

Local Public Agency	LOCAL AGENCY	 <b>Illinois Department of Transportation</b>  <b>Preliminary Engineering Services Agreement For Federal Participation</b>	CONSULTANT	Consultant
Village of Oak Park				AECOM Technical Services, Inc.
County				Address
Cook				303 E. Wacker Drive, Suite 1400
Section				City
05-00240-00-EG				Chicago
Project No.				State
HD-8003 (560)				IL
Job No.				Zip Code
P-91-135-06				60601
Contact Name/Phone/E-mail Address				Contact Name/Phone/E-mail Address
Bill McKenna, Village Engineer				Stan Wang
(708) 358-5722				(312) 373-6714
mckenna@oak-park.us				Stan.Wang@aecom.com

THIS AGREEMENT is made and entered into this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_ between the above Local Public Agency (LPA) and Consultant (ENGINEER) and covers certain professional engineering services in connection with the PROJECT. Federal-aid funds allotted to the LPA by the state of Illinois under the general supervision of the Illinois Department of Transportation (STATE) will be used entirely or in part to finance engineering services as described under AGREEMENT PROVISIONS.

#### Project Description

Name I-290 Cap from IL 43 to Austin Avenue Route FAI-290 Length 1.6 mi Structure No. N/A

Termini IL 43 to Austin Avenue

Description Feasibility study for expanded bridge decking over I-290

#### Agreement Provisions

##### I. THE ENGINEER AGREES,

1. To perform or be responsible for the performance, in accordance with STATE approved design standards and policies, of engineering services for the LPA for the proposed improvement herein described.
2. To attend any and all meetings and visit the site of the proposed improvement at any reasonable time when requested by representatives of the LPA or STATE.
3. To complete the services herein described within \_\_\_\_\_ calendar days from the date of the Notice to Proceed from the LPA, excluding from consideration periods of delay caused by circumstances beyond the control of the ENGINEER.
4. The classifications of the employees used in the work should be consistent with the employee classifications and estimated man-hours shown in EXHIBIT A. If higher-salaried personnel of the firm, including the Principal Engineer, perform services that are indicated in Exhibit A to be performed by lesser-salaried personnel, the wage rate billed for such services shall be commensurate with the payroll rate for the work performed.
5. That the ENGINEER is qualified technically and is entirely conversant with the design standards and policies applicable for the PROJECT; and that the ENGINEER has sufficient properly trained, organized and experienced personnel to perform the services enumerated herein.
6. That the ENGINEER shall be responsible for the accuracy of the work and shall promptly make necessary revisions or corrections resulting from the ENGINEER's errors, omissions or negligent acts without additional compensation. Acceptance of work by the STATE will not relieve the ENGINEER of the responsibility to make subsequent correction of any such errors or omissions or for clarification of any ambiguities.
7. That all plans and other documents furnished by the ENGINEER pursuant to this AGREEMENT will be endorsed by the ENGINEER and will affix the ENGINEER's professional seal when such seal is required by law. Plans for structures to be built as a part of the improvement will be prepared under the supervision of a registered structural engineer and will affix structural engineer seal when such seal is required by law. It will be the ENGINEER's responsibility to affix the proper seal as required by the Bureau of Local Roads and Streets manual published by the STATE.
8. That the ENGINEER will comply with applicable federal statutes, state of Illinois statutes, and local laws or ordinances of the LPA.

