



CONTRACT AMENDMENT NO. CA - 00002
TO
Kimley-Horn & Associates Inc
IN
THE CITY OF BURLESON, TEXAS

DATE: 11.21.2024 01:01PM
OWNER: The City of Burleson Texas
CONTRACTOR: Kimley-Horn & Associates Inc

The Contractor is directed by the Owner to make the following changes to the work specified in the above referenced contract:

SEE ATTACHED PAGES

| | | | |
|--|------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Original Contract Amount | \$1,090,915.00 | | |
| Net INCREASE in Contract Amount from Previous Contract Amendment | \$0.00 | | |
| Net INCREASE in Contract Amount from this Contract Amendment | \$120,277.00 | Current Increase (%) | 11.03% |
| Revised Contract Total Amount | \$1,211,192.00 | Overall Increase (%) | 11.03% |
| Original Contract Completion Time | 1774 | Original Completion Date | 01.31.2028 |
| Change in Contract completion Time from Previous Contract Amendment | 0 | Revised Completion Date | 01.31.2028 |
| Change in Contract completion Time from this Contract Amendment | 0 | | |
| Recommended by: | CITY OF BURLESON | Accepted by: | Kimley-Horn & Associates Inc |
| By: Mccullough, Michelle | | Signed by: <i>Douglas Arnold</i> | |
| Title: Project Engineer | | By: <i>D7A6C9199E604BC</i> | |
| | | Title: Contract Specialist | |

Approved By Owner: CITY OF BURLESON

By: _____
Title: _____

For Internal Use Only
City Council Financial
Transaction if:

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Current Increase > 10% | |
| Overall Increase > 20% | |



| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Current Increase > \$50,000 | |
| Council Date | |

Scope of Work:

Contract Amendment for expanding the limits of the Schematic Design for FM1902 and the Lakewood Extension beyond the Chisolm Trail Parkway intersections, to include a realignment of CR 915 and FM 1902. The additional limits are likely to add 1,200 LF of CR 915 and 1,200 LF of FM 1902 to the project scope. Additional survey, geotechnical analysis and SUE is also included in this amendment.

Background

The traffic study indicated a significant volume of traffic coming from CR 915 and a signal was warranted today at the intersection of CR 915 and FM 1902. The current contract does not take into account schematic design west of the tollway which is needed in order to effectively design the extension of Lakewood to the tollway. The city met with TxDOT and proposed amending our contract to add the schematic and TxDOT will be responsible for fully funding the detail design and construction of the west side improvements. This amendment will include the schematic design of the re-alignment of FM 1902 to CR 915.

| Item Number | Description | Quantity | Unit of Measure | Unit Price | Original Quantity | New Quantity | Pre-Amendment Item Value | Contract Amendment Total Amount |
|-------------|--|----------|-----------------|------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| CA2.1 | Task 1 - Design Survey | | | | 0 | | \$28,240.00 | \$17,020.00 |
| CA2.2 | Task 3 - Schematic Design | | | | 0 | | \$154,675.00 | \$153,790.00 |
| CA2.3 | Task 5 - Geotechnical Investigation | | | | 0 | | \$20,800.00 | \$20,132.00 |
| CA2.4 | Task 11 - Meetings (Hourly) | | | | 0 | | \$68,660.00 | \$36,320.00 |
| CA2.5 | Task 12 - Subsurface Utility Engineering | | | | 0 | | \$44,820.00 | \$22,690.00 |
| CA2.6 | Task 9 - Chisolm Trail Pkwy Intersection Improvements (Hourly) | | | | 0 | | \$163,270.00 | \$-129,675.00 |
| | | | | | | | | <u>\$120,277.00</u> |

The work described in this contract amendment consist of furnishing the additional quantities of materials, labor, equipment, tools and incidentals as specified above that is necessary to construct the work. All work and



payments shall be in accordance with the contract plans and specifications referenced in the agreement for "Lakewood Drive Ext Design" between the City of Burleson, Texas and Kimley-Horn & Associates Inc that was entered by both parties on 3/24/2023 12:00:00 AM.

End of Scope for work for City of Burleson Lakewood Drive Ext Design
No. CA - 00002
Contract Amendment No. CA - 00002

**AMENDMENT NUMBER 2 TO THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN CLIENT AND KIMLEY-HORN
AND ASSOCIATES, INC.**

This is Amendment number 2 dated September 11, 2024 to the agreement between City of Burleson ("City") and Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. ("Engineer") dated March 24, 2023 ("the Agreement") and modified on September 9, 2024 with Amendment number 1, concerning FM 1902 (Lakewood Drive) Extension, City Project No. 031023 ("Project").

