



Staff Report

File #: 15-541, **Version:** 1

Agenda Date: 12/15/2015

Subject:

First Amendment to the Agreement with URS Corporation Southern, Inc., for professional engineering consulting services for the Dunedin Causeway Bridge project development and environment study.

Recommended Action:

Consider approving the first amendment to the agreement with URS Corporation Southern, Inc. (URS).

Contract No. 134-0092-NC, PID No. 000423A in the amount of \$377,322.25. Chairman to sign and Clerk to attest.

Strategic Plan:

Ensure Public Health, Safety, and Welfare

2.5 Enhance pedestrian and bicycle safety

Foster Continual Economic Growth and Vitality

4.4 Invest in infrastructure to meet current and future needs

4.5 Provide safe and effective transportation systems to support the efficient flow of motorists, commerce, and regional connectivity

Summary:

This item is back before the Board of County Commissioners (Board) for consideration with additional information relating to the cost and time delay of additional alignment alternatives and opposition from the City of Dunedin (City) and the City of Dunedin Ad Hoc Advisory Committee (Ad Hoc Committee).

On August 4, 2015, the Board directed staff to amend the agreement with URS to include six (6) additional alternative replacement concepts.

If approved, the amendment revises the agreement with URS to include additional work required for the detailed development of six (6) additional replacement alternative concepts for the Dunedin Causeway main bridge. This additional work effort will increase the agreement by \$377,322.25, and extend the agreement duration by an additional six (6) months, through June 3, 2017, for a total of thirty (30) months.

Prior to the August 4, 2015 Board meeting, the City and the Ad Hoc Committee endorsed the staff and design professional's proposal to evaluate the three (3) center alignment concepts. After receiving the design professional's cost proposal to include the six (6) additional concepts, staff solicited support from the City and Ad Hoc Committee. Both the City and Ad Hoc Committee reiterated their recommendation to proceed with the three (3) center alignment alternatives.

Background Information:

At the August 4, 2015 Board meeting, there was discussion that future approval of any center alignment concept will require the installation of a temporary bridge. The design professional provided a relative order of magnitude estimate of \$10,000,000 for the temporary bridge. It is important to note that a decision to proceed with a center alignment alternative will not necessarily cost more than a north or south alignment alternative. North or south alignment alternatives introduce costs to the project due to a variety of factors such as; sea grass mitigation, recreation mitigation, and/or relocation of utility services.

The original scope and fee schedule proposed three (3) viable concepts to be selected for further evaluation based on a preliminary screening of the nine (9) replacement alternatives. The nine (9) replacement alternative concepts for detailed development, as proposed in this amendment for the main bridge, are as follows:

High-Level Fixed Bridge (with a minimum vertical clearance of 65 feet)

- North Alignment
- Existing Alignment
- South Alignment

Mid-Level Movable Bridge (with a minimum vertical clearance of 35 feet)

- North Alignment
- Existing Alignment
- South Alignment

Low-Level Movable Bridge (with a minimum vertical clearance of 21 feet)

- North Alignment
- Existing Alignment
- South Alignment

Approval of this amendment will enable staff and URS to move forward with the project development and environmental (PD&E) process, including development and business analysis of the nine replacement alternatives.

The Board approved the original agreement with URS on November 19, 2014, to evaluate the rehabilitation or replacement of the Dunedin Causeway main bridge, the tidal relief bridge, and the approaches and public access to recreation areas on the causeway.

The bridges are located in the City of Dunedin. The project limits extend along Dunedin Causeway Boulevard from the entrance to Honeymoon Island State Park, west of Royal Stewart Arms Parkway on Honeymoon Island and east to Gary Place/Gary Circle on Ward Island, a distance of approximately two (2) miles. The estimated construction cost is \$100 million. Approval by the Federal Highway Administration is critical to the future funding for the design and construction of this project. Additionally, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process for funding approval through the project development and environment study must be followed with the most important element of that process, the categorical inclusion of the public in the development of the PD&E study.

Fiscal Impact:

Original twenty-four (24) month expenditure: \$1,356,433.73
Amendment No. 1 increase: \$ 377,322.25
Revised contract amount: \$1,733,755.98

Funding for this project is derived from the Infrastructure Sales Tax (Penny for Pinellas):
Transportation and Traffic Flow, Bridge Rehabilitation Program Allocation.

Staff Member Responsible:

Kevin Becotte, P.E., Director, Engineering and Technical Support
Joe Lauro, Director, Purchasing

Partners:

City of Dunedin
City of Dunedin Ad Hoc Advisory Committee
Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Board
MPO Technical Coordinating Committee
MPO Citizens Advisory Committee
MPO Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee.

