#### **RESOLUTION NO. 1660**

A RESOLUTION APPROVING AND AUTHORIZING AMENDMENT NO. 1, AN ADDENDUM TO DESIGN/BUILD AGREEMENT, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED MAXIMUM PRICE FOR THE DESIGN/BUILD THE GUARANTEED TO. **AGREEMENT FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE WILLAMETTE RIVER** WATER TREATMENT PLANT PROJECT, APPROVING THE START OF ONSITE CONSTRUCTION. ESTABLISHING AN OWNER CONTROLLED CONTINGENCY WITHIN THE DESIGN/BUILD AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF WILSONVILLE "CITY OR OWNER" AND MONTGOMERY WATSON. INC., MONTGOMERY WATSON AMERICAS, INC., AND MONTGOMERY WATSON CONSTRUCTORS, INC., COLLECTIVELY KNOWN AS MONTGOMERY WATSON DESIGN/BUILDER. AND APPROVING **OWNER'S** OR REPRESENTATIVE SERVICES BY CH2M HILL THROUGH CONSTRUCTION AND PLANT STARTUP AT A PRICE NOT TO EXCEED \$879,000.

WHEREAS, after a competitive selection process the city selected Montgomery Watson, Inc., Montgomery Watson Americas, Inc., and Montgomery Watson Constructors, Inc. (collectively known as Montgomery Watson) as the design/builder of the Willamette River Water treatment plant effective December 22, 1999, and;

WHEREAS, approval of the design/build agreement included authorization to proceed with engineering permitting and management services for the Willamette River Water Treatment Plant, inclusive of accessory improvements and facilities (Water Treatment Plant) and upon reaching a negotiated Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) to amend the agreement to reflect same; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery Watson has completed the design to guarantee maximum price documents for the Water Treatment Plant, which are necessary to negotiate a GMP; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery Watson has been working with the City staff to obtain all necessary approvals and permits and all necessary permits have been submitted for approval and either have received approval, or if outstanding, do not appear likely to be denied; and

WHEREAS, the Water Treatment Plant needs to be constructed so that it will be producing water for the peak demand season during the summer of 2002 and for the Coffee Lake Prison by April 2002; and WHEREAS, Montgomery Watson has selected the subcontractors and has developed a GMP which the City, its representative CH2M Hill and Tualatin Valley Water District, a water supply district formed under chapter 264 (TVWD) have reviewed and negotiated a sum of \$43,097,341, to complete the work included in the final design plans and additional work as identified in Exhibit N to Amendment No. 1, An addendum to Design/Build Agreement, Exhibit 1, a copy of which is attached hereto and incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein; and

WHEREAS, an owner controlled contingency of \$955,000 has been added to the Design/Build Agreement to cover the potential increase in cost related to future Design Review Board approval of road, bikeway, pedestrian access to the Water Treatment Plant, and/or construction changes or delays as set forth in Exhibit M to Amendment No. 1; and

WHEREAS, contingency and other project costs totaling \$2,829,333, have been identified inclusive of CH2M Hill's Owner's Representative Services set forth below, plant operator services during construction, system development charges, legal, and administration expenses; and

WHEREAS, the total cost of the project including, but not limited to the GMP is \$46,881,674 as identified in Exhibit 2, a copy of which is attached hereto and incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein; and

WHEREAS, the funding sources for the total project are also identified in Exhibit 2; and

WHEREAS, CH2M Hill has been providing owners' representative services during the design and permitting of the plant; and

WHEREAS, during the negotiating process, CH2M Hill conducted a value engineering review of the preliminary engineering design and this value engineering review found no fatal flaws in the preliminary engineering documents; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery Watson provided CH2M Hill with copies of their estimated schedule of values and of the subcontracts and proposed equipment orders for the project; and

WHEREAS, after a very detailed review of the proposed guaranteed maximum price and significant inquiry into some areas through the negotiation process, the CH2M Hill review team now finds there is no area in which they take exception; and

WHEREAS, copies of the value engineering report and of the technical memorandum summarizing the guaranteed maximum price review are available within community development and will be provided upon request; and

WHEREAS, previous task orders issued to CH2M Hill as part of the City's agreement with CH2M Hill extended from preliminary engineering through the review of the guaranteed maximum price and the final design documents and CH2M Hill has proposed and staff recommends that CH2M Hill be issued Task Order No. 3 to provide owner's representative services during construction and plant startup at a cost of \$879,000.

#### NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY OF WILSONVILLE RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. The above recitals and findings are incorporated herein.
- 2. Council hereby approves and authorizes the Mayor to execute the Amendment No. 1, An Addendum to the Design/Build Agreement between the City and Montgomery Watson at a guaranteed maximum price of \$43,097,341, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit No. 1.
- 3. Council hereby approves and authorizes an owner controlled contingency within the Design/Build Agreement of \$955,000 as part of the project cost.
- Council approves and authorizes additional costs of \$2,829,330 set forth in Exhibit 2 and authorizes the City Engineer to sign Task Order No. 3 to CH2M Hill at a cost of \$879,000 as part of the additional project costs of \$2,829,333.
- 5. The total project costs approved and authorized is the sum of the guaranteed maximum price of \$43,097,341, the owner controlled contingency of \$955,000 and the additional costs of \$2,829,333 for a total project costs of \$46,881, 674, which total project costs shall be shared costs with Tualatin Valley Water District (TVWD) as set forth in the City's agreement with TVWD authorized by Resolution No. 1661, adopted contemporaneously herewith, and with the Department of Corrections (DOC) as set forth in the City's Cooperative Agreement with DOC authorized by Resolution No. 1595, adopted December 6, 1999. The City Engineer is authorized to approve change orders to the owner controlled contingency set forth in Amendment No. 1 to the Design/Build Agreement up to the amount of \$955,000, so long as the total

project costs do not exceed the budget amount. The City Engineer is authorized to approve transfers from the owner controlled contingency to the guaranteed maximum price part of the Design/Build Agreement in accordance with the Engineer's approved change orders.

6. Council authorizes the expenditure of project funds as budgeted for FY 00-01 as amended from:

ACCOUNT 530-49130-5000-322 AMOUNT \$38,000,000

7. The balance of the total project cost is to be budgeted in FY 01-02 in keeping with annual budget appropriations.

ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Wilsonville at a special meeting thereof this 6<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2000, and filed with the Wilsonville City Reporter this same flate

CHARLOTTE LEHAN, MAYOR

ATTEST:

Diane M. Panhonin acting City Recorden

SUMMARY OF VOTES:Mayor LehanYeahCouncilor KirkYeahCouncilor HelserYeahCouncilor BartonYeahCouncilor HoltYeah

Exhibit 1: Addendum to Design/Build Agreement with Exhibits Exhibit 2: Project Cost

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1, AN ADDENDUM TO DESIGN/BUILD AGREEMENT

#### RECITALS

WHEREAS, a Design/Build Agreement ("Agreement") was entered into effective the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of December, 1999, pursuant to Resolution No. 1628, by and between City of Wilsonville ("City" or "Owner") and Montgomery Watson, Inc. ("MW"), Montgomery Watson Americas, Inc. ("MWA") and Montgomery Watson Constructors, Inc. ("MWC") collectively known as ("Montgomery Watson" or "Design/Builder"); and

WHEREAS, said Agreement requires that a Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) be established for the Work to be performed or provided by Design/Builder pursuant to the Contract Documents; and

WHEREAS, the November 1, 1999 Request for Qualifications, adopted by Resolution No. 1602 established a projected budget for a 120 mgd intake structure, 15 mgd initial plant, and 70 mgd piping at \$44,921,000; and

WHEREAS, the Design/Builder has provided the Owner with the 10% Preliminary Engineering Design, the Design to GMP (30%), the Final Design Documents, and the GMP Addendum Documents; and

WHEREAS, Volume 1 and 2 of the Design to GMP documents (30%) in their entirety have been included in the Final Design Document; and

WHEREAS, the Owner has reviewed and approved the Design to GMP document and approved a concept for the Final Design Documents, with additions and changes noted on Exhibit N, the GMP Addendum Documents; and

WHEREAS, all costs to complete all obligations of MW under the Design/Build Agreement as hereinafter amended per Volume 3 of the Design to GMP document, the final design document and additions at Exhibit N, attached hereto and incorporated by reference herein, are included in the Guaranteed Maximum Price proposal from Montgomery Watson; and

WHEREAS, access decisions have been deferred for later review by the Development Review Board (DRB) and these decisions could impact overall project costs; and

WHEREAS, the City is conducting contract negotiations with an operations operator finalist recommended by the technical solicitations team and subject to final approval by Owner, and as part of the negotiation process the operator still needs to review and comment on the plant electrical control concept and administrative layout, which could impact overall project costs; and

WHEREAS, since DRB also conditioned a further site design review of certain landscape areas there have been landscaping and other modifications since the final design documents were submitted to DRB and are subject to DRB approval, which could impact overall project costs; and

WHEREAS, a separate contingency is required to cover the above potential added costs because of changing conditions that cannot be confirmed at this time, but can be reasonably estimated to establish a separate owner controlled contingency of \$955,000 set forth in Exhibit M, attached hereto and incorporated by reference herein, and shall be added to the guaranteed maximum price at the time a change order is issued for an owner controlled contingency item; and

WHEREAS, Exhibit B, Major Project Milestone Schedule to the Agreement was based on the City issuing a notice to proceed with construction by July 1, 2000; and

WHEREAS, paragraph 4.3 requires that the owner shall cause the delivery of and access to the Site by Design/Builder by dates set forth in schedule; and

WHEREAS, construction access to the water treatment plant site will be available after July 1, 2000, but before July 17, 2000; and

WHEREAS, resolution of some access, easement and permit issues are pending; and

WHEREAS, owner and Design/Builder desire to start construction now; and

WHEREAS, it is anticipated that it will take until July 17 to obtain signatures on this Amendment No. 1; and

WHEREAS, the notice to proceed with construction will be issued no later than July 18, 2000, and Exhibit B needs to be revised in accordance therewith; and

WHEREAS, paragraph 10.4 Bonds of the Design Build Agreement requires the Design Builder to furnish and deliver to the Owner a Labor and Materials Bond and a Performance Bond covering the design and construction work in the penal sum equal to the Guaranteed Maximum Price; and

WHEREAS, paragraph 3.5.5 Incorporation of Contract Documents requires that each subcontract shall incorporate any terms of this agreement and the contract documents to the

extent applicable to the work to be performed by the subcontractor and necessary to make all provisions of this contract effective; and

WHEREAS, given the paragraph 10.4 Bond requirement for the Design Builder, the elimination from paragraph 3.5.5 of any overlap in the bond requirement for subcontractor such as the plant contractor, the intake contractor and the electrical contractor for performance and payment bonds could reduce costs substantially without adversely affecting the City; and

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties do hereby agree to amend the Design/Build Agreement by this Amendment No. 1 as follows:

1. ARTICLE 5, Schedule & Completion, paragraph 5.2 Notice to Proceed shall be deleted and replaced by:

5.2 Notice to Proceed. The City Engineer will issue the notice to proceed for the water treatment plant no later than July 18, 2000, provided this Amendment No. 1 has been executed by all parties, the intake structure and the transmission main when this Amendment No. 1 has been duly executed by the parties and necessary permits have been issued and necessary easements for construction have been executed. The Design/Builder will be entitled to an equitable adjustment to Exhibit B, Revised Major Project Milestone Schedule, if the notices to proceed are delayed by the City in executing this Amendment No. 1, issuance of necessary permits, and/or the execution of necessary easements, causing delay to any major project schedule times set forth in the revised Exhibit B.