The Engineer has entered into the Agreement with City for the furnishing of professional services, and the parties now desire to amend the Agreement.

The Agreement is amended to include services to be performed by Engineer for compensation as set forth below in accordance with the terms of the Agreement, which are incorporated by reference.

Engineer will provide the services specifically set forth in the Scope of Services Attachment A.

The services currently authorized to be performed by Engineer in accordance with the Agreement and previous amendments.

For the services set forth in Attachment A, a fee breakdown by task is provided in Attachment A. Budget reallocation will be utilized for this amendment. Below is a breakdown of the fee reallocation and additional fee requested for this amendment:

Reallocation Budget:

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Task 9 – Chisholm Trail Pkwy Intersection Improvements (Hourly) | (\$129,675) |
|---|-------------|

Amendment 2 Fee per Attachment A:

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Task 1 – Design Survey | \$17,020 |
| Task 3 – Schematic Design | \$153,790 |
| Task 5 – Geotechnical Investigation | \$20,132 |
| Task 11 – Meetings (Hourly) | \$36,320 |
| Task 12 – Subsurface Utility Engineering | \$22,690 |
| Subtotal Amendment per Attachment A | \$249,952 |

| | |
|--|------------------|
| The total amount of Amendment 2 is: | \$120,277 |
|--|------------------|

CITY:

CITY OF BURLESON, TEXAS

By: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

ENGINEER:

KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC.

By: Doreen Alm

Title: Contract Specialist

Date: 09/11/2024

ATTACHMENT A

I. Scope of Services

The Consultant understands that the City wishes to expand the limits of the Schematic Design for FM 1902 and the Lakewood Extension beyond the Chisolm Trail Parkway intersections, to include a realignment of CR 915 and FM 1902. The additional limits are likely to add 1,200 LF of CR 915 and 1,200 LF of FM 1902 to the project scope. Additional survey, geotechnical analysis and SUE is also included in this amendment. The additional traffic evaluation scope has been included in Amendment 1.

The original contract included schematic design, final design, bidding, CCA and environmental for FM 1902 from Chisolm Trail Parkway to the Chisolm Trail connection. This scope will expand the schematic design to include the additional FM 1902 and CR 915.

Amendment 1 included the additional traffic evaluation scope, matching the Schematic Design limits added in this amendment.

The Consultant will complete the following tasks:

Task 1 – Design Survey

The Consultant, through its subconsultant, Spooner & Associates, Inc. will provide topographic survey for the limits shown in the provided exhibit. The limits consist of 1,500 LF of CR 915; 4,200 LF of existing and proposed FM 1902 and the temporary connection between FM 1902 and the Lakewood Extension.

Subtasks for this task consist of:

A. Topographic Survey

- 1) Making a topographic survey of all existing features above ground level by using both Mobile LIDAR and on the ground survey. These features will consist of telephone poles, power poles, utilities, utility markers, fences, retaining walls, water meters, detector check valves, manholes, vaults, sprinkler heads, structures, culvert pipes and any other facilities in close proximity to the anticipated construction limits. Also, all buildings, trees, and other topographical features.
- 2) Determining horizontal and vertical location of all underground utilities or other underground structures where they cross any part of the proposed project.
- 3) Making of all surveys necessary to determine limits of any existing right-of-way or easements.
- 4) Tie all public improvements to existing City monument system.

Task 3 – Schematic Design

- A. Prior to developing the schematic plans, the Consultant will develop conceptual exhibits with up to two (2) options for the new alignment of CR 915 and FM 1902. Up to two (2) rounds of comments will be addressed prior to finalizing the conceptual layouts and proceeding with Schematic plan development (as described in this task).
- B. Schematic Plans. Schematic plan and profile will be drawn at a scale no smaller than 1" = 100' and to such detail as is necessary to meet TxDOT requirements. The Consultant will prepare schematic plans which will consist of the following:
 - 1) Roadway improvements (plan and profile) showing curb, median, turn lanes, median openings, sidewalk, existing and proposed right-of-way. The approximate location of all existing and proposed driveways within the limits of the project.