FIRST AMENDMENT

This Amendment made and entered into this _____ day of _____, 2015, by and between PINELLAS COUNTY, a political subdivision of the State of Florida, hereinafter referred to as "County," and URS Corporation Southern, Tampa, FL hereinafter referred to as "Contractor,"

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, the County and the Contractor entered into an agreement dated November 18, 2014, pursuant to Pinellas County RFP No. 134-0092-NC (hereinafter "Agreement") pursuant to which the Contractor agreed to provide Engineering Services for County; and

WHEREAS, Section 25 of the Agreement permits modification by mutual written agreement of the parties; and

WHEREAS, the County and the Contractor now wish to modify the Agreement in order to provide for a revised scope of work, extended term, and increased funding, at the same terms, and conditions;

NOW THEREFORE, the parties agree that the Agreement is amended as follows:

1. The Agreement term is hereby extended beginning on December 4, 2016 and continuing for six (6) months from that date, and the not-to-exceed compensation amount is increased by \$377,322.25.
2. The Agreement is revised to include the Supplemental Scope of Services dated September 25, 2015 and attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference.
3. Except as changed or modified herein, all provisions and conditions of the original

Agreement shall remain in full force and effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the parties herein have executed this First Amendment to the Agreement
as of the day and year first written above.

Contractor:

PINELLAS COUNTY, FLORIDA
by and through its
Board of County Commissioners

Vice 
President (signature)

Chairman

Vice Steven Henricore, P.E.
President (printed name)

ATTEST:

ATTEST:
KEN BURKE

By: 
(Attesting Witness' name/title)

By: _____
Deputy Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM

By: 
Office of the County Attorney

SUPPLEMENTAL SCOPE OF SERVICES
September 25, 2015
for

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT
ENGINEERING CONSULTING SERVICES

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENT (PD&E) STUDY
FOR
DUNEDIN CAUSEWAY BRIDGES

County PID: 00423A/Contract 134-0092-NC
Prepared for:

Pinellas County
Engineering & Technical Support Division
14 S. Fort Harrison Avenue
Clearwater, FL 33756

Prepared by:

URS Corporation
7650 West Courtney Campbell Causeway
Suite 700
Tampa, Florida 33607

EXHIBIT A

SCOPE OF SERVICES FOR CONSULTING ENGINEERING SERVICES

This Exhibit is an amendment to the original Scope of Service agreement between Pinellas County (hereinafter referred to as the COUNTY) and URS Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the CONSULTANT) relative to the transportation facility described as follows:

I. PROJECT TITLE

Professional Engineering Services for the Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study to Evaluate Rehabilitation or Replacement of the Dunedin Causeway Bridges (Bridge Numbers 150068 and 150067) over the Intracoastal Waterway and St. Joseph Sound in the City of Dunedin, Pinellas County, FL

The limits of the project extend from the entrance to Honeymoon Island State Park, west of Royal Stewart Arms Parkway on Honeymoon Island, east to the intersection of Gary Place/Gary Circle with Causeway Boulevard on Ward Island, a length of approximately 2.0 miles.

II. OBJECTIVE

The overall objective is to seek services to complete a PD&E study to evaluate alternatives for rehabilitation or replacement of the Dunedin Causeway Bridges, and evaluation of alternatives to improve access management along the causeway.

The purpose of this Exhibit is to describe the scope of work and the responsibilities of the CONSULTANT and the COUNTY in connection with the Preliminary Engineering (Conceptual Design), and Environmental Studies necessary to comply with Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) procedures and to obtain Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Location and Design Concept Acceptance (LDCA) of proposed improvements to this transportation facility.

Except as noted herein, the Project Development Process shall follow the most recent version of the FDOT's publication titled "Project Development and Environment Manual". Throughout this Scope of Services portion of this CONSULTANT Contract, the publication will be referred to as the "PD&E Manual". All tasks identified in this scope of work will be done in accordance with the FDOT's PD&E Manual, unless otherwise stated.

The PD&E Manual incorporates all the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA); Federal law and executive orders; applicable Federal regulations included in the Federal Highway Administration Federal-Aid Policy Guide; and applicable State laws and regulations including Chapter 339.155 of the Florida Statutes. The project documentation prepared by the CONSULTANT in accordance with the PD&E Manual shall therefore be in compliance with all applicable State and Federal laws, executive orders, and regulations.