9. The undersigned certifies neither the ENGINEER nor I have:
- employed or retained for commission, percentage, brokerage, contingent fee or other considerations, any firm or person (other than a bona fide employee working solely for me or the above ENGINEER) to solicit or secure this AGREEMENT,
  - agreed, as an express or implied condition for obtaining this AGREEMENT, to employ or retain the services of any firm or person in connection with carrying out the AGREEMENT or
  - paid, or agreed to pay any firm, organization or person (other than a bona fide employee working solely for me or the above ENGINEER) any fee, contribution, donation or consideration of any kind for, or in connection with, procuring or carrying out the AGREEMENT.
  - are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible or voluntarily excluded from covered transactions by any Federal department or agency,
  - have not within a three-year period preceding the AGREEMENT been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against them for commission of fraud or criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain or performing a public (Federal, State or local) transaction; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements or receiving stolen property,
  - are not presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a government entity (Federal, State or local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (e) and
  - have not within a three-year period preceding this AGREEMENT had one or more public transactions (Federal, State or local) terminated for cause or default.
10. To pay its subconsultants for satisfactory performance no later than 30 days from receipt of each payment from the LPA.
11. To submit all invoices to the LPA within one year of the completion of the work called for in this AGREEMENT or any subsequent Amendment or Supplement.
12. To submit BLR 05613, Engineering Payment Report, to the STATE upon completion of the project (Exhibit B).
13. Scope of Services to be provided by the ENGINEER:
- ☐ Make such detailed surveys as are necessary for the planning and design of the PROJECT.
  - ☐ Make stream and flood plain hydraulic surveys and gather both existing bridge upstream and downstream high water data and flood flow histories.
  - ☐ Prepare applications for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Permit, Illinois Department of Natural Resources Office of Water Resources Permit and Illinois Environmental Protection Agency Section 404 Water Quality Certification.
  - ☐ Design and/or approve cofferdams and superstructure shop drawings.
  - ☐ Prepare Bridge Condition Report and Preliminary Bridge Design and Hydraulic Report, (including economic analysis of bridge or culvert types and high water effects on roadway overflows and bridge approaches).
  - ☐ Prepare the necessary environmental and planning documents including the Project Development Report or Environmental Assessment, State Clearinghouse, Substate Clearinghouse and all necessary environmental clearances.
  - ☐ Make such soil surveys or subsurface investigations including borings and soil profiles as may be required to furnish sufficient data for the design of the proposed improvement. Such investigations to be made in accordance with the current Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction, Bureau of Local Roads and Streets Administrative Policies, Federal-Aid Procedures for Local Highway Improvements or any other applicable requirements of the STATE.
  - ☐ Analyze and evaluate the soil surveys and structure borings to determine the roadway structural design and bridge foundation.
  - ☐ Prepare preliminary roadway and drainage structure plans and meet with representatives of the LPA and STATE at the site of the improvement for review of plans prior to the establishment of final vertical and horizontal alignment, location and size of drainage structures, and compliance with applicable design requirements and policies.
  - ☐ Make or cause to be made such traffic studies and counts and special intersection studies as may be required to furnish sufficient data for the design of the proposed improvement.
  - ☐ Complete the general and detailed plans, special provisions and estimate of cost. Contract plans shall be prepared in accordance with the guidelines contained in the Bureau of Local Roads and Streets manual. The special provisions and detailed estimate of cost shall be furnished in quadruplicate.
  - ☐ Furnish the LPA with survey and drafts in quadruplicate all necessary right-of-way dedications, construction easements and borrow pit and channel change agreements including prints of the corresponding plats and staking as required.

## II. THE LPA AGREES,

1. To furnish the ENGINEER all presently available survey data and information
2. To pay the ENGINEER as compensation for all services rendered in accordance with this AGREEMENT, on the basis of the following compensation formulas:

Cost Plus Fixed Fee      ☒ CPFF = 14.5%[DL + R(DL) + OH(DL) + IHDC], or  
                                 ☐ CPFF = 14.5%[DL + R(DL) + 1.4(DL) + IHDC], or  
                                 ☐ CPFF = 14.5%[(2.3 + R)DL + IHDC]

Where:      DL = Direct Labor  
                 IHDC = In House Direct Costs  
                 OH = Consultant Firm's Actual Overhead Factor  
                 R = Complexity Factor

Specific Rate              ☐ (Pay per element)

Lump Sum                ☐ \_\_\_\_\_

3. To pay the ENGINEER using one of the following methods as required by 49 CFR part 26 and 605 ILCS 5/5-409:

☐ With Retainage

- a) **For the first 50% of completed work**, and upon receipt of monthly invoices from the ENGINEER and the approval thereof by the LPA, monthly payments for the work performed shall be due and payable to the ENGINEER, such payments to be equal to 90% of the value of the partially completed work minus all previous partial payments made to the ENGINEER.
- b) **After 50% of the work is completed**, and upon receipt of monthly invoices from the ENGINEER and the approval thereof by the LPA, monthly payments covering work performed shall be due and payable to the ENGINEER, such payments to be equal to 95% of the value of the partially completed work minus all previous partial payments made to the ENGINEER.
- c) **Final Payment** – Upon approval of the work by the LPA but not later than 60 days after the work is completed and reports have been made and accepted by the LPA and the STATE, a sum of money equal to the basic fee as determined in this AGREEMENT less the total of the amounts of partial payments previously paid to the ENGINEER shall be due and payable to the ENGINEER.