2. ARTICLE 6, Price and Payment, paragraph 6.1, GMP, shall be amended by adding:

6.1.1 Established GMP. The Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) shall be and is established at \$43,097,341.00. The schedule of values for the Guaranteed Maximum Price is attached as Exhibit E, Revised Guaranteed Maximum Price and Schedule of Values.

3. ARTICLE 7, Change Orders, shall be amended by adding a new paragraph 7.7

7.7 Owner's Change Order Account. Owner shall maintain a Change Order Account for the purpose of providing for Change Orders authorized under Article 7 and as set forth in owner controlled contingency in Exhibit M. Upon written notice from the City Engineer, the amount authorized from this account by the Change Order shall be added to the GMP without further amendment to this Agreement, up to a cumulative limit of \$955,000. Change Order amounts in excess of this limit shall be authorized by written amendment to this Agreement.

4. ARTICLE 10, Insurance and Bonds, paragraph 10.4 Bonds shall be deleted and replaced by:

Design/Builder and /or its prime subcontractors, Natt McDougall Company, 10.4 Bonds. Slayden Construction, Tigard Electric, Inc. and Professional Services Industries, shall furnish and deliver to Owner Labor and Materials Bonds and Performance bonds before commencing the Design and Construction Work on the Site that shall cover such Design and Construction Work. The Labor and Materials Bond and the Performance Bond shall each name Owner as obligee and shall each be in the penal sum equal to the GMP. The Labor and Materials Bond and Performance Bond shall be in the forms set forth as Exhibit F. All premiums for the Labor and Materials Bond and Performance bond shall be included in the GMP. The Labor and Materials Bond and Performance Bond shall be issued by a surety who is (i) on the U.S. Department of Treasury list for the amount of its responsibility and (ii) licensed to do business in the State. Until the GMP is established, the penal amount of the bonds will be the estimated cost of design and other services to establish the GMP. When the GMP is established, the penal amount of the bonds will be increased to the amount of the GMP. Design/Builder shall assume the risk for the non-performance of any subcontractor and/or supplier, including, but not limited to, the financial risk of any such subcontractor or supplier who is either not bonded or insufficiently bonded.

5. The Design/Build Agreement shall be further amended by adding and incorporating into the Design/Build Agreement by reference as if fully set forth therein the following exhibits, which exhibits shall be placed on file and as of record with the City Recorder, the City Engineer and MW:

Exhibit B – Revised. Revised Major Project Milestone Schedule which shall be substituted for and replace the original Exhibit B.

Exhibit E - Revised Guaranteed Maximum Price (GM) and Schedule of Values which shall be substituted for and replace the original Exhibit E.

Exhibit J – The 10% Preliminary Engineering Design.

Exhibit K – Volume 3 of the Design to Guaranteed Maximum Price (30%).

Exhibit L – The final design document is approved in concept subject to technical approval by the Oregon Health Department, the Building Official, the Clackamas County Electrical Plans Examiners, and the Tualatin Fire and Rescue.

Exhibit M- The Guaranteed Maximum Price submittal with Schedule of Values and Owner Controlled Contingency.

Exhibit N - Changes to the final design documents included in the Guaranteed Maximum Price.

This Amendment No. 1 shall be effective July 7, 2000, and except as otherwise set forth in this

Amendment No. 1, the terms and conditions of the Design/Build Agreement remain in full force and effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties have executed this Agreement as of the date first above written.

CITY OF	WIL	SON	VIL	LE
---------	-----	-----	-----	----

MONTGOMERY WATSON, INC.

Charlotte Lehan

By\_\_\_\_\_ Its: Mayor

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

This \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_\_, 2000.

By .				
Its:				

MONTGOMERY WATSON AMERICAS, INC.

Michael E. Kohlhoff, City Attorney	
City of Wilsonville, Oregon	

By			
Its:			

### Amendment No. 1, An Addendum to Design Build Agreement

N:\Legal\pankonin\Mike2\Agree, Amend 1.doc

# MONTGOMERY WATSON CONSTRUCTORS, INC.

By \_\_\_\_\_\_ Its: \_\_\_\_\_

## Exhibit 2



Cost Estimate with \$17,000,000 from TVWD for Supply facilities						
	00 This sheet h					
PROJECT ELEMENT		WV in %	TVWD in %	TOTAL COST	WV COST	TVWD COST
	CAP. in					
	MGD					
RAW WATER INTAKE ANI	D					
PUMP STATION						
Screening	70	28.6%	71.4%	\$724,386	\$206,967	\$517,419
Intake Pipe	120	16.7%	83.3%	\$1,368,175	\$228,029	\$1,140,146
Wetwell	120	16.7%	83.3%	\$2,189,079	\$364,847	\$1,824,233
<b>Pump Station Building</b>	120	16.7%	83.3%	\$1,403,001	\$233,834	\$1,169,168
Pumps	15	66.7%	33.3%	\$597,022	\$398,015	\$199,007
Electrical - wire & conduit	70	80.0%	20.0%	\$199,007	\$159,206	\$39,801
Electrical - equipment	15	66.7%	33.3%	\$398,014	\$265,356	\$132,658
Raw Water Pipeline	70	28.6%	71.4%	\$611,947	\$174,842	\$437,105
SUBTOTAL				\$7,490,631	\$2,031,095	\$5,459,536
WATER TREATMENT PLA	NT					
<b>Clarification-Actiflo</b>	15	66.7%	33.3%	\$3,566,642	\$2,377,761	\$1,188,881
Ozone building & piping	70	82.9%	17.1%	\$497,518	\$412,229	\$85,289
Ozone Contactor	15	66.7%	33.3%	\$1,539,332	\$1,026,221	\$513,111
Ozone Generators	15	66.7%	33.3%	\$770,119	\$513,413	\$256,706
Ozone destruct units	15	66.7%	33.3%	\$149,255	\$99,503	\$49,752
Filters	15	66.7%	33.3%	\$3,383,539	\$2,255,693	\$1,127,846
Filter to Waste	70	<b>66.</b> 7%	33.3%	\$49,752	\$33,168	\$16,584
Chemical building	70	92.9%	7.1%	\$597,022	\$554,378	\$42,644
Chemical Feed Systems	35	85.7%	14.3%	\$1,703,186	\$1,459,874	\$243,312
Backwash System	70	92.9%	7.1%	\$1,195,215	\$1,109,843	\$85,373
Sludge Handling	35	85.7%	14.3%	\$1,647,914	\$1,412,498	\$235,416
Clearwell	70	92.9%	7.1%	\$3,023,831	\$2,807,843	\$215,988
FW Pump Station Building	70	92.9%	7.1%	\$1,167,581	\$1,084,182	\$83,399
FW Transmission Pumps	15	66.7%	33.3%	\$377,126	\$251,417	\$125,709
FW Wire & Conduit.	10 70	92.9%	7.1%	\$199,007	\$184,792	\$14,215
Electrical - equipment	15	66.7%	33.3%	\$497,518	\$331,679	\$165,839
Administration Bldg-WTP	13 70	92.9%	7.1%	\$1,183,826	\$1,099,267	\$84,559
Landscaping & irrigation	70 70	28.6%	71.4%	\$250,000	\$71,429	\$178,571
Landscaping & irrigation	/0	20.070	/ 1.4 /0	\$230,000	\$71,423	31/0,3/1
City	70	100.0%	0.0%	\$1,074,610	\$1,074,610	\$0
Uny Water feature	70 70	100.0%	0.0%	\$1,074,010 \$597,022	\$1,074,610 \$597,022	
Roads and Bridge	70 70	78.6%	0.0% 21.4%	\$597,022 \$1,549,400	\$397,022 \$1,217,386	\$0 \$332,014
Storm drainage	70 70	28.6%	21.4% 71.4%			
Storm drainage Overflow and yard piping	70 70		71.4% 71.4%	\$194,584 \$1,990,072	\$55,595 \$568 592	\$138,989 \$1.421.480
		28.6%		\$1,990,072 \$3,532,378	\$568,592 \$2,472,665	\$1,421,480 \$1,050,713
Electrical Service	30	70.0%	30.0%	\$3,532,378	\$2,472,665	\$1,059,713