- 2) Intersection improvements based on the findings of the traffic evaluation in Task 7. One layout will be developed for the intersection of FM 1902 and CR 915.
- 3) Existing and proposed typical sections.
- 4) Existing utilities and survey data collected in Task 1 and Task 12.
- 5) A preliminary drainage study, consisting of drainage areas, location, and size of existing drainage facilities, the approximate size and alignment of proposed drainage facilities, and approximate discharges.
- 6) Existing water and sanitary sewer mains and potential conflicts (if applicable).
- 7) An opinion of probable construction cost. Because the Consultant does not control the cost of labor, materials, equipment or services furnished by others, methods of determining prices, or competitive bidding or market conditions, any opinions rendered as to costs, including but not limited to opinions as to the costs of construction and materials, will be made on the basis of its experience and represent its judgment as an experienced and qualified professional, familiar with the industry. The Consultant cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids or actual costs will not vary from its opinions of cost.
- 8) A 30%, 60% and Final Schematic Submittal is assumed.
- 9) Address up to three (3) rounds of comments from the City, TxDOT and NTTA on the schematic submittal.

Task 5 – Geotechnical

The Consultant, through its subconsultant (CMJ Engineering), will provide geotechnical services as follows:

- A. The Consultant will perform geotechnical investigations and analyses necessary to complete the PS&E design for FM 1902 and Lakewood Drive (east of Chisolm Train Parkway). The Consultant will prepare a geotechnical report describing existing geotechnical conditions and considerations necessary for design and construction of the project for City and TxDOT review and approval. The report will consist of up to four (4) additional pavement borings.

Task 11 – Meetings (Hourly)

- A. Meetings
 - 1) The Consultant will attend up to two (2) plan review meetings during schematic design with the City, NTTA, and TxDOT.
 - 2) The Consultant will attend up to twelve (10) coordination meetings with the City and TxDOT or other stakeholder to discuss progress, design and/or coordination items beyond in addition to the review meetings listed above.
 - 3) The Consultant will prepare an agenda and meeting notes for all meetings.

Task 12 – Subsurface Utility Engineering

The Consultant, through its subconsultant (The Rios Group), will provide subsurface utility engineering for the survey limits.

- A. Provide Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE) to Quality Level D, C and B.
 - 1) Perform Level B SUE along new stretches of CR 915 & FM 1902 (up to 2,000 LF feet)

Method of Compensation

The Consultant will perform the services in Tasks 1, Task 3 and Task 5 for the total lump sum fee below. Individual task amounts are informational only. All permitting, application, and similar project fees will be paid directly by the City.

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| Task 1 – Design Survey | \$17,020 |
| Task 3 – Schematic Design | \$153,790 |
| <u>Task 5 – Geotechnical Investigation</u> | <u>\$20,132</u> |
| Total Lump Sum Fee | \$190,942 |

Lump sum fees will be invoiced monthly based upon the overall percentage of services performed.

The Consultant will perform the services in Task 11 and Task 12 on a labor fee plus expense basis with the maximum labor fee shown below.

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| Task 11 – Meetings (Hourly) | \$36,320 |
| <u>Task 12 – Subsurface Utility Engineering</u> | <u>\$22,690</u> |
| Maximum Labor Fee | \$59,010 |

Total Fee **\$249,952**

The Consultant will not exceed the total maximum labor fee shown without authorization from the Client. Individual task amounts are provided for budgeting purposes only. The Consultant reserves the right to reallocate amounts among tasks as necessary.

Labor fee will be billed on an hourly basis according to our then-current rates. As to these tasks, direct reimbursable expenses such as express delivery services, fees, air travel, and other direct expenses will be billed at 1.15 times cost.

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
Hourly Labor Rate Schedule

| Classification | Rate |
|---|---------------|
| Analyst | \$165 - 250 |
| Professional | \$235 - \$300 |
| Senior Professional I/Project Manager | \$260 - \$360 |
| Senior Professional II/Senior Project Manager | \$345 - \$380 |
| Support Staff | \$110 - \$150 |

Lakewood Drive Extension Design – Survey Exhibit



Level of Effort Spreadsheet
TASK/HOUR BREAKDOWN
Design Services for
Lakewood Extension - Amendment 2

