. The Geotechnical Foundation Report is not based on current design codes and should be updated to reflect current design codes.
- Scour analysis
- Preparation of a construction Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).