# Cost Estimate with \$17,000,000 from TVWD for Supply facilities

PROJECT ELEMENT         TOTAL         WV in %         TVWD in %         TOTAL COST         WV COST         TVWD COST           CAP. in	2/3/0/				uppij ideniti		
CAP. in MGD           MGD           Backup Power         4         100.0%         0.0%         \$497,518         \$497,518         \$0           Instrumentation & telemetry         70         66.7%         33.3%         \$1,343,299         \$895,537         \$447,762           Barge removal         70         31.0%         69.0%         \$139,305         \$43,205         \$96,100           SUBTOTAL         70         31.0%         69.0%         \$135,740         \$163,740         \$8,209,252           FINISHED WATER PIPELINE         10         100.0%         0.0%         \$163,740         \$163,740         \$0           WTP to Kinsman Rd.         70         28.6%         71.4%         \$2,26399         \$778,971         \$1,947,428           SUBTOTAL         \$2,890,139         \$942,711         \$1,947,428         \$1,947,428         \$15,616,216           Additional contingency in D-B contract         Total contingency in D-B contract         \$43,097,341         \$27,481,125         \$15,616,216           Additional contingency in D-B contract         \$955,000         \$489,760         \$465,240           Total in D-B contract         \$955,000         \$489,760         \$465,240           Total in D-B contract					TOTAL COST	WW COST	TYND COST
MGD           Backup Power         4         100.0%         0.0%         \$497,518         \$497,518         \$497,518         \$47,762           Barge removal         70         31.0%         69.0%         \$13,345,299         \$895,557         \$447,762           Barge removal         70         31.0%         69.0%         \$139,305         \$43,205         \$96,100           SUBTOTAL         70         31.0%         69.0%         \$139,305         \$43,205         \$82,09,252           FINISHED WATER PIPELINE         70         28.6%         71.4%         \$163,740         \$163,740         \$0           WTP to Kinsman Rd.         70         28.6%         71.4%         \$2,726,399         \$778,971         \$1,947,428           SUBTOTAL         52,890,139         \$942,711         \$1,947,428         \$163,740         \$11,947,428           TOTAL GMP         5         \$43,097,341         \$27,748,1125         \$15,616,216           Additional contingency in D-B contract         \$43,097,341         \$27,2481,425         \$16,616,216           Cotal in D-B contract         \$44,052,341         \$27,970,885         \$16,681,456           Operator syces during         \$15,31,141,000         \$27,417         \$15,581	FROJECT ELEMENT		WW III 70		IUTAL COST	wv COSI	I v wD COSI
Backup Power         4         100.0%         0.0%         \$497,518         \$497,518         \$497,518         \$407,518         \$497,518         \$407,518         \$497,518         \$407,518         \$407,518         \$407,518         \$407,518         \$407,518         \$407,518         \$407,518         \$407,518         \$407,518         \$407,518         \$407,518         \$407,518         \$407,518         \$407,518         \$407,518         \$407,518         \$407,518         \$507         \$543,205         \$544,005         \$543,205         \$546,100         \$513,374         \$524,507,319         \$58,209,252           FINISHED WATER PIPELINE         10         100.0%         0.0%         \$163,740         \$5163,740         \$50         \$6778,971         \$51,947,428           SUBTOTAL         \$2,890,139         \$942,711         \$1,947,428         \$156,616,216         \$4,4,011,000         \$27,481,125         \$15,616,216           Additional contingency in D-B contract         \$43,097,341         \$27,481,125         \$15,616,216         \$44,051,2341         \$27,90,885         \$16,081,456           Other project expenses         \$44,052,341         \$27,90,885         \$16,081,456         \$44,052,341         \$27,474         \$416,526           Operator svces during         \$50,000         \$59,242         \$54,758 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>							
Instrumentation & telemetry         70         66.7%         33.3%         \$1,343,299         \$895,537         \$447,762           Barge removal         70         31.0%         69.0%         \$139,305         \$343,205         \$96,100           SUBTOTAL         532,716,571         \$24,507,319         \$88,209,252           FINISHED WATER PIPELINE         Meter/PRV to Wilsonville         10         100.0%         0.0%         \$163,740         \$163,740         \$0           WTP to Kinsman Rd.         70         28.6%         71.4%         \$2,726,399         \$778,971         \$1,947,428           SUBTOTAL         \$2,890,139         \$942,711         \$1,947,428           TOTAL GMP         \$43,097,341         \$27,481,125         \$15,616,216           Additional contingency in D-B contract         \$955,000         \$489,760         \$465,240           Total contingency in D-B contract         \$955,000         \$489,760         \$465,240           Total in D-B contract         \$955,000         \$489,760         \$465,240           Other project expenses         \$1,141,000         \$724,474         \$416,526           Operator syces during         \$150,000         \$27,419         \$15,581           City & TVWD control         \$43,000         \$27,419	Backup Bower		100.00/	A A97	\$407 519	\$ <i>4</i> 07 519	£0
Barge removal SUBTOTAL         70         31.0%         69.0%         \$139,305         \$43,205         \$96,100           SUBTOTAL         \$32,716,571         \$24,507,319         \$8,209,252           FINISHED WATER PIPELINE         10         100.0%         0.0%         \$163,740         \$163,740         \$0           WTP to Kinsman Rd.         70         28.6%         71.4%         \$2,726,599         \$778,971         \$1,947,428           SUBTOTAL         \$2,890,139         \$942,711         \$1,947,428         \$10,00%         \$43,097,341         \$27,481,125         \$15,616,216           Additional contingency in D-B contract         Total contingency in D-B contract         \$44,052,341         \$27,970,885         \$16,081,456           Other project expenses         \$11,141,000         \$724,474         \$416,526           Operator syces during control cont	-	_			-		
SUBTOTAL         S32,716,571         S24,507,319         S8,209,252           FINISHED WATER PIPELINE         10         100.0%         6.0%         S163,740         S163,740         S163,740         S1,947,428           Meter/PRV to Wilsonville         10         100.0%         6.0%         S163,740         S163,740         S1,947,428           SUBTOTAL         S2,890,139         S942,711         S1,947,428         S1,947,428           TOTAL GMP         S43,097,341         S27,481,125         S15,616,216           Additional contingency in D-B contract         S955,000         S489,760         S465,240           Total contingency in D-B contract         S955,000         S489,760         S465,240           Total in D-B contract         S955,000         S489,760         S465,240           Total in D-B contract         S1,141,000         S724,474         S416,526           Operator svces during         S150,000         S95,242         S54,758           SDC's for plant         S43,000         S27,419         S15,818           City & TVWD control         S802,500         S622,814         S179,686           Subtotal for other project         S29,8233         S441,613         S21,220           City supervision,         S692,833	_						
FINISHED WATER PIPELINE         Meter/PRV to Wilsonville       10       100.0%       0.0%       \$163,740       \$163,740       \$0         WTP to Kinsman Rd.       70       28.6%       71.4%       \$2,726,399       \$5778,971       \$1,947,428         SUBTOTAL       \$2,890,139       \$942,711       \$1,947,428         TOTAL GMP       \$43,097,341       \$27,481,125       \$15,616,216         Additional contingency in D-B contract       5955,000       \$489,760       \$465,240         Total in D-B contract       \$955,000       \$489,760       \$465,240         Other project expenses       \$1,141,000       \$724,474       \$416,526         Operator svces during construction       \$150,000       \$95,242       \$54,758         SDC's for plant       \$43,000       \$27,119       \$15,581         City & TVWD control cont	6	/0	51.0 /0	09.070	-		
Meter/PRV to Wilsonville         10         100.0%         0.0%         5163,740         5163,740         510,740         50           WTP to Kinsman Rd.         70         28.6%         71.4%         52,726,399         5778,971         51,947,428           SUBTOTAL         52,890,139         S942,711         S1,947,428           TOTAL GMP         543,097,341         527,481,125         S15,616,216           Additional contingency in D-B contract         5955,000         S489,760         S465,240           Total contingency in D-B contract         544,052,341         527,970,885         S16,081,456           Other project expenses         51,141,000         S724,474         S416,526           Operator svees during construction         5150,000         S95,242         S54,758           SDC's for plant         543,000         S27,419         S15,81           City & TVWD control co	SUBIOTAL				<i>432,110,31</i> 1	¢24,50,507	\$0,209,232
WTP to Kinsman Rd.         70         28.6%         71.4%         \$2,726,399         \$778,971         \$1,947,428           SUBTOTAL         \$2,890,139         \$942,711         \$1,947,428           TOTAL GMP         \$43,097,341         \$27,481,125         \$15,616,216           Additional contingency in D-B contract         \$955,000         \$489,760         \$465,240           Total contingency in D-B contract         \$955,000         \$489,760         \$465,240           Total in D-B contract         \$955,000         \$489,760         \$465,240           Total in D-B contract         \$955,000         \$489,760         \$465,240           Owner's rep services estimate         \$1,141,000         \$724,474         \$416,526           Operator svces during         \$150,000         \$95,242         \$54,758           SDC's for plant         \$150,000         \$27,419         \$15,581           City & TVWD control         \$146,949         \$666,551         \$1469,949         \$666,551           Subtotal for other project         \$2,136,500         \$1,469,949         \$666,551           Subtotal         \$29,882,447         \$16,999,227         \$16,999,227           DOC funding         \$6,400,000         \$1,900,000         \$1,900,000         \$1,900,000	FINISHED WATER PIPELIN	E					
WTP to Kinsman Rd.         70         28.6%         71.4%         \$2,726,399         \$778,971         \$1,947,428           SUBTOTAL         \$2,890,139         \$942,711         \$1,947,428           TOTAL GMP         \$43,097,341         \$27,481,125         \$15,616,216           Additional contingency in D-B contract         \$955,000         \$489,760         \$465,240           Total contingency in D-B contract         \$955,000         \$489,760         \$465,240           Total in D-B contract         \$955,000         \$489,760         \$465,240           Total in D-B contract         \$955,000         \$489,760         \$465,240           Owner's rep services estimate         \$1,141,000         \$724,474         \$416,526           Operator svces during         \$150,000         \$95,242         \$54,758           SDC's for plant         \$150,000         \$27,419         \$15,581           City & TVWD control         \$146,949         \$666,551         \$1469,949         \$666,551           Subtotal for other project         \$2,136,500         \$1,469,949         \$666,551           Subtotal         \$29,882,447         \$16,999,227         \$16,999,227           DOC funding         \$6,400,000         \$1,900,000         \$1,900,000         \$1,900,000	Meter/PRV to Wilsonville	10	100.0%	0.0%	\$163.740	\$163.740	\$0
SUBTOTAL       \$2,890,139       \$942,711       \$1,947,428         TOTAL GMP       \$43,097,341       \$27,481,125       \$15,616,216         Additional contingency in D-B contract       \$955,000       \$489,760       \$465,240         Total contingency in D-B contract       \$955,000       \$489,760       \$465,240         Total in D-B contract       \$955,000       \$489,760       \$465,240         Total in D-B contract       \$942,711       \$1,081,456         Other project expenses       \$1,141,000       \$724,474       \$416,526         Operator svces during       \$150,000       \$95,242       \$54,758         SDC's for plant       \$150,000       \$95,242       \$54,758         City & TVWD control       \$802,500       \$622,814       \$179,686         Subtotal for other project       \$2,136,500       \$1,469,949       \$666,551         Subtotal       \$46,188,841       \$29,440,834       \$16,748,007         City supervision, administration & overhead       \$692,833       \$441,613       \$251,220         TOTAL PROJECT       \$3.7%       36.3%       \$46,881,674       \$29,882,447       \$16,999,227         DOC funding       \$6,400,000       \$1,200,000       \$1,200,000       \$1,200,000       \$1,200,000	WTP to Kinsman Rd.	70			•	-	\$1,947,428
TOTAL GMP       \$43,097,341       \$27,481,125       \$15,616,216         Additional contingency in D-B contract       Total contingency in D-B       \$955,000       \$489,760       \$465,240         Total in D-B contract       \$955,000       \$489,760       \$465,240         Total in D-B contract       \$955,000       \$489,760       \$465,240         Total in D-B contract       \$955,000       \$489,760       \$465,240         Other project expenses       \$11,141,000       \$724,474       \$416,526         Operator svces during       \$150,000       \$95,242       \$54,758         SDC's for plant       \$150,000       \$95,242       \$54,758         City & TVWD control       contral contingency       \$802,500       \$622,814       \$179,686         Subtotal for other project       \$22,136,500       \$1,469,949       \$666,551         Subtotal       \$46,188,841       \$29,440,834       \$16,748,007         City supervision, administration & overhead       \$692,833       \$441,613       \$225,1,220         DOC funding       \$6,400,000       \$1,6,999,227       \$16,999,227         Land sale revenue       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000         NULL ANDIE       \$20,292,447       \$20,292,447       \$20,292,447 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>							
Additional contingency in D-B contract         Total contingency in D-B contract       \$955,000       \$489,760       \$465,240         Total in D-B contract       \$940,052,341       \$27,970,885       \$16,081,456         Other project expenses       \$1,141,000       \$724,474       \$416,526         Operator svces during       \$150,000       \$95,242       \$54,758         SDC's for plant       \$150,000       \$27,419       \$15,581         City & TVWD control       \$43,000       \$27,419       \$15,581         city & TVWD control       \$802,500       \$622,814       \$179,686         Subtotal for other project       \$2,136,500       \$1,469,949       \$666,551         Subtotal for other project       \$2,136,500       \$1,469,949       \$666,551         Subtotal       \$46,188,841       \$29,440,834       \$16,748,007         City supervision, administration & overhead       \$692,833       \$441,613       \$251,220         TOTAL PROJECT       \$3.7%       36.3%       \$46,881,674       \$29,882,447       \$16,999,227         DOC funding       \$6,400,000       \$6,400,000       \$1,900,000       \$1,900,000       \$1,900,000         SDC income       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000 <td>SUBTOTAL</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>\$2,890,139</td> <td>\$942,711</td> <td>\$1,947,428</td>	SUBTOTAL				\$2,890,139	\$942,711	\$1,947,428