| Task No. | Task Description | Labor (hours) | | | | | | | Total Labor Cost | Expense | | | Total Expense Cost | Task Sub Total |
|----------|---|------------------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------|------------------|---------------|--------|--------------|--------------------|----------------|
| | | Senior Project Manager | Project Manager | Professional | Analyst III / EIT III | Analyst II / EIT II | Analyst I / EIT I | Admin | | Subconsultant | Travel | Reproduction | | |
| 1.0 | Design Survey | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$520 | \$16,500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$16,500 | \$17,020 |
| | Additional Survey | | 2 | | | | | | \$520 | \$16,500 | | | \$16,500 | \$17,020 |
| 3.0 | Schematic Design | 36 | 118 | 0 | 304 | 0 | 330 | 0 | \$153,790 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$153,790 |
| | Base Files - incorporate Survey and Record Drawings | | 2 | | 10 | | 20 | | \$5,670 | | | | \$0 | \$5,670 |
| | Conceptual Layout (2 options, 2 revisions) | 8 | 15 | | 40 | | 20 | | \$17,360 | | | | \$0 | \$17,360 |
| | Roadway plan layout/alignment | 2 | 6 | | 20 | | 60 | | \$15,850 | | | | \$0 | \$15,850 |
| | Intersection Layout - CR 915 & FM 1902 | 2 | 10 | | 10 | | 20 | | \$8,440 | | | | \$0 | \$8,440 |
| | Typical Sections - TxDOT Requirements | 1 | 4 | | 10 | | 20 | | \$6,535 | | | | \$0 | \$6,535 |
| | Roadway Profile | 2 | 10 | | 30 | | | | \$8,840 | | | | \$0 | \$8,840 |
| | Cross-Sections | 1 | 15 | | 30 | | | | \$9,795 | | | | \$0 | \$9,795 |
| | Schematic Roll Plot Exhibit | | 2 | | 4 | | 20 | | \$4,560 | | | | \$0 | \$4,560 |
| | Drainage Area Map | 2 | 10 | | 20 | | 20 | | \$10,290 | | | | \$0 | \$10,290 |
| | Drainage Study | 2 | 20 | | 40 | | 40 | | \$19,890 | | | | \$0 | \$19,890 |
| | Utility Conflicts | | 2 | | | | | | \$520 | | | | \$0 | \$520 |
| | QC and Address Comments | 4 | 2 | | 4 | | 10 | | \$4,290 | | | | \$0 | \$4,290 |
| | 30% Schematic Submittal | | 1 | | 4 | | | | \$1,000 | | | | \$0 | \$1,000 |
| | Address External Comments | 1 | 2 | | 20 | | 20 | | \$7,865 | | | | \$0 | \$7,865 |
| | 60% Schematic | | 2 | | 10 | | 10 | | \$4,020 | | | | \$0 | \$4,020 |
| | QC and Address Comments | 4 | 4 | | 10 | | 20 | | \$7,570 | | | | \$0 | \$7,570 |
| | 60% Schematic Submittal | | 1 | | 4 | | | | \$1,000 | | | | \$0 | \$1,000 |
| | Address External Comments | 4 | 4 | | 10 | | 20 | | \$7,570 | | | | \$0 | \$7,570 |
| | 90% Schematic | | 2 | | 8 | | 10 | | \$3,650 | | | | \$0 | \$3,650 |
| | QC and Address Comments | 2 | 2 | | 8 | | 10 | | \$4,340 | | | | \$0 | \$4,340 |
| | 90% Submittal | | | | 4 | | | | \$740 | | | | \$0 | \$740 |
| | Address External Comments | 1 | 2 | | 8 | | 10 | | \$3,995 | | | | \$0 | \$3,995 |
| 5.0 | Geotechnical | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$1,040 | \$19,092 | \$0 | \$0 | \$19,092 | \$20,132 |
| | Geotechnical Report | | 4 | | | | | | \$1,040 | \$19,092 | | | \$19,092 | \$20,132 |
| 11.0 | Meetings | 24 | 38 | 38 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 20 | \$36,320 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$36,320 |
| | Schematic Plan Review (2) | 2 | 4 | | 4 | | | | \$3,410 | | | | \$0 | \$3,410 |
| | Coordination Meetings (10) | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | | | | \$10,250 | | | | \$0 | \$10,250 |
| | Meeting Agendas and Notes | 12 | 24 | 24 | 24 | | | 20 | \$22,660 | | | | \$0 | \$22,660 |
| 12.0 | SUE | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$520 | \$22,170 | \$0 | \$0 | \$22,170 | \$22,690 |
| | Level B | | 2 | | | | | | \$520 | \$22,170 | | | | \$22,690 |
| | Totals | 60 | 164 | 38 | 342 | 0 | 330 | 20 | \$192,190 | \$57,762 | \$0 | \$0 | \$57,762 | \$249,952 |

| Project Summary | |
|---------------------------|------------------|
| Total Labor | \$192,190 |
| Total Expense | \$57,762 |
| Total Project Cost | \$249,952 |