☒ Without Retainage

- a) **For progressive payments** – Upon receipt of monthly invoices from the ENGINEER and the approval thereof by the LPA, monthly payments for the work performed shall be due and payable to the ENGINEER, such payments to be equal to the value of the partially completed work minus all previous partial payments made to the ENGINEER.
  - b) **Final Payment** – Upon approval of the work by the LPA but not later than 60 days after the work is completed and reports have been made and accepted by the LPA and STATE, a sum o money equal to the basic fee as determined in this AGREEMENT less the total of the amounts of partial payments previously paid to the ENGINEER shall be due and payable to the ENGINEER.
4. The recipient shall not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin or sex in the award and performance of any DOT-assisted contract or in the administration of its DBE program or the requirements of 49 CFR part 26. The recipient shall take all necessary and reasonable steps under 49 CFR part 26 to ensure nondiscrimination in the award and administration of DOT-assisted contracts. The recipient's DBE program, as required by 49 CFR part 26 and as approved by DOT, is incorporated by reference in this agreement. Implementation of this program is a legal obligation and failure to carry out its terms shall be treated as violation of this agreement. Upon notification to the recipient of its failure to carry out its approved program, the Department may impose sanctions as provided for under part 26 and may, in appropriate cases, refer the matter for enforcement under 18 U.S.C. 1001 and/or the Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act of 1986 (31U.S.C. 3801 et seq.).
  5. To certify by execution of this AGREEMENT that the selection of the ENGINEER was performed in accordance with the Local Government Professional Services Selection Act 50 ILCS 510, the Brooks Act 40USC 11, and Procurement, Management, and Administration of Engineering and Design related Services (23 CFR part 172). Exhibit C is required to be completed with this agreement.

## III. IT IS MUTALLY AGREED,

1. That no work shall be commenced by the ENGINEER prior to issuance by the LPA of a written Notice to Proceed.
2. That tracings, plans, specifications, estimates, maps and other documents prepared by the ENGINEER in accordance with this AGREEMENT shall be delivered to and become the property of the LPA and that basic survey notes, sketches, charts and other data prepared or obtained in accordance with this AGREEMENT shall be made available, upon request, to the LPA or to the STATE, without restriction or limitation as to their use.

3. That all reports, plans, estimates and special provisions furnished by the ENGINEER shall be in accordance with the current Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction, Bureau of Local Roads and Streets Administrative Policies, Federal-Aid Procedures for Local Highway Improvements or any other applicable requirements of the STATE, it being understood that all such furnished documents shall be approved by the LPA and the STATE before final acceptance. During the performance of the engineering services herein provided for, the ENGINEER shall be responsible for any loss or damage to the documents herein enumerated while they are in the ENGINEER's possession and any such loss or damage shall be restored at the ENGINEER's expense.
4. That none of the services to be furnished by the ENGINEER shall be sublet, assigned or transferred to any other party or parties without written consent of the LPA. The consent to sublet, assign or otherwise transfer any portion of the services to be furnished by the ENGINEER shall not be construed to relieve the ENGINEER of any responsibility for the fulfillment of this agreement.
5. To maintain, for a minimum of 3 years after the completion of the contract, adequate books, records and supporting documents to verify the amounts, recipients and uses of all disbursements of funds passing in conjunction with the contract; the contract and all books, records and supporting documents related to the contract shall be available for review and audit by the Auditor General and the STATE; and to provide full access to all relevant materials. Failure to maintain the books, records and supporting documents required by this section shall establish a presumption in favor of the STATE for the recovery of any funds paid by the STATE under the contract for which adequate books, records and supporting documentation are not available to support their purported disbursement.
6. The payment by the LPA in accordance with numbered paragraph 3 of Section II will be considered payment in full for all services rendered in accordance with this AGREEMENT whether or not they be actually enumerated in this AGREEMENT.
7. That the ENGINEER shall be responsible for any and all damages to property or persons arising out of an error, omission and/or negligent act in the prosecution of the ENGINEER's work and shall indemnify and save harmless the LPA, the STATE, and their officers, agents and employees from all suits, claims, actions or damages of any nature whatsoever resulting there from. These indemnities shall not be limited by the listing of any insurance policy.
8. This AGREEMENT may be terminated by the LPA upon giving notice in writing to the ENGINEER at the ENGINEER's last known post office address. Upon such termination, the ENGINEER shall cause to be delivered to the LPA all drawings, plats, surveys, reports, permits, agreements, soils and foundation analysis, provisions, specifications, partial and completed estimates and data, if any from soil survey and subsurface investigation with the understanding that all such material becomes the property of the LPA. The LPA will be responsible for reimbursement of all eligible expenses to date of the written notice of termination.
9. This certification is required by the Drug Free Workplace Act (30ILCS 580). The Drug Free Workplace Act requires that no grantee or contractor shall receive a grant or be considered for the purpose of being awarded a contract for the procurement of any property or service from the State unless that grantee or contractor will provide a drug free workplace. False certification or violation of the certification may result in sanctions including, but not limited to, suspension of contract or grant payments, termination of a contract or grant and debarment of the contracting or grant opportunities with the State for at least one (1) year but no more than five (5) years.