Total contingency in D-B       \$955,000       \$489,760       \$465,240         Total in D-B contract       \$44,052,341       \$27,970,885       \$16,081,456         Other project expenses       \$1,141,000       \$724,474       \$416,526         Operator svces during       \$150,000       \$95,242       \$54,758         Cots for plant       \$150,000       \$95,242       \$54,758         SDC's for plant       \$43,000       \$27,419       \$15,581         City & TVWD control       \$802,500       \$622,814       \$179,686         Subtotal for other project       \$802,500       \$622,814       \$179,686         Subtotal for other project       \$802,500       \$622,814       \$179,686         Subtotal       \$46,188,841       \$29,440,834       \$16,748,007         City supervision,       \$46,188,841       \$29,440,834       \$16,748,007         City supervision,       \$46,188,841       \$29,440,834       \$16,748,007         City supervision,       \$692,833       \$441,613       \$251,220         DOC funding       \$6,400,000       \$1,900,000       \$1,900,000         SDC income       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000         TVWD       \$16,999,227       \$16,999,227       \$20,292,447 <t< td=""><td>TOTAL GMP</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>\$43,097,341</td><td>\$27,481,125</td><td>\$15,616,216</td></t<>	TOTAL GMP				\$43,097,341	\$27,481,125	\$15,616,216
contract         \$955,000         \$489,760         \$465,240           Total in D-B contract         \$44,052,341         \$27,970,885         \$16,081,456           Other project expenses         \$1,141,000         \$724,474         \$416,526           Operator svces during         \$150,000         \$95,242         \$54,758           SDC's for plant         \$150,000         \$95,242         \$54,758           City & TVWD control         \$43,000         \$27,419         \$15,581           City & TVWD control         \$802,500         \$622,814         \$179,686           Subtotal for other project         \$802,500         \$146,934         \$16,748,007           City supervision,         \$441,613         \$2251,220         \$266,551           Subtotal         \$46,188,841         \$29,440,834         \$16,748,007           City supervision,         \$692,833         \$441,613         \$251,220           TOTAL PROJECT         \$3.7%         36.3%         \$46,881,674         \$29,882,447         \$16,999,227           DOC funding         \$6,400,000         \$1,900,000         \$1,900,000         \$1,900,000         \$1,290,000           TVWD         \$16,999,227         \$16,999,227         \$20,292,447         \$20,292,447         \$20,292,447	Additional contingency in .	D-B cont	ract				
contract         \$955,000         \$489,760         \$465,240           Total in D-B contract         \$44,052,341         \$27,970,885         \$16,081,456           Other project expenses         \$1,141,000         \$724,474         \$416,526           Operator svces during         \$150,000         \$95,242         \$54,758           SDC's for plant         \$150,000         \$95,242         \$54,758           City & TVWD control         \$43,000         \$27,419         \$15,581           City & TVWD control         \$802,500         \$622,814         \$179,686           Subtotal for other project         \$802,500         \$146,934         \$16,748,007           City supervision,         \$441,613         \$2251,220         \$266,551           Subtotal         \$46,188,841         \$29,440,834         \$16,748,007           City supervision,         \$692,833         \$441,613         \$251,220           TOTAL PROJECT         \$3.7%         36.3%         \$46,881,674         \$29,882,447         \$16,999,227           DOC funding         \$6,400,000         \$1,900,000         \$1,900,000         \$1,900,000         \$1,290,000           TVWD         \$16,999,227         \$16,999,227         \$20,292,447         \$20,292,447         \$20,292,447	Total contingency in D-B						
Total in D-B contract       \$44,052,341       \$27,970,885       \$16,081,456         Other project expenses       \$1,141,000       \$724,474       \$416,526         Operator svces during       \$150,000       \$95,242       \$54,758         SDC's for plant       \$43,000       \$27,419       \$15,581         City & TVWD control       \$802,500       \$622,814       \$179,686         Subtotal for other project       \$802,500       \$1,469,949       \$666,551         Subtotal       \$46,188,841       \$29,440,834       \$16,748,007         City supervision,       \$692,833       \$441,613       \$251,220         TOTAL PROJECT       63.7%       36.3%       \$46,881,674       \$29,882,447       \$16,999,227         Land sale revenue       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000         Net bond proceeds       \$20,292,447       \$20,292,447       \$20,292,447	•••				\$955,000	\$489,760	\$465,240
Other project expenses         S1,141,000         \$724,474         \$416,526           Operator svces during construction         \$150,000         \$95,242         \$54,758           SDC's for plant         \$43,000         \$27,419         \$15,581           City & TVWD control contingency         \$802,500         \$622,814         \$179,686           Subtotal for other project expenses         \$2,136,500         \$1,469,949         \$666,551           Subtotal         \$46,188,841         \$29,440,834         \$16,748,007           City supervision, administration & overhead         \$692,833         \$441,613         \$251,220           TOTAL PROJECT         63.7%         36.3%         \$46,881,674         \$29,882,447         \$16,999,227           DOC funding SDC income         \$1,900,000         \$1,900,000         \$1,900,000         \$1,290,000           TVWD         \$16,999,227         Land sale revenue         \$1,290,000         \$1,290,000         \$1,290,000	Total in D-B contract				\$44,052,341	-	-
Owner's rep services estimate       \$1,141,000       \$724,474       \$416,526         Operator svces during       \$150,000       \$95,242       \$54,758         SDC's for plant       \$43,000       \$27,419       \$15,581         City & TVWD control       \$802,500       \$622,814       \$179,686         Subtotal for other project       \$2,136,500       \$1,469,949       \$666,551         Subtotal       \$46,188,841       \$29,440,834       \$16,748,007         City supervision,       \$46,188,841       \$29,882,447       \$16,999,227         DOC funding       \$6,400,000       \$6,400,000       \$1,909,000         SDC income       \$1,900,000       \$1,900,000       \$1,900,000         TVWD       \$16,999,227       \$16,999,227       \$16,999,227         Land sale revenue       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000         Net bond proceeds       \$20,292,447       \$20,292,447       \$20,292,447					••••	<i>•=•</i> ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	\$20,002,100
Operator svces during         S150,000         \$95,242         \$\$54,758           SDC's for plant         \$43,000         \$27,419         \$15,581           City & TVWD control         \$802,500         \$622,814         \$179,686           Subtotal for other project         \$802,500         \$622,814         \$179,686           Subtotal for other project         \$22,136,500         \$1,469,949         \$666,551           Subtotal         \$46,188,841         \$29,440,834         \$16,748,007           City supervision,         \$692,833         \$441,613         \$251,220           TOTAL PROJECT         63.7%         36.3%         \$46,881,674         \$29,882,447         \$16,999,227           DOC funding         \$6,400,000         \$1,900,000         \$1,900,000         \$1,900,000           SDC income         \$12,90,000         \$1,290,000         \$1,290,000           TVWD         \$16,999,227         \$20,292,447         \$20,292,447           Land sale revenue         \$1,290,000         \$1,290,000         \$1,290,000           Net bond proceeds         \$20,292,447         \$20,292,447         \$20,292,447	other project expenses						
Operator svces during         S150,000         \$95,242         \$\$54,758           SDC's for plant         \$43,000         \$27,419         \$15,581           City & TVWD control         \$802,500         \$622,814         \$179,686           Subtotal for other project         \$802,500         \$622,814         \$179,686           Subtotal for other project         \$22,136,500         \$1,469,949         \$666,551           Subtotal         \$46,188,841         \$29,440,834         \$16,748,007           City supervision,         \$692,833         \$441,613         \$251,220           TOTAL PROJECT         63.7%         36.3%         \$46,881,674         \$29,882,447         \$16,999,227           DOC funding         \$6,400,000         \$1,900,000         \$1,900,000         \$1,900,000           SDC income         \$12,90,000         \$1,290,000         \$1,290,000           TVWD         \$16,999,227         \$20,292,447         \$20,292,447           Land sale revenue         \$1,290,000         \$1,290,000         \$1,290,000           Net bond proceeds         \$20,292,447         \$20,292,447         \$20,292,447	Owner's ren services estimate				\$1,141,000	\$724.474	\$416.526
construction         \$150,000         \$95,242         \$54,758           SDC's for plant         \$43,000         \$27,419         \$15,581           City & TVWD control          \$802,500         \$622,814         \$179,686           Subtotal for other project          \$2,136,500         \$1,469,949         \$6666,551           Subtotal         \$2,136,500         \$1,469,949         \$6666,551         \$16,748,007           City supervision,         \$46,188,841         \$29,440,834         \$16,748,007           City supervision,         \$692,833         \$441,613         \$251,220           TOTAL PROJECT         63.7%         36.3%         \$46,881,674         \$29,882,447         \$16,999,227           DOC funding         \$6,400,000         \$1,900,000         \$1,900,000         \$1,900,000           SDC income         \$16,999,227         \$16,999,227         \$16,999,227         \$16,999,227           Land sale revenue         \$1,290,000         \$1,290,000         \$1,290,000         \$1,290,000           Net bond proceeds         \$20,292,447         \$20,292,447         \$20,292,447         \$20,292,447	-				<i><i><i>v</i>-<i>y<sup>2</sup><sup>1</sup><sup>2</sup><sup>3</sup><sup>3</sup><sup>3</sup><sup>3</sup><sup>3</sup><sup>3</sup><sup>3</sup><sup>3</sup></i></i></i>	<i>Q</i> , <b>_</b> , <b>, , , , , , , , , </b>	\$110,020
SDC's for plant       \$43,000       \$27,419       \$15,581         City & TVWD control       \$802,500       \$622,814       \$179,686         Subtotal for other project       \$2,136,500       \$1,469,949       \$666,551         Subtotal       \$46,188,841       \$29,440,834       \$16,748,007         City supervision,       \$46,188,841       \$29,440,834       \$16,748,007         City supervision,       \$692,833       \$441,613       \$251,220         TOTAL PROJECT       63.7%       36.3%       \$46,881,674       \$29,882,447       \$16,999,227         DOC funding       \$6,400,000       \$6,400,000       \$1,900,000       \$1,900,000       \$1,900,000         SDC income       \$16,999,227       \$16,999,227       \$16,999,227       \$16,999,227       \$16,999,227         Land sale revenue       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000         Net bond proceeds       \$20,292,447       \$20,292,447       \$20,292,447       \$20,292,447					\$150.000	\$95,242	\$54,758
City & TVWD control       \$802,500       \$622,814       \$179,686         Subtotal for other project       \$2,136,500       \$1,469,949       \$6666,551         Subtotal       \$46,188,841       \$29,440,834       \$16,748,007         City supervision,       administration & overhead       \$692,833       \$441,613       \$251,220         TOTAL PROJECT       63.7%       36.3%       \$46,881,674       \$29,882,447       \$16,999,227         DOC funding       \$6,400,000       \$1,900,000       \$1,900,000       \$1,900,000       \$1,900,000         SDC income       \$16,999,227       \$16,999,227       \$16,999,227       \$16,999,227       \$16,999,227         Land sale revenue       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000         Net bond proceeds       \$20,292,447       \$20,292,447       \$20,292,447       \$20,292,447       \$20,292,447						•	•
contingency       \$802,500       \$622,814       \$179,686         Subtotal for other project	-				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·,	
Subtotal for other project       \$2,136,500       \$1,469,949       \$666,551         subtotal       \$46,188,841       \$29,440,834       \$16,748,007         City supervision,       administration & overhead       \$692,833       \$441,613       \$251,220         TOTAL PROJECT       63.7%       36.3%       \$46,881,674       \$29,882,447       \$16,999,227         DOC funding       \$6,400,000       \$6,400,000       \$1,900,000       \$1,900,000       \$1,900,000         SDC income       \$16,999,227       \$16,999,227       \$16,999,227       \$16,999,227         Land sale revenue       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000         Net bond proceeds       \$20,292,447       \$20,292,447       \$20,292,447       \$20,292,447	•				\$802,500	\$622,814	\$179,686
expenses       \$2,136,500       \$1,469,949       \$666,551         Subtotal       \$46,188,841       \$29,440,834       \$16,748,007         City supervision,       administration & overhead       \$692,833       \$441,613       \$251,220         TOTAL PROJECT       63.7%       36.3%       \$46,881,674       \$29,882,447       \$16,999,227         DOC funding       \$6,400,000       \$1,900,000       \$1,900,000       \$1,900,000         SDC income       \$16,999,227       \$16,999,227       \$16,999,227         Land sale revenue       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000         Net bond proceeds       \$20,292,447       \$20,292,447       \$20,292,447					·		
Subtotal       \$46,188,841       \$29,440,834       \$16,748,007         City supervision, administration & overhead       \$692,833       \$441,613       \$251,220         TOTAL PROJECT       63.7%       36.3%       \$46,881,674       \$29,882,447       \$16,999,227         DOC funding       \$66,400,000       \$1,900,000       \$1,900,000       \$1,900,000       \$1,900,000         SDC income       \$16,999,227       \$16,999,227       \$16,999,227       \$16,999,227         Land sale revenue       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000         Net bond proceeds       \$20,292,447       \$20,292,447       \$20,292,447					\$2,136,500	\$1,469,949	\$666,551
administration & overhead       \$692,833       \$441,613       \$251,220         TOTAL PROJECT       63.7%       36.3%       \$46,881,674       \$29,882,447       \$16,999,227         DOC funding       \$6,400,000       \$6,400,000       \$1,900,000       \$1,900,000       \$1,900,000         SDC income       \$16,999,227       \$16,999,227       \$16,999,227       \$16,999,227         Land sale revenue       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000         Net bond proceeds       \$20,292,447       \$20,292,447       \$20,292,447	-				\$46,188,841	\$29,440,834	\$16,748,007
TOTAL PROJECT       63.7%       36.3%       \$46,881,674       \$29,882,447       \$16,999,227         DOC funding       \$6,400,000       \$6,400,000       \$1,900,000       \$1,900,000         SDC income       \$16,999,227       \$16,999,227         TVWD       \$16,999,227       \$16,999,227         Land sale revenue       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000         Net bond proceeds       \$20,292,447       \$20,292,447	City supervision,						
DOC funding\$6,400,000\$6,400,000SDC income\$1,900,000\$1,900,000TVWD\$16,999,227\$16,999,227Land sale revenue\$1,290,000\$1,290,000Net bond proceeds\$20,292,447\$20,292,447	administration & overhead				\$692,833	\$441,613	\$251,220
SDC income       \$1,900,000       \$1,900,000         TVWD       \$16,999,227         Land sale revenue       \$1,290,000       \$1,290,000         Net bond proceeds       \$20,292,447       \$20,292,447	TOTAL PROJECT		63.7%	36.3%	\$46,881,674	\$29,882,447	\$16,999,227
TVWD\$16,999,227Land sale revenue\$1,290,000Net bond proceeds\$20,292,447	-						
Land sale revenue         \$1,290,000         \$1,290,000           Net bond proceeds         \$20,292,447         \$20,292,447						\$1,900,000	
Net bond proceeds \$20,292,447 \$20,292,447	TVWD						
TOTAL AVAILABLE         \$46,881,674         \$29,882,447         \$16,999,227	-						
	TOTAL AVAILABLE				\$46,881,674	\$29,882,447	\$16,999,227