The CONSULTANT shall perform those engineering services required for LDCA studies, including consideration of all social, economic, environmental effects, and mitigation as required by the FHWA and/or the Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Manual, along with the required environmental documents, engineering reports, preliminary plans, public hearing, and right-of-way maps.

TASKS 1 through 4 of the Scope of Services will establish which items of work described in the PD&E Manual are specifically included in this contract, and also which of the items of work will be the responsibility of the CONSULTANT or the COUNTY.

The COUNTY will provide contract administration and provide management services and technical reviews of all work associated with the development and preparation of the engineering/environmental study reports for the transportation facility.

III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The CONSULTANT is to study the rehabilitation or replacement of the Dunedin Causeway Bridges in Pinellas County, Florida. The following alternatives shall be evaluated:

Alternatives considered for the existing Main Bridge (#150067) will include the following:

No Build

Rehabilitation

Replacement with a High-Level Fixed Bridge

Replacement with a Low-Level Bascule Bridge

Replacement with a Mid-Level Bascule Bridge

Alternatives for the West Tide Relief Bridge (#1150068) include:

No Build

Rehabilitation

Replacement with a Bridge of Similar Type and Vertical Clearance

For each replacement alternative, three horizontal alignments (to the north, along the existing, and to the south) will be prepared for the Main Bridge and two horizontal alignments (shift north, shift south) will be prepared for the Tide Relief Bridge.

Alternate corridors for bridge location will not be required to be evaluated due to the extent of development in the vicinity of the existing bridge. Because of anticipated substantial environmental impacts and unreasonable projected costs, a tunnel alternative need not be considered at either bridge location or along the Causeway.

Capacity improvements will not be considered. A Transportation Systems Management and Operations alternative is not appropriate for this project and need not be evaluated in detail. This alternative will be briefly discussed and dismissed in the Preliminary Engineering Report.

The limits of the project extend from the entrance to Honeymoon State Park, west of Royal Stewart Arms Parkway on Honeymoon Island, to Gary Place/Gary Circle with Causeway Boulevard on Ward Island, a length of approximately 2.0 miles.

IV. ADDITIONAL SCOPE OF WORK

All Study Requirements and Provisions for Work outlined in the Original Scope of Services apply to the Amendment.

This Amendment includes additional tasks that will be performed associated with detailed development of six additional alternative concepts for the Main Bridge. The original Scope and Services for the project included detailed development of three of the nine alternatives developed for the Preliminary Screening Analysis as described in Section 1.81 of the original Scope. This supplemental scope describes services required to develop and evaluate all nine of these alternatives for the Main Bridge considered in the Preliminary Screening Analysis. These additional alternatives will be presented to the public at the Alternatives Community Workshop.

The task numbers below correspond to the tasks in the original Scope of Services negotiated for this project.

TASK 1 – ENGINEERING ANALYSIS AND REPORTS

1.18 Bridge and Roadway Design Alternatives

- Approach roadway concepts for six additional main bridge alternatives will be developed.

1.21 Prepare Alternative Concept Plans

- Concept plans will be prepared for six additional main bridge alternatives.

1.20 Structures Analysis

- Structures evaluation will be conducted for six additional alternative concepts for the Main Bridge.

1.28 Comparative Analysis and Evaluation Matrix

The original Scope of Services and Fees assumed, based on the results of the Preliminary Screening of nine build alternatives for the Main Bridge (described in Section 1.18 of the original Scope of Services,) that only three viable concepts would be selected for further evaluation, including detailed engineering and environmental analyses to be carried through the public involvement process and presented to the public at an Alternatives Public Workshop.

Based on input from the County Commission, all nine build alternative alignments for the Main Bridge (considered in the Preliminary Screening Analysis) will be further evaluated including detailed engineering and environmental analyses to be carried through the public involvement process and presented to the public at an Alternatives Public Workshop.

These nine build alternatives are described in section 1.18 of the original Scope of Services and include the following:

High-Level Fixed Bridge (with a minimum vertical clearance of 65 feet)

North Alignment

Existing Alignment

South Alignment

Mid-Level Movable Bridge (with a minimum vertical clearance of 35 feet)

North Alignment

Existing Alignment

South Alignment

Low-Level Movable Bridge (with a minimum vertical clearance of 21 feet)

North Alignment

Existing Alignment

South Alignment

The Alternatives Matrix, developed to facilitate comparative analysis of alternatives, will include all nine build alternatives for the Main Bridge (six additional alternatives compared to three in the original Scope of Services).