For the purpose of this certification, "grantee" or "contractor" means a corporation, partnership or other entity with twenty-five (25) or more employees at the time of issuing the grant, or a department, division or other unit thereof, directly responsible for the specific performance under a contract or grant of \$5,000 or more from the State, as defined in the Act.

The contractor/grantee certifies and agrees that it will provide a drug free workplace by:

- a. Publishing a statement:
  - (1) Notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession or use of a controlled substance, including cannabis, is prohibited in the grantee's or contractor's workplace.
  - (2) Specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violations of such prohibition.
  - (3) Notifying the employee that, as a condition of employment on such contract or grant, the employee will:
    - (a) abide by the terms of the statement; and
    - (b) notify the employer of any criminal drug statute conviction for a violation occurring in the workplace no later than five (5) days after such conviction.
- b. Establishing a drug free awareness program to inform employees about:
  - (1) The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace;
  - (2) The grantee's or contractor's policy of maintaining a drug free workplace;
  - (3) Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation and employee assistance program; and
  - (4) The penalties that may be imposed upon an employee for drug violations.
- c. Providing a copy of the statement required by subparagraph (a) to each employee engaged in the performance of the contract or grant and to post the statement in a prominent place in the workplace.
- d. Notifying the contracting or granting agency within ten (10) days after receiving notice under part (B) of paragraph (3) of subsection (a) above from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of such conviction.
- e. Imposing a sanction on, or requiring the satisfactory participation in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program by,
- f. Assisting employees in selecting a course of action in the event drug counseling, treatment and rehabilitation is required and indicating that a trained referral team is in place.
- g. Making a good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug free workplace through implementation of the Drug Free Workplace Act.

10. The ENGINEER or subconsultant shall not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin or sex in the performance of this AGREEMENT. The ENGINEER shall carry out applicable requirements of 49 CFR part 26 in the administration of DOT assisted contracts. Failure by the ENGINEER to carry out these requirements is a material breach of this AGREEMENT, which may result in the termination of this AGREEMENT or such other remedy as the LPA deems appropriate.
11. When the ENGINEER is requested to complete work outside the scope of the original AGREEMENT, a supplemental AGREEMENT will be required. Supplements will also be required for the addition or removal of subconsultants, direct costs, the use of previously unspecified staff, and other material changes to the original AGREEMENT.

#### Agreement Summary

Prime Consultant:	TIN Number	Agreement Amount
AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	95-2661922	

Sub-Consultants:	TIN Number	Agreement Amount
Environmental Design International, Inc.	36-3759119	\$132,993.00
Mathewson ROW Company	20-3870834	\$20,000.00
Strata Earth Services, LLC	27-3634206	\$34,000.00
Ehlers & Associates, Inc.	41-0837545	\$60,000.00
	Sub-Consultant Total:	\$246,993
	Prime Consultant Total:	\$1,067,953
	Total for all Work:	\$1,314,946

Executed by the LPA:

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Municipality/Township/County)

ATTEST:

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Clerk


By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Title: \_\_\_\_\_

(SEAL)

Executed by the ENGINEER:

ATTEST:

By:   
Title: Associate Vice President

AECOM Technical Services, Inc.  
By:   
Title: Authorized Signatory/Associate Vice President

## COST ESTIMATE OF CONSULTANTS SERVICES

AECOM

### Cap the Ike

Feasibility Study for Expanded Bridge Decking over I-290

Date: November 13, 2017

### Village of Oak Park

Engineering Division of the Public Works Department

Overhead Rate (OH) = 135.09%

Complexity (R) =

CPFF = 14.5%[DL + R(DL) + OH(DL) + IHDC]

		HOURS	PAYROLL	OVERHEAD AND FRINGES	IN HOUSE DIRECT COSTS	FIXED FEE	SERVICES BY OTHERS	TOTAL	% OF GRAND TOTAL
1	<b>Overall Corridor Wide Aesthetic Treatments</b>	1,240	59,717	80,671	8,548	21,596		170,531	13.0%
2	<b>Community Coordination</b>	980	54,296	73,349	7,500	19,596		154,741	11.8%
3	<b>Oak Park and East Avenue Decking Feasibility Study</b>	3,800	200,369	270,678	8,011	69,463		548,521	41.7%
	Environmental Design International (Survey and Environmental)						132,993	132,993	10.1%
	Mathewson ROW Company (Appraisal and ROW Services)						20,000	20,000	1.5%
	Strata Earth Services (Geotechnical Drilling)						34,000	34,000	2.6%
	Ehlers (TIF Eligibility and Housing Impact Analysis Services)						60,000	60,000	4.6%
4	<b>Oak Park Avenue Expanded Decking</b>	360	19,116	25,823		6,516		51,455	3.9%
5	<b>East Avenue Expanded Decking</b>	760	34,319	46,362		11,699		92,379	7.0%
6	<b>Other Bridge Enhancements</b>	360	18,696	25,256		6,373		50,325	3.8%
	<b>TOTAL</b>	7,500	\$ 386,512	\$ 522,139	\$ 24,059	\$ 135,243	\$ 246,993	\$ 1,314,946	100.0%

## COST ESTIMATE OF CONSULTANTS SERVICES

AECOM

### Cap the Ike

Feasibility Study for Expanded Bridge Decking over I-290

Date: November 13, 2017

### Village of Oak Park

Engineering Division of the Public Works Department

Overhead Rate (OH) = 135.09%

Complexity (R) =

CPFF = 14.5%[DL + R(DL) + OH(DL) + IHDC]

		HOURS	PAYROLL	OVERHEAD AND FRINGES	IN HOUSE DIRECT COSTS	FIXED FEE	SERVICES BY OTHERS	TOTAL	% OF GRAND TOTAL
1	<b>Overall Corridor Wide Aesthetic Treatments</b>	1,240	58,855	79,507	8,548	21,302		168,212	12.9%
2	<b>Community Coordination</b>	980	53,632	72,451	7,500	19,370		152,953	11.7%
3	<b>Oak Park and East Avenue Decking Feasibility Study</b>	3,800	198,010	267,492	8,011	68,659		542,172	41.6%
	Environmental Design International (Survey and Environmental)						132,993	132,993	10.2%
	Mathewson ROW Company (Appraisal and ROW Services)						20,000	20,000	1.5%
	Strata Earth Services (Geotechnical Drilling)						34,000	34,000	2.6%
	Ehlers (TIF Eligibility and Housing Impact Analysis Services)						60,000	60,000	4.6%
4	<b>Oak Park Avenue Expanded Decking</b>	360	18,963	25,617		6,464		51,044	3.9%
5	<b>East Avenue Expanded Decking</b>	760	33,862	45,744		11,543		91,148	7.0%
6	<b>Other Bridge Enhancements</b>	360	18,446	24,919		6,288		49,653	3.8%
	<b>TOTAL</b>	7,500	\$ 381,768	\$ 515,731	\$ 24,059	\$ 133,626	\$ 246,993	\$ 1,302,176	100.0%