**30000 SW Town Center Loop E Wilsonville, Oregon 97070** (503) 682-1011 (503) 682-1015 Fax (503) 682-0843 TDD

July 7, 2000

C062)

Joseph L. Glicker, P.E. Vice President Montgomery Watson 111 SW 5th Avenue, Suite 1770 Portland, OR 97204

Re: Execution of Amendment No. 1, Addendum to Design/Build Agreement, Water Treatment Plant

Dear Joe:

As you are aware, the Wilsonville City Council adopted Resolution No. 1660 which approved and authorized Mayor Charlotte Lehan to execute Addendum No. 1 to the Design/Build Agreement between the City and Montgomery Watson, Inc., Montgomery Watson Americas, Inc., and Montgomery Watson Constructors, Inc., effective July 7, 2000.

Four duplicate originals are enclosed, each having been duly executed by the Mayor. Please return one original, fully executed by each of the authorized representatives for the respective Montgomery Watson corporations, to my office as soon as possible and no later than July 17, 2000.

Thank you for your courtesies in this matter.

Very truly yours,

Michael E. Kohlhoff City Attorney

mek:dp enclosures



#### AMENDMENT NO. 1, AN ADDENDUM TO DESIGN/BUILD AGREEMENT

#### RECITALS

WHEREAS, a Design/Build Agreement ("Agreement") was entered into effective the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of December, 1999, pursuant to Resolution No. 1628, by and between City of Wilsonville ("City" or "Owner") and Montgomery Watson, Inc. ("MW"), Montgomery Watson Americas, Inc. ("MWA") and Montgomery Watson Constructors, Inc. ("MWC") collectively known as ("Montgomery Watson" or "Design/Builder"); and

WHEREAS, said Agreement requires that a Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) be established for the Work to be performed or provided by Design/Builder pursuant to the Contract Documents; and

WHEREAS, the November 1, 1999 Request for Qualifications, adopted by Resolution No. 1602 established a projected budget for a 120 mgd intake structure, 15 mgd initial plant, and 70 mgd piping at \$44,921,000; and

WHEREAS, the Design/Builder has provided the Owner with the 10% Preliminary Engineering Design, the Design to GMP (30%), the Final Design Documents, and the GMP Addendum Documents; and

WHEREAS, Volume 1 and 2 of the Design to GMP documents (30%) in their entirety have been included in the Final Design Document; and

WHEREAS, the Owner has reviewed and approved the Design to GMP document and approved a concept for the Final Design Documents, with additions and changes noted on Exhibit N, the GMP Addendum Documents; and

WHEREAS, all costs to complete all obligations of MW under the Design/Build Agreement as hereinafter amended per Volume 3 of the Design to GMP document, the final design document and additions at Exhibit N, attached hereto and incorporated by reference herein, are included in the Guaranteed Maximum Price proposal from Montgomery Watson; and

WHEREAS, access decisions have been deferred for later review by the Development Review Board (DRB) and these decisions could impact overall project costs; and

WHEREAS, the City is conducting contract negotiations with an operations operator finalist recommended by the technical solicitations team and subject to final approval by Owner, and as part of the negotiation process the operator still needs to review and comment on the plant electrical control concept and administrative layout, which could impact overall project costs; and

WHEREAS, since DRB also conditioned a further site design review of certain landscape areas there have been landscaping and other modifications since the final design documents were submitted to DRB and are subject to DRB approval, which could impact overall project costs; and

WHEREAS, a separate contingency is required to cover the above potential added costs because of changing conditions that cannot be confirmed at this time, but can be reasonably estimated to establish a separate owner controlled contingency of \$955,000 set forth in Exhibit M, attached hereto and incorporated by reference herein, and shall be added to the guaranteed maximum price at the time a change order is issued for an owner controlled contingency item; and

WHEREAS, Exhibit B, Major Project Milestone Schedule to the Agreement was based on the City issuing a notice to proceed with construction by July 1, 2000; and

WHEREAS, paragraph 4.3 requires that the owner shall cause the delivery of and access to the Site by Design/Builder by dates set forth in schedule; and

WHEREAS, construction access to the water treatment plant site will be available after July 1, 2000, but before July 17, 2000; and

WHEREAS, resolution of some access, easement and permit issues are pending; and

WHEREAS, owner and Design/Builder desire to start construction now; and

WHEREAS, it is anticipated that it will take until July 17 to obtain signatures on this Amendment No. 1; and

WHEREAS, the notice to proceed with construction will be issued no later than July 18, 2000, and Exhibit B needs to be revised in accordance therewith; and

WHEREAS, paragraph 10.4 Bonds of the Design Build Agreement requires the Design Builder to furnish and deliver to the Owner a Labor and Materials Bond and a Performance Bond covering the design and construction work in the penal sum equal to the Guaranteed Maximum Price; and

WHEREAS, paragraph 3.5.5 Incorporation of Contract Documents requires that each subcontract shall incorporate any terms of this agreement and the contract documents to the

extent applicable to the work to be performed by the subcontractor and necessary to make all provisions of this contract effective; and

WHEREAS, given the paragraph 10.4 Bond requirement for the Design Builder, the elimination from paragraph 3.5.5 of any overlap in the bond requirement for subcontractor such as the plant contractor, the intake contractor and the electrical contractor for performance and payment bonds could reduce costs substantially without adversely affecting the City; and

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties do hereby agree to amend the Design/Build Agreement by this Amendment No. 1 as follows:

1. ARTICLE 5, Schedule & Completion, paragraph 5.2 Notice to Proceed shall be deleted and replaced by:

5.2 Notice to Proceed. The City Engineer will issue the notice to proceed for the water treatment plant no later than July 18, 2000, provided this Amendment No. 1 has been executed by all parties, the intake structure and the transmission main when this Amendment No. 1 has been duly executed by the parties and necessary permits have been issued and necessary easements for construction have been executed. The Design/Builder will be entitled to an equitable adjustment to Exhibit B, Revised Major Project Milestone Schedule, if the notices to proceed are delayed by the City in executing this Amendment No. 1, issuance of necessary permits, and/or the execution of necessary easements, causing delay to any major project schedule times set forth in the revised Exhibit B.