1.33 Construction Cost Estimates

- In addition to the cost estimates described in the original Scope of Services, cost estimates will be prepared for each of the six additional alternative Main Bridge build alternatives.

1.36 Preliminary Engineering Report

- Development and Analysis of six additional build alternatives will be included in the Preliminary Engineering Report.

1.37 Quality Control

- Independent Technical Reviews will be conducted for the concept plans for the six additional build concepts for the Main Bridge.

TASK 2 – ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND REPORTS

2.5 Aesthetics

- Evaluation of impacts to the viewshed and aesthetic values will be conducted for six additional Main Bridge build alternatives.

2.9 Wetlands and Essential Fish Habitat (EFH)

Potential impacts to wetlands and EFH for each of the additional six build alternative concepts for the main bridge will be evaluated and included in the Wetlands Evaluation/Biological Assessment Report (WEBAR)

TASK 3 – OPTIONAL SERVICES

- No additional optional services are anticipated for this supplement.

TASK 4 – PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

4.2 Public Involvement Data Collection

- It is anticipated that additional questions from the public would be received as a result of the additional alternatives proposed and the extension of the project schedule. The CONSULTANT would assist the COUNTY with preparation of additional responses.

4.5 Scheduled Public Meetings - Alternatives Community Workshop

- **Setup and Attendance**– Additional effort is needed to prepare additional display boards, power point slides and script related to the additional six Main Bridge Alternatives. Additional staff will be required at the workshop to “man” the substantial number of additional concept display boards.

4.6 Other (Unscheduled) Public and Agency Meetings

- The CONSULTANT will prepare appropriate exhibits and meeting materials, make a presentation as needed, and attend four additional unscheduled meetings as follows:
 - Dunedin Causeway Bridge Ad Hoc Advisory Committee Meeting
 - City of Dunedin Commission Meeting
 - Pinellas County Board of County Commissioners Meeting
 - One additional Stakeholder Meeting

4.9 Special Public Involvement Requirements

- **Website Development and Maintenance** – The CONSULTANT will prepare updates to the project website as needed for the additional six months of the schedule.
- **Videos and Renderings** –The CONSULTANT will construct 3D digital models for the six additional main bridge build alternatives and align the 3D models to field photographs to produce renderings from five views. In addition, the CONSULTANT will prepare animations for these six additional bridge alternatives.

4.10 Quality Control

- Quality Control will consist of checking all CADD files and other additional deliverables resulting from the supplemental work.

TASK 5 – MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES

5.1 Contract and Project Files

- The original duration of the contract is being extended by approximately six months. The CONSULTANT will develop updated monthly progress reports and schedule updates, as well as maintain files for the additional months proposed in the schedule.

5.2 Project Management Meeting and Coordination

- The original duration of the contract is being extended by approximately six months. The CONSULTANT will meet with the COUNTY as needed for progress meetings or other team meetings as needed during these additional months.

VI. SCHEDULE

The CONSULTANT shall begin work upon written notice to proceed. The project shall be completed within **30 months** of notice to proceed (of the original contract) unless otherwise authorized by the COUNTY.

The CONSULTANT shall complete the Project Development and Environmental Study in accordance with the Microsoft Project Schedule attached to this Amendment and agreed to by the COUNTY. The schedule will identify the County's review period for all submittals as agreed to by the COUNTY. The schedule can be modified during the contract period as mutually agreed by the CONSULTANT and COUNTY.

VII. INVOICES & PROGRESS REPORTS

The CONSULTANT will submit an invoice monthly. With each invoice, CONSULTANT shall submit a progress report summarizing the work completed during the invoice period. The CONSULTANT shall also provide a Microsoft Project Schedule with applicable updates to be included with each monthly invoice submittal.

VIII. SERVICES TO BE PERFORMED BY THE COUNTY

There is no change to the services to be performed by the County from the original Scope of Services.

**PINELLAS COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (CIP)
PROJECT FINANCIAL OVERVIEW**

1. Design Phase: 2. Date:
 3. Contract Award:

4. Title: Dunedin Causeway Bridge Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study (PID 000423A)

5. Anticipated Scope and Description: Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study in FY14 - FY17 to determine the type of improvements or replacement necessary.