# **HOOR ESTIMATE** AECOM

**Cap the Ike**  
Feasibility Study for Expanded Bridge Decking over I-290

**Village of Oak Park**  
Engineering Division of the Public Works Department

	ITEM DESCRIPTION	CLASSIFICATION and AVERAGE RATE															AECOM HOURS
		PD	PM	TS	PE	PP	PA	SE	SP	SA	E	P	A	ET	PMS		
		70.00	69.47	68.51	59.18	59.18	59.18	56.75	56.75	56.75	39.37	39.37	39.37	40.45	34.80		
A	<b>Overall Corridor Wide Aesthetic Treatments</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>200</b>				<b>120</b>			<b>120</b>			<b>440</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1240</b>	
i	Concept Design						120			120			200			440	
ii	Corridor Renderings												240	240		480	
	Project Management and QA/QC	20	200												100	320	
B	<b>Community Coordination</b>		<b>166</b>	<b>166</b>			<b>156</b>			<b>156</b>		<b>192</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>72</b>		<b>980</b>	
i	Coordination with Village Community Design Commission (5 meetings)		80	80			80			80		80				400	
ii	Coordination with East Ave Stakeholder Group (5 meetings)		40	40			40			40		40				200	
iii	Host Public Open House Meetings (3 meetings assumed)		36	36			36			36		72	72	72		360	
iv	Attendance and Presentation at Village Board Meetings (3 meetings)		10	10												20	
C	<b>Oak Park and East Avenue Decking Feasibility Study</b>		<b>40</b>	<b>724</b>	<b>730</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>390</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>570</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>604</b>	<b>310</b>		<b>3800</b>	
i	Coordination with CTA on Blue Line Vision Study		40	20	20											80	
ii	Aesthetic Treatments			320			120			120			240			800	
iii	Environmental Sustainability						20			20			40			80	
iv	Topographic Survey (by EDI)										20					20	
v	Geotechnical Investigation			20	20			50			40			70		200	
vi	Structural Analysis and Draft TS&L			240	600			240			400			80		1560	
vii	ROW acquisition title research, survey, and estimated cost (by EDI)																
viii	Potential environmental impacts per NEPA (by EDI)																
ix	Changes for roadway geometry, adjacent local street network			10	40			40			40					130	
x	Parking and traffic impacts, needs, opportunities			20				40			40					100	
xi	Utility impacts, public and private (by EDI)																
xii	Potential impacts to proposed noise walls along I-290			40	20			20								80	
xiii	Economic analysis on benefits and impacts to surrounding community			16		24						60				100	
xiv	Develop renderings of proposed improvements												320	160		480	
xv	Potential long term operating costs			8		8	8		4	4		4	4			40	
xvi	Preliminary cost estimates for each deck			30	30		20			20	30					130	
D	<b>Oak Park Avenue Expanded Decking</b>			<b>156</b>		<b>20</b>						<b>184</b>				<b>360</b>	
i	Identify potential funding mechanisms (TIF, PPP)			20		20						60				100	
ii	Determine potential uses of expanded decking			16								24				40	
iii	Evaluate economic viability and demand for development			120								100				220	
E	<b>East Avenue Expanded Decking</b>			<b>60</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>40</b>		<b>12</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>240</b>		<b>760</b>	
i	Determine potential uses of expanded decking			4	4	4	4		4			4				24	
ii	Identify potential partnerships for funding and maintenance			4		4			4			4				16	
iii	Concept design of athletic field / park space			40			40			40			320	240		680	
iv	Evaluate potential tunnel condition for I-290 and impacts			8	8			8								24	
v	Determine opportunities to acquire and incorporate adjacent ROW			4		4			4			4				16	
F	<b>Other Bridge Enhancements</b>			<b>32</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>80</b>		<b>8</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>112</b>			<b>360</b>	
i	Identify aesthetic enhancements						40			40			80			160	
ii	Potential long term operating and maintenance costs of aesthetics			8			16			16			16			56	
iii	Preliminary cost estimates for each enhancement			8			16			16			16			56	
iv	Feasibility, best land usage, concept level cost estimates for Ridgeland and Lombard to assess for further study			8		8	8			8	8	8				48	
v	Potential opportunities for expanded deck on Harlem and Austin			8	8	8			8			8				40	
TOTAL		20	406	1138	750	80	568	398	24	560	578	468	1548	862	100	7,500	