2. ARTICLE 6, Price and Payment, paragraph 6.1, GMP, shall be amended by adding:

6.1.1 Established GMP. The Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) shall be and is established at \$43,097,341.00. The schedule of values for the Guaranteed Maximum Price is attached as Exhibit E, Revised Guaranteed Maximum Price and Schedule of Values.

3. ARTICLE 7, Change Orders, shall be amended by adding a new paragraph 7.7

7.7 Owner's Change Order Account. Owner shall maintain a Change Order Account for the purpose of providing for Change Orders authorized under Article 7 and as set forth in owner controlled contingency in Exhibit M. Upon written notice from the City Engineer, the amount authorized from this account by the Change Order shall be added to the GMP without further amendment to this Agreement, up to a cumulative limit of \$955,000. Change Order amounts in excess of this limit shall be authorized by written amendment to this Agreement.

4. ARTICLE 10, Insurance and Bonds, paragraph 10.4 Bonds shall be deleted and replaced by:

10.4 Bonds. Design/Builder and /or its prime subcontractors, Natt McDougall Company, Slayden Construction, Tigard Electric, Inc. and Professional Services Industries, shall furnish and deliver to Owner Labor and Materials Bonds and Performance bonds before commencing the Design and Construction Work on the Site that shall cover such Design and Construction Work. The Labor and Materials Bond and the Performance Bond shall each name Owner as obligee and shall each be in the penal sum equal to the GMP. The Labor and Materials Bond and Performance Bond shall be in the forms set forth as Exhibit F. All premiums for the Labor and Materials Bond and Performance bond shall be included in the GMP. The Labor and Materials Bond and Performance Bond shall be issued by a surety who is (i) on the U.S. Department of Treasury list for the amount of its responsibility and (ii) licensed to do business in the State. Until the GMP is established, the penal amount of the bonds will be the estimated cost of design and other services to establish the GMP. When the GMP is established, the penal amount of the bonds will be increased to the amount of the GMP. Design/Builder shall assume the risk for the non-performance of any subcontractor and/or supplier, including, but not limited to, the financial risk of any such subcontractor or supplier who is either not bonded or insufficiently bonded.

5. The Design/Build Agreement shall be further amended by adding and incorporating into the Design/Build Agreement by reference as if fully set forth therein the following exhibits, which exhibits shall be placed on file and as of record with the City Recorder, the City Engineer and MW:

Exhibit B - Revised. Revised Major Project Milestone Schedule which shall be substituted for and replace the original Exhibit B.

Exhibit E – Revised Guaranteed Maximum Price (GM) and Schedule of Values which shall be substituted for and replace the original Exhibit E.

Exhibit J – The 10% Preliminary Engineering Design.

Exhibit K – Volume 3 of the Design to Guaranteed Maximum Price (30%).

Exhibit L – The final design document is approved in concept subject to technical approval by the Oregon Health Department, the Building Official, the Clackamas County Electrical Plans Examiners, and the Tualatin Fire and Rescue.

Exhibit M– The Guaranteed Maximum Price submittal with Schedule of Values and Owner Controlled Contingency.

Exhibit N - Changes to the final design documents included in the Guaranteed Maximum Price.

This Amendment No. 1 shall be effective July 7, 2000, and except as otherwise set forth in this

Amendment No. 1, the terms and conditions of the Design/Build Agreement remain in full force and effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties have executed this Agreement as of the date first above written.

CITY O	F WI	LSON	<b>JVIL</b>	LE
--------	------	------	-------------	----

MONTGOMERY WATSON, INC.

Charlotte Lehan

By		
Its:	Mayor	

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

This \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_\_, 2000.

Michael E. Kohlhoff, City Attorney
City of Wilsonville, Oregon

By \_\_\_\_\_\_ Its: \_\_\_\_\_

MONTGOMERY WATSON AMERICAS, INC.

By	
Its:	 

Amendment No. 1, An Addendum	to Design	Build	Agreement
N:\Legal\pankonin\Mike2\Agree, Amend 1.doc	U		0

# MONTGOMERY WATSON CONSTRUCTORS, INC.

By \_\_\_\_\_\_ Its: \_\_\_\_\_

٠

÷

..

#### EXHIBIT B MAJOR PROJECT MILESTONE SCHEDULE

MILESTONE	DATE OR DURATION
INITIAL OWNER NOTICE TO PROCEED	DECEMBER 23, 1999
10 % PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING DESIGN DEVELOPMENT SUBMITTAL	FEBRUARY 16, 2000
OWNER'S APPROVAL OF 10% SUBMITTAL	MARCH 16, 2000
GMP DESIGN SUBMITTAL	APRIL 3, 2000
OWNER'S NOTICE TO PROCEED FOR TO PROCURE VENDORS AND SUBCONTRACTORS AND START MOBILIZATION ACTIVITIES, SHOP DRAWINGS AND SUBMITTALS	APRIL 3, 2000
OWNER'APPROVAL OF GMP DESIGN SUBMITTAL	MAY 3, 2000
SUBMIT DESIGN/CONSTRUCTION GMP PRICE	JUNE 1, 2000
SUBMIT CONSTRUCTION DESIGN DELIVERABLE	JULY 1, 2000
OWNER'S CONSTRUCTION NOTICE TO PROCEED FOR FIELD INSTALLATION	JULY 7, 2000
OWNER'S APPROVAL OF CONSTRUCTION DESIGN DELIVERABLE	AUGUST 1, 2000
3 MGD CAPACITY AVAILABLE TO DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	639 DAYS AFTER CONSTRUCTION NOTICE TO PROCEED (APRIL 7, 2002 BASED ON JULY 7, 2000 CONSTRUCTION NOTICE TO PROCEED)
SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION	761 DAYS AFTER CONSTRUCTION NOTICE TO PROCEED (AUGUST 7, 2002 BASED ON JULY 7, 2000 CONSTRUCTION NOTICE TO PROCEED)
FINAL COMPLETION	822 DAYS AFTER CONSTRUCTION

	NOTICE TO PROCEED (OCTOBER 7, 2002 BASED ON JULY 7, 2000 CONSTRUCTION NOTICE TO PROCEED)
END OF PROJECT WARRANTY	365 DAYS AFTER SUBSTANTIAL
PERIOD	COMPLETION

-

1

# MEMORANDUM MEMORANDUM Memoral Market Memoral Market To: Eldon Johansen Date: June 30, 2000 From: Joe Glicker Subject: Comparison of Proposal to GMP Costs

You have asked for information as to how we moved from the estimated cost of \$36.5 million in our proposal last December, to the Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) of \$42.8 million. This memo summarizes that evolution.

Table 1 summarizes the changes in project cost of the major project elements and the timing of those changes, as we have estimated them since December. These costs include all permitting, community involvement, engineering, construction, contingencies and other related costs of Montgomery Watson as design-builder. They do not include any owner's agent costs.

Project Element	Proposal	10% Design Submittal Estimate	30% Design Submittal Estimate	GMP	Difference Between GMP and Proposal
Date of	November 29,	February 16,	March 31,	June 1, 2000	
Estimate	1999	2000	2000		
Raw Water	\$ 6,500,000	\$ 7,250,000	\$ 8,400,000	\$ 7,510,000	\$1,028,000
Intake and PS					
Water	\$26,500,000	\$28,080,000	\$29,885,000	\$32,697,000	\$6,020,000
Treatment Plant					
Finished	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 2,980,000	\$ 2,890,000	-\$ 686,000
Water Pipeline					
TOTAL	\$36,500,000	\$38,830,000	\$41,270,000	\$43,097,000	\$6,597,000

 Table 1

 Summary of Changes in Estimated Project Costs

Table 2 provides as detailed a comparison as is possible between the costs that we had assumed in the proposal, and the costs that are now in the GMP. The estimated cost from the proposal, the GMP cost, and the difference between the proposal and GMP cost are shown for each major



item in the project. Also shown in Table 2 is a brief summary for the reasons for these differences. Some comments on this comparison are appropriate:

- The difference in cost in the raw water pump station/intake is due to the increase in size from 70 mgd in the proposal, to 120 mgd. This was done at the 10% design submittal as a result of the participation of the Tualatin Valley Water District (TVWD). While the price of this element increased, the City of Wilsonville's proportionate share of the cost of this element dropped \$600,000 as a consequence of having a larger TVWD involvement in the project.
- The increase in cost on the Actiflo clarification system was a consequence of the City's desire to have 100% redundancy throughout the design. The proposal included two Actiflo unit process trains, each sized at 7.5 mgd. This was increased to two 15 mgd trains in the 10% design submittal. We also added a pilot study with Actiflo to demonstrate that this process will in fact work on the Willamette. The resulting cost increases were \$500,000.
- In the proposal, we assumed that native soil from the site excavations (primarily the clearwell, filters, and ozone contactors) could be used for backfill. We also assumed that disposal of excess soil would be similar to that which occurs on most projects. We assumed soils would be hauled to some nearby location and provided at no cost to someone who wanted it for fill dirt. When we conducted on-site geotechnical studies, the soil report did not allow use of native soil for backfill. Due to the high level of local construction activity, the only dump sites that were available had significant tipping charges associated with them. Hauling this excess soil would have resulted in excess project costs of almost \$900,000 had we not mitigated it. As a consequence, we re-engineered the backfill design to allow us to reuse some of soil on site and we re-graded the site to place more soil on site. This reduced the increase in soil handling costs, but still left them several hundred thousand dollars above those that would have normally been expected and that were included in the proposal. (As an aside note, this is an example of how design-build does in fact save money. In a traditional design/bid/build process, the City would have just paid the full excess disposal cost in the bidding process without even knowing it).
- In the proposal, we had assumed that nice, architectural finishes would be utilized on the administration and other buildings. However, through the public input process, we have developed a more extensive architectural concept. This concept integrates the park, the water treatment plant, and the surrounding environment. Major components of cost increases include replacing fencing with a wall along the western edge; maintaining a fixed elevation along the western wall; special finishes on water holding structures in addition to those on the buildings; and large windows that allow viewing into some of the buildings. The net of these changes added over \$800,000 to the project cost. These costs show up in cost increases to the ozonation contactors, chemical feed building, filters, and finished water pump station.
- We had assumed extensive landscaping to screen the neighbors from the plant in the proposal. However, through the community involvement process we agreed to plant the tallest trees possible to provide more immediate screening. This added cost to the landscaping plan.