6. YEAR OF CONSTRUCTION START: FY

7. PROJECT BUDGET:	FY 16 Approved	Multi-Year Plan
Professional Services (Architectural/Engineering/Consulting)	\$ 850,000	\$ 1,433,054
Land/Right of Way/Building Acquisitions		0
Construction:		0
Testing		9,591
Inter-local		0
TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET	\$ (1) 850,000	\$ (2) 1,442,645

8. FINANCIAL RESOURCES:

Penny for Pinellas Sales Tax:	\$ 1,442,645
Local Option Gas Tax:	
Transportation Impact Fees:	
Grant(S): Federal	
Reimbursements:	
Enterprise Revenue (Water, Sewer):	
Other:	
TOTAL FINANCIAL RESOURCES	\$ (2) 1,442,645

9. Project's First Full Year Estimated Operating Budget Fiscal Impact: ⁽³⁾

Fiscal Year:	FY
New Positions:	NONE
Number:	N.A.
Type:	N.A.
Total Est. Fiscal Impact (Personal Services, Operating Expenses)	\$ 0

(2) Amount represents expenditures from prior years, current Multi - Year Plan's project estimate and anticipated resources.

(3) Does not apply to current phase.



Doing Things!

DUNEDIN BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

Project Development
& Environment Study (PD&E)
December 15, 2015



Status



- Board meeting on August 4, 2015
 - Staff recommendation to proceed with analysis of three (3) center alignment alternatives.
 - Board requested information for six (6) alternatives pertaining to north and south alignments.
- Item before the Board – Amendment 1 to PD&E study
 - Consideration of PD&E cost increase and time extension to evaluate additional alternatives.
 - Discuss position of the City of Dunedin and Ad Hoc Committee.

Conceptual Cost Estimate



- Total bridge cost estimate \$100 Million
 - Center alignment requires a temporary bridge (included in project cost).
 - North and South alignments will have additional costs for mitigation of environmental, recreational, and/or utility impacts.
- Grant funding potential
 - Center alignments satisfy NEPA requirements and increase opportunity for future grant funding.
 - North and South alignments would require mitigation to satisfy grant funding requirements.



Impact matrix



Preliminary Screening Matrix

IMPACT EVALUATION CRITERIA	Impacts to Recreation Areas	Wetland Impacts (Fill)	Seagrass Impacts	Utility Impacts	Duration of Construction	Public Input
North Alignment - Main Bridge						
Low Level Movable (21 feet VC)	Medium	High	High	High	Medium (2.5 yrs)	General #3 -Keep Lower Movable Bridge
Mid-Level Movable (35 feet VC)	Medium	High	High	High	Medium (2.5 yrs)	General #3 -Keep Lower Movable Bridge
High-Level Fixed (65 feet VC)	Low	High	High	High	Medium (2.5 yrs)	Travel/Traffic #5 object to steeper grade
South Alignment - Main Bridge						
Low Level Movable (21 feet VC)	High	Medium	Medium	Low	Medium (2.5 yrs)	General #3 -Keep Lower Movable Bridge
Mid-Level Movable (35 feet VC)	High	Medium	Medium	Low	Medium (2.5 yrs)	General #3 -Keep Lower Movable Bridge
High-Level Fixed (65 feet VC)	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	Medium (2.5 yrs)	Travel/Traffic #5 object to steeper grade
Existing Alignment w/Temporary Bridge - Main Bridge						
General #1 Preserve all recreation areas /no changes to causeway; Keep project small-similar to existing						
Low Level Movable (21 feet VC)	Low	Low	Low	Low	High (4 years)	General #3 -Keep Lower Movable Bridge
Mid-Level Movable (35 feet VC)	Low	Low	Low	Medium	High (4 years)	General #3 -Keep Lower Movable Bridge
High-Level Fixed (65 feet VC)	Low	Low	Low	Medium	High (4 years)	Travel/Traffic #5 object to steeper grade
Temporary Impacts	Low	Low	Low	Low		
Tide Relief Bridge						
North Alignment	Low	Low	Low	High	18 months	High Public Opposition
South Alignment	Low	Low	Low	Low	18 months	
Rehabilitation	Low	Low	Low	Medium	14 months	

Dunedin Bridge PD&E



- Options:
 - Approve amendment to design consultant agreement to analyze nine (9) alternatives, increase cost by \$377,000, and extend term by six (6) months, OR
 - Not approve the amendment and direct staff to analyze the three recommended center alignment alternatives.
 - City and Ad-hoc Committee concur.
 - Provides increased opportunity for future grant funding.

PD&E Schedule



- Original PD&E schedule – 24 months process – completion in first quarter of 2017
- Revised PD&E schedule with amendment (6 months) – completion in third quarter of 2017.

Doing Things!



Questions?