## AVERAGE HOURLY PROJECT RATES

**FIRM** AECOM  
**CLIENT** Village of Oak Park  
**Project** Cap the Ike

**DATE** 11/13/17

**SHEET** 1 OF 2

PAYROLL  CLASSIFICATION	AVG HOURLY RATES	TOTAL PROJECT RATES			Overall Corridor Wide Aesthetics			Community Coordination			Oak Park and East Avenue Deck			Oak Park Avenue Expanded Deck			East Avenue Expanded Deck		
		Hours	% Part.	Wgtd Avg	Hours	% Part.	Wgtd Avg	Hours	% Part.	Wgtd Avg	Hours	% Part.	Wgtd Avg	Hours	% Part.	Wgtd Avg	Hours	% Part.	Wgtd Avg
Project Director (PD)	70.00	20	0.27%	0.19	20	1.61%	1.13	0			0			0			0		
Project Manager (PM)	69.47	406	5.41%	3.76	200	16.13%	11.20	166	16.94%	11.77	40	1.05%	0.73	0			0		
Technical Specialist (TS)	68.51	1138	15.17%	10.40	0			166	16.94%	11.60	724	19.05%	13.05	156	43.33%	29.69	60	7.89%	5.41
Project Engineer (PE)	59.18	750	10.00%	5.92	0			0			730	19.21%	11.37	0			12	1.58%	0.93
Project Planner (PP)	59.18	80	1.07%	0.63	0			0			32	0.84%	0.50	20	5.56%	3.29	12	1.58%	0.93
Project Architect (PA)	59.18	568	7.57%	4.48	120	9.68%	5.73	156	15.92%	9.42	168	4.42%	2.62	0			44	5.79%	3.43
Senior Engineer (SE)	56.75	398	5.31%	3.01	0			0			390	10.26%	5.82	0			8	1.05%	0.60
Senior Planner (SP)	56.75	24	0.32%	0.18	0			0			4	0.11%	0.06	0			12	1.58%	0.90
Senior Architect (SA)	56.75	560	7.47%	4.24	120	9.68%	5.49	156	15.92%	9.03	164	4.32%	2.45	0			40	5.26%	2.99
Engineer (E)	39.37	578	7.71%	3.03	0			0			570	15.00%	5.91	0			0		
Planner (P)	39.37	468	6.24%	2.46	0			192	19.59%	7.71	64	1.68%	0.66	184	51.11%	20.12	12	1.58%	0.62
Architect (A)	39.37	1548	20.64%	8.13	440	35.48%	13.97	72	7.35%	2.89	604	15.89%	6.26	0			320	42.11%	16.58
Engineering Technician, Design	40.45	862	11.49%	4.65	240	19.35%	7.83	72	7.35%	2.97	310	8.16%	3.30	0			240	31.58%	12.77
PM Support (PMS)	34.80	100	1.33%	0.46	100	8.06%	2.81	0			0			0			0		
<b>TOTALS</b>		7500	100%	\$51.53	1240	100%	\$48.16	980	100%	\$55.40	3800	100%	\$52.73	360	100%	\$53.10	760	100%	\$45.16

## AVERAGE HOURLY PROJECT RATES

<b>FIRM</b>	<b>AECOM</b>
<b>CLIENT</b>	<b>Village of Oak Park</b>
<b>Project</b>	<b>Cap the Ike</b>

DATE 11/13/17

**SHEET**      2      **OF**      2

PAYROLL  CLASSIFICATION	AVG HOURLY RATES	Other Bridge Enhancements																	
		Hours	% Part.	Wgtd Avg	Hours	% Part.	Wgtd Avg	Hours	% Part.	Wgtd Avg	Hours	% Part.	Wgtd Avg	Hours	% Part.	Wgtd Avg	Hours	% Part.	Wgtd Avg
Project Director (PD)	70.00	0																	
Project Manager (PM)	69.47	0																	
Technical Specialist (TS)	68.51	32	8.89%	6.09															
Project Engineer (PE)	59.18	8	2.22%	1.32															
Project Planner (PP)	59.18	16	4.44%	2.63															
Project Architect (PA)	59.18	80	22.22%	13.15															
Senior Engineer (SE)	56.75	0																	
Senior Planner (SP)	56.75	8	2.22%	1.26															
Senior Architect (SA)	56.75	80	22.22%	12.61															
Engineer (E)	39.37	8	2.22%	0.87															
Planner (P)	39.37	16	4.44%	1.75															
Architect (A)	39.37	112	31.11%	12.25															
Engineering Technican, Des	40.45	0																	
PM Support (PMS)	34.80	0																	
TOTALS		360	100%	\$51.93	0	0%	\$0.00	0	0%	\$0.00	0	0%	\$0.00	0	0%	\$0.00	0	0%	\$0.00