- The proposal did not include park features such as the interpretative path along the plant wall, picnic shelters, and the bridge overlook to the river. These were added as part of the architectural concept to break up the imposing length of the water treatment plant wall, in response to neighbor concerns, and in order to create a public amenity at the plant site.
- A water feature was not included in the proposal. Again, it arose as part of the architectural concept and community input.
- The proposal assumed that the road on the plant site would be built as a private driveway. Instead, it is being built to full-width City street standards with curbs, gutters, sidewalks, and a joint pedestrian/bike pathways. While the proposal included the cost of a bridge over Arrowhead Creek, we had to significantly extend the span of the bridge to completely avoid any wetland impacts and the associated impact on the schedule for obtaining Army Corps 404 and other permits for the project. These changes in the road and bridge resulted in a cost increase of over \$500,000.
- The costs for extension of electrical service by PGE to the site are much higher than are routinely found. We had included an allowance for improvements in PGE's supply system to the site in our proposal cost based on the discussions that we had at that time with PGE. However, actual PGE service costs are now a couple of hundred thousand dollars higher than what we had been led to believe they were during the proposal. Other electrical costs in the proposal were estimated as a percentage of other project costs, based on what is typically found in water treatment plant projects. There was, however, no specific definition of plant electrical system requirements. That generalized estimate proved to be low for this project
- The costs for extension of telephone service to the site are much higher than are routinely found. We had assumed service could be extended from Brockway Dr. to the plant. However, it must now come from Wilsonville Road. The instrumentation and telemetry costs in the proposal were estimated as a percentage of other project costs, based on what is typically found in water treatment plant projects. There was, however, no specific definition of instrumentation and telemetry requirements. That generalized estimate proved to be low for this project.
- The proposal did not include an emergency power generator. Based on the City's experience with power reliability at its wastewater treatment plant nearby, the City decided during the 10% design process to add an emergency generator to the project.
- During the design process, we discovered that a barge had been buried on the site. That was unknown at the time of the proposal. Removal and disposal costs are now included in the project.

# TABLE 2PROPOSAL AND GMP COST COMPARISON

PROJECT ELEMENT	PROPOSAL	GMP	DIFFERENCE	REASONS FOR MAJOR VARIATIONS
RAW WATER PUMP STATION AND INTAKE	\$6,500,000	\$7,510,000	\$1,010,000	Increase to 120 mgd
WATER TREATMENT PLANT	\$26,500,000	\$32,701,000	\$6,201,000	
Clarification (actifla)	\$3,000,000	\$3,570,000	\$570,000	Full redundancy of actiflo system; actiflo pilot test
Clarification (actiflo) Ozone contactors and generators	\$2,600,000	\$2,840,000		Impact of incorporating architectural wall on facility
Ozone contactors and generators	\$2,600,000	<b>\$2,040,000</b>	Φ240,000	Earth handling due to soils report and lack of local disposal
Filters	\$3,200,000	\$3,430,000	\$230,000	site; impact of arch. wall
Chemical Feed	\$2,100,000	\$2,300,000	•	Impact of incorporating architectural wall on facility
Backwash & WW Recovery	\$1,100,000	\$1,200,000		Estimating variation
Sludge Handling	\$1,600,000	\$1,650,000		Small estimating varation
	Ψ1,000,000	Ψ1,000,000	400,000	Earth handling due to soils report and lack of local disposal
Clearwell	\$2,800,000	\$3,025,000	\$225,000	site
FW PS	\$1,900,000	\$2,240,000	· •	Impact of incorporating architectural wall on facility
	<i><b></b></i>	<i><b>4</b>2,2 (0,000</i>	40 10,000	Architectural design; response to community input/DRB
Admin Building	\$1,000,000	\$1,180,000	\$180,000	review
	• .,•••,•••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•••••	Big trees to screen neighbors; response to community
Landscaping	\$250,000	\$340,000	\$90,000	input/DRB review
	+=,	+,	+,	River overlook; screening of neighbors; interpretative
Park Features	\$0	\$984,000	\$984,000	walkway
Water Feature	\$0	\$597,000		Screening, site amenity; water wall, ponds
		+	+ ,	Street design instead of plant road; avoid wetlands impact
Roads and Bridge	\$1,000,000	\$1,550,000	\$550,000	on bridge; access issues
Storm Drainage	\$150,000	\$195,000	. ,	Requirements for erosion control
Overflow and Yard Piping	\$1,900,000	\$1,990,000		Small estimating varation
Electrical	\$2,900,000	\$3,630,000		High electrical service cost; low proposal estimate
Instrumentation and Telemetry	\$1,000,000	\$1,340,000		Excess phone costs; low proposal estimate
Emergency Generator	\$0	\$500,000		City request based on WWTP experience
Barge Removal	\$0	\$140,000	\$140,000	Discovered on site
FINISHED WATER PIPELINE	\$3,500,000	\$2,889,000	-\$611,000	High proposal estimate
TOTAL	\$36,500,000	\$43,100,000	\$6,600,000	

ME	MORLNDUM	
	ONTGOMERY WATSON	
 To:	Mike Stone	Date: June 29, 2000
From:	Joe Glicker	Reference:
Subject:	GMP	

Attached is a revised Exhibit E to our Design-Build Contract detailing the Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) for the Willamette Water Treatment Plant project. Exhibit E shows the GMP by subcontractor work package and by the process unit Schedule of Values

Several comments and qualifiers are appropriate regarding the GMP.

- 1. The GMP includes all project elements as shown in the 100% drawings and all modifications as shown in the GMP Addendum. Anything shown or represented in those documents has been included in the GMP.
- 2. The GMP assumes the City will issue a construction Notice-to-Proceed by July 18, 2000 that includes access as described below, that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers issues a 404 permit by September 1, 2000, and that this 404 permit allows in-river work to occur this year.
- 3. The park water feature is undergoing continued review. Any further modifications or changes beyond those shown in the GMP Addendum that increases or decreases costs will be addressed at that time as a change to the scope and adjustments made accordingly to the GMP from the City's contingency.
- 4. There are miscellaneous landscaping adjustments near the Administration Building area including path revisions as shown in the GMP Addendum, and additional landscaping at the "throat" area, that will need to be submitted to the DRB for review and approval. If further modifications result from the DRB process they will need to be reviewed to determine if any scope additions or deletions have incurred which impact price, and adjustments made accordingly to the GMP from the City's contingency.
- 5. It is assumed that site access is provided from three separate points in stages and that the City has all necessary rights-of-way and easements for these accesses. Per the DRB approval conditions, large oversized construction equipment will be brought to the site via Brockway following 24 hour notification to those on the access route. Temporary construction access will be provided from the Old Haul Road (Jobsey Lane) and Brown Road. All easements and parking restrictions necessary for this access are provided by the City and will be in-place on the date of construction notice-to-proceed. Permanent construction and site access will be obtained from Industrial Way via a new road and bridge crossing of Arrowhead Creek. Once the new bridge is in-place, the temporary construction along the Old Haul Road will cease. If

this access plan is modified, if a temporary bridge or other adjustment is needed on the Old Haul Road, or if easements are not in-place on the date of construction notice-to-proceed, the implications on cost and schedule will be reviewed and adjustments made accordingly to the GMP from the City's contingency.

- 6. The GMP includes the costs of the roadway to the property line. If roadwork to Wilsonville Road is desired once the access issues are resolved, this would need to be incorporated into the GMP from the City's contingency.
- 7. The Operations Contractor that has been selected may wish adjustments in the Administration Building layout, in process design details, or in instrumentation and controls. We will be meeting with them and the City to determine what, if any, of such modifications should be included in the project. Adjustments will be then need to be made accordingly to the schedule and to the GMP from the City's contingency.
- 8. The finished water pipeline alignment is shown in the GMP Addendum. If there are any future adjustments to the pipeline alignment, appropriate adjustments would need to be made to the GMP from the City's contingency and schedule would be revised if necessary.
- 9. The finished water pipe crossing of Arrowhead Creek will be performed using a jack and bore method.
- 10. As listed above, items that are identified as not being included in the GMP, will be included in the City's contingency. Other modifications to the project scope that the City may wish to make will also be funded from the City's contingency.

#### EXHIBIT E SCHEDULE OF VALUES

All values shown in this Schedule of Values are estimates prepared for the Guaranteed Maximum Price. The Schedule of Values will be revised to reflect actual project costs at project close-out.

#### WORK PACKAGES SCHEDULE OF VALUES

#### **ENGINEERING, PERMITTING AND MANAGEMENT SERVICES:**

<b>MANAGEMENT SERVICES :</b>	\$400,000
<b>10% PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING:</b>	\$325,000
GMP DESIGN:	\$155,000
<b>CONSTRUCTION DESIGN:</b>	\$975,000
ENGINEERING SERVICES DURING CONSTRUCTION:	\$1,445,000
SUBTOTAL ENGINEERING, PERMITTING AND MANAGEMEN	T: \$3,300,000
CONSTRUCTION:	
<b>GMP PRICE PREPARATION:</b>	\$ 320,000
<b>PRECONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES:</b>	\$ 350,000
<b>CONSTRUCTION SUPERVISION:</b>	\$ 1,992,926
WORK PACKAGE#1 BARGE REMOVAL:	\$ 117,185
WORK PACKAGE # 2 RAW WATER INTAKE:	\$ 5,755,730
WORK PACKAGE #3 WATER TREATMENT PLANT:	\$16,399,612
WORK PACKAGE #4 CLEARWELL:	\$ 1,383,367

WORK PACKAGE #5	
FINISHED WATER PIPELINE:	\$ 1,962,038
WORK PACKAGE #6	
ACCESS ROAD AND BRIDGE:	\$ 1,164,819
WORK PACKAGE #7	
ELECTRICAL:	\$ 5,855,323
WORK PACKAGE #8	
EQUIPMENT:	\$ 3,506,612
WORK PACKAGE #9	
<b>RAW WATER PIPELINE:</b>	\$ 541,026
<b>BONDS AND INSURANCE</b>	\$ 448,703
SUBTOTAL CONSTRUCTION:	\$39,797,341

TOTAL GUARANTEED MAXIMUM PRICE (GMP):

# \$43,097,341

# **PROCESS UNIT SCHEDULE OF VALUES:**

-

Raw water intake and	
Pump station :	
Screening	\$ 724,386
Intake Pipe	\$1,368,175
Wetwell	<b>\$2,</b> 189,079
Pump Station Building	\$1,403,001
Pumps	\$ 597,022
Electrical Wire and Conduit	\$ 199,007
Electrical Equipment	\$ 398,014
Raw Water Pipeline	<b>\$</b> 611,947
Water treatment plant:	
Clarification	\$3,566,642
Ozone Building and Piping	\$ 497,518
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
Ozone Contactor	\$1,539,332
	· ·
Ozone Contactor	\$1,539,332
Ozone Contactor Ozone Generators	\$1,539,332 \$770,119
Ozone Contactor Ozone Generators Ozone Destruct Units	\$1,539,332 \$770,119 \$149,255
Ozone Contactor Ozone Generators Ozone Destruct Units Filters	\$1,539,332 \$770,119 \$149,255 \$3,383,539

Backwash System	\$1,195,215
Sludge Handling	\$1,647,914
Clearwell	\$3,023,831
FW Pump Station Building	\$1,167,581
FW Pumps	\$ 377,126
FW Wire and Conduit	<b>\$</b> 199,007
FW Electrical Equipment	\$ 497,518
Administration Building	\$1,183,826
Landscaping and Irrigation	\$1,324,610
Water Feature	\$ 597,022
Roads and Bridge	\$1,549,400
Storm drainage	\$ 194,584
Overflow and yard piping	\$1,990,072
Electrical Service	\$3,532,378
Instrumentation and Telemetry	\$1,343,299
Backup Power Generator	\$ 497,518
Barge Removal	\$ 139,305
Finished water pipeline:	
Meter/DDV to Wilcommille	e 162 740

Meter/PRV to Wilsonville	\$ 163,740
WTP to Kinsman Rd.	<b>\$2,</b> 726,399

#### EXHIBIT E SCHEDULE OF VALUES

All values shown in this Schedule of Values are estimates prepared for the Guaranteed Maximum Price. The Schedule of Values will be revised to reflect actual project costs at project close-out.

#### WORK PACKAGES SCHEDULE OF VALUES

# ENGINEERING, PERMITTING AND MANAGEMENT SERVICES:

MANAGEMENT SERVICES :	\$400,000
<b>10% PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING:</b>	\$325,000
GMP DESIGN:	\$155,000
<b>CONSTRUCTION DESIGN:</b>	\$975,000
ENGINEERING SERVICES DURING CONSTRUCTION:	\$1,445,000
SUBTOTAL ENGINEERING, PERMITTING AND MANAGEMEN	VT: \$3,300,000
CONSTRUCTION:	
<b>GMP PRICE PREPARATION:</b>	\$ 320,000
<b>PRECONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES:</b>	\$ 350,000
<b>CONSTRUCTION SUPERVISION:</b>	\$ 1,992,926
WORK PACKAGE#1 BARGE REMOVAL:	\$ 117,185
WORK PACKAGE # 2 RAW WATER INTAKE:	\$ 5,755,730
WORK PACKAGE #3 WATER TREATMENT PLANT:	\$16,399,612
WORK PACKAGE #4 CLEARWELL:	\$ 1,383,367

WORK PACKAGE #5	
FINISHED WATER PIPELINE:	\$ 1,962,038
WORK PACKAGE #6	
ACCESS ROAD AND BRIDGE:	\$ 1,164,819
WORK PACKAGE #7	
ELECTRICAL:	\$ 5,855,323
WORK PACKAGE #8	
EQUIPMENT:	\$ 3,506,612
WORK PACKAGE #9	
<b>RAW WATER PIPELINE:</b>	\$ 541,026
BONDS AND INSURANCE	\$ 448,703
SUBTOTAL CONSTRUCTION:	\$39,797,341

TOTAL GUARANTEED MAXIMUM PRICE (GMP):

\$43,097,341

# **PROCESS UNIT SCHEDULE OF VALUES:**

Raw water intake and	
Pump station :	
Screening	\$ 724,386
Intake Pipe	\$1,368,175
Wetwell	\$2,189,079
Pump Station Building	\$1,403,001
Pumps	\$ 597,022
Electrical Wire and Conduit	\$ 199,007
Electrical Equipment	\$ 398,014
Raw Water Pipeline	\$ 611,947
Water treatment plant:	
Clarification	\$3,566,642
Ozone Building and Piping	\$ 497,518
Ozone Contactor	\$1,539,332
Ozone Generators	\$ 770,119
Ozone Destruct Units	\$ 149,255
Filters	\$3,383,539
Filter Waste	\$ 49,752
Chemical Building	\$ 597,022
Chemical Feed Systems	\$1,703,186

Backwash System	\$1,195,215
Sludge Handling	\$1,647,914
Clearwell	\$3,023,831
FW Pump Station Building	\$1,167,581
FW Pumps	\$ 377,126
FW Wire and Conduit	\$ 199,007
FW Electrical Equipment	\$ 497,518
Administration Building	\$1,183,826
Landscaping and Irrigation	\$1,324,610
Water Feature	\$ 597,022
Roads and Bridge	\$1,549,400
Storm drainage	\$ 194,584
Overflow and yard piping	\$1,990,072
Electrical Service	\$3,532,378
Instrumentation and Telemetry	\$1,343,299
Backup Power Generator	\$ 497,518
Barge Removal	\$ 139,305
Finished water pipeline:	
Meter/PRV to Wilsonville	\$ 163,740
WTP to Kinsman Rd.	\$2,726,399

.

.

#### EXHIBIT M



WILSONVILLE / TVWD

#### Design-Build Contract GMP & Contingency 6/30/00

PROJECT ELEMENT	
TOTAL GMP	\$43,097,341
Additional contingency in D-B contract	
Placeholder-added road repair on Industrial Way from property to WV Rd	
Placeholder-added bicycle and pedestrian trail from property on Industrial Way to WV Rd to Kinsman	
Placeholder-Upgrade of haul road	
Placeholder-delay of work in river until Spring 2001	
Placeholder, bicycle trail along Old Haul Road	
Admin bldg revisions	
Brockway ext if reqd	
Improvements suggested by operator	
Other contingency	
Total contingency in D-B contract	\$955,000
Total in D-B contract	\$44,052,341

#### COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT STAFF REPORT

Date:	June 29, 2000
To:	Honorable Mayor and City Councilors
From:	Eldon R. Johansen, Community Development Director
Subject:	Approval of Resolution Authorizing the Guaranteed Maximum Price and The Beginning of Construction for the Willamette River Water Treatment Plant And Extension of Owner's Representative Services

#### BACKGROUND:

On September 21, 2000, the voters approved up to \$25 million in revenue bonds for construction of a water treatment plant to use Willamette River water as a long-term water supply source. At the time the ballot measure was approved we did not know if we would have other partners. There were two basic alternatives that were presented to the voters as options depending on who would be involved in construction of the water treatment plant. The alternatives were as follows:

City participation at 10 MGD in a subregional water treatment plant with an initial capacity of 35 MGD with potential partners including Sherwood, Tualatin, Tigard and Tualatin Valley Water District. This project included City water treatment plant capacity of 10 MGD, a City oversizing of the intake, the piping within the plant, some plant components and the finished waterline from the plant to the vicinity of Grahams Ferry Road and Day Road with the oversizing to serve a build-out requirement of 20 MGD.

The other alternative was for City construction of a 5 MGD initial capacity with the intake, plant piping and some plant components sized for 20 MGD and the finished waterline terminating at the intersection of Wilsonville Road and Kinsman Road. Access for this alternative was planned from Brockway.

At the time the preparations for the previously mentioned election were underway, the State Department of Corrections was negotiating to obtain water for the Women's Prison and Intake Center. Their plan was to obtain initial interim water from Tualatin Valley Water District by transfer from the water district through Tualatin, through the City of Wilsonville storage, transmission and distribution systems to the prison. Under this scenario the City would have received \$3.6 million for transmission facilities and systems development charges for the ultimate connection to the City system with the City providing longterm water from the water treatment plant after it was constructed. Subsequently, Tualatin Valley Water District was not able to provide water to the prison and the City agreed to expedite construction of the water treatment plant so it could provide water to the prison in October 2001 from existing wells and in summer of 2002 from the proposed water treatment plant. This change in plans resulted in the Department of Corrections agreeing to provide an additional \$6.4 million to the City for expediting and constructing a water treatment plant to provide water service. Subsequent elections in Tigard, Sherwood and Tualatin resulted in these municipalities not participating in the initial phase of the water treatment plant. The Tualatin Valley Water District had initially planned to participate in the intake to give an ultimate capacity of the intake at 70 MGD. 70 MGD in transmission capacity from the intake structure to Day Road and no participation in the water treatment plant construction. TVWD subsequently reevaluated their position and increased participation in the intake structure to a total capacity of 120 MGD and also 5 MGD in initial treatment plant capacity. Under the current agreement with Tualatin Valley Water District the finished water main will terminate at the intersection of Wilsonville Road and Kinsman Road. Preliminary modeling results indicate that the City transmission and distribution system can accommodate up to 12 MGD in water from the water treatment plant at the intersection of Wilsonville Road and Kinsman Road after the waterline west to Willamette Way is completed. This waterline is under construction and is being completed prior to the beginning of water service from the treatment plant.

To expedite construction of the water treatment plant, the City, through a competitive selection process, selected Montgomery Watson Incorporated ("MW"), Montgomery Watson Americas, Incorporated ("MWA") and Montgomery Watson Constructors, Incorporated ("MWC") collectively known as design/builder to design and construct the water treatment plant. The City also selected CH2M Hill to provide owner's representative services during design and construction of the water treatment plant.

The design is now complete and the permitting process is proceeding sufficiently well so that Council can approve the guaranteed maximum price and authorize onsite construction.

In addition to the payments to Montgomery Watson in accordance with the guaranteed maximum price there are other items that the City will pay with a prorata reimbursement from the Tualatin Valley Water District. This includes the following:

- □ Continuing owners representative services by CH2M Hill for an onsite representative, an onsite owner's representative.
- □ An onsite representative of the plant operator, to ensure that the operator is fully familiar with all of the underground facilities of the water treatment plant.
- □ Access easements and possible construction if any as required for permanent access.
- D Potential added bicycle and pedestrian trail expenses, as may be required from DRB.
- □ Systems development charges and a contingency for other unknown expenses. These items have been included in the cost estimate that is Attachment B to the resolution. There have been revenue increases or reduced expenditures, which will more than offset any increased costs. Offsets include the following:

1. The agreement by the Department of Corrections to contribute \$6.4 million to the cost of expediting and constructing the water treatment plant.

2. A reduction in City costs for the intake of \$605,000 because of the decision by Tualatin Valley Water District to oversize the intake structure and intake line from 70 MGD to 120 MGD, thereby reducing the proportional City share of construction costs and reducing the unit price of construction costs.

3. The original participation in the supply facility by Tualatin Valley Water District was to be \$15 million. They have subsequently agreed to increase the total amount to not exceed \$17 million, thereby decreasing the City out-of-pocket costs by an equivalent amount.

The net result of the previously mentioned additional revenues and decreased costs has resulted in the ability of the City to pay for construction of 10 MGD of an initial 15 MGD per plant capacity with a reduction of approximately \$5 million in overall bond requirements.

This does not end the staff work that is required to obtain a long-term water source from the Willamette River in April 2002. Mike Stone, City Engineer will continue to manage plant construction through Montgomery Watson and CH2M Hill. The Public Works and Community Development staff will be working with Tualatin Valley Water District and the selected plant operator to develop a contract for plant operations. In addition, the Community Development, Public Works, Legal and Finance staffs will be working with representatives from the Tualatin Valley Water District to expand the scope of the Intergovernmental Agreement between TVWD and the City to include much greater detail on plant operations, plant expansion, plant leases and other miscellaneous activities that are essential to coordinate on any activities between TVWD and the City.

#### **<u>RECOMMENDATION</u>**:

That Council approve Resolution No. 1660 authorizing the Mayor to sign an amendment to the design/build contract establishing the guaranteed maximum price, establishing a contingency and authorizing construction to begin and also authorizing the City Engineer to sign Task Order No. 3 to CH2M Hill for owner's representative services during water treatment plant design and startup.

# EXHIBIT 2

# NOT INCLUDED IN THE PACKET