**PAYROLL ESCALATION TABLE  
ANNIVERSARY RAISES**

FIRM NAME  
PRIME/SUPPLEMENT

AECOM  
Prime

DATE 11/13/17  
PTB NO. Cap the Ike

CONTRACT TERM 12 MONTHS  
START DATE 12/1/2017  
RAISE DATE ANNIVERSARY

OVERHEAD RATE 135.09%  
COMPLEXITY FACTOR 0  
% OF RAISE 3.00%

**ESCALATION PER YEAR**

**DETERMINE THE MID POINT OF THE AGREEMENT**

6

**CALCULATE THE ESCALATION FACTOR TO THE MIDPOINT OF THE CONTRACT**

1.50%

The total escalation for this project would be: 1.50%

## PAYROLL RATES

**FIRM NAME**  
**PRIME/SUPPLEMENT**  
**PTB NO.**

<b>AECOM</b>	<b>DATE</b>
<b>Prime</b>	
<b>Cap the Ike</b>	

**DATE** 11/13/17

<b>ESCALATION FACTOR</b>	<b>1.50%</b>
--------------------------	--------------

[illegible]

**COMPANY NAME: AECOM**

PTB NUMBER: **Village of Oak Park, Cap the Ike**

TODAY'S DATE: **11/13/2017**

ITEM	ALLOWABLE	UTILIZE W.O. ONLY	QUANTITY J.S. ONLY	CONTRACT RATE	TOTAL
Per Diem (per GOVERNOR'S TRAVEL CONTROL BOARD)	Up to state rate maximum		12	\$215.00	\$2,580.00
Lodging (per GOVERNOR'S TRAVEL CONTROL BOARD)	Actual cost (Up to state rate maximum)			\$0.00	\$0.00
Lodging Taxes and Fees (per GOVERNOR'S TRAVEL CONTROL BOARD)	Actual cost			\$0.00	\$0.00
Air Fare	Coach rate, actual cost, requires minimum two weeks' notice, with prior IDOT approval		12	\$436.00	\$5,232.00
Vehicle Mileage (per GOVERNOR'S TRAVEL CONTROL BOARD)	Up to state rate maximum		300	\$0.535	\$160.50
Vehicle Owned or Leased	\$32.50/half day (4 hours or less) or \$65/full day			\$0.00	\$0.00
Vehicle Rental	Actual cost (Up to \$55/day)		5	\$55.00	\$275.00
Tolls	Actual cost			\$0.00	\$0.00
Parking	Actual cost			\$0.00	\$0.00
Overtime	Premium portion (Submit supporting documentation)			\$0.00	\$0.00
Shift Differential	Actual cost (Based on firm's policy)			\$0.00	\$0.00
Overnight Delivery/Postage/Courier Service	Actual cost (Submit supporting documentation)		10	\$30.00	\$300.00
Copies of Deliverables/Mylars (In-house)	Actual cost (Submit supporting documentation)		1,000	\$1.50	\$1,500.00
Copies of Deliverables/Mylars (Outside)	Actual cost (Submit supporting documentation)		1,000	\$3.00	\$3,000.00
Project Specific Insurance	Actual cost			\$0.00	\$0.00
Monuments (Permanent)	Actual cost			\$0.00	\$0.00
Photo Processing	Actual cost			\$0.00	\$0.00
2-Way Radio (Survey or Phase III Only)	Actual cost			\$0.00	\$0.00
Telephone Usage (Traffic System Monitoring Only)	Actual cost			\$0.00	\$0.00
CADD	Actual cost (Max \$15/hour)			\$0.00	\$0.00
Web Site	Actual cost (Submit supporting documentation)			\$0.00	\$0.00
Advertisements	Actual cost (Submit supporting documentation)		3	\$500.00	\$1,500.00
Public Meeting Facility Rental	Actual cost (Submit supporting documentation)			\$0.00	\$0.00
Public Meeting Exhibits/Renderings & Equipment	Actual cost (Submit supporting documentation)		3	\$2,000.00	\$6,000.00
Recording Fees	Actual cost			\$0.00	\$0.00
Transcriptions (specific to project)	Actual cost			\$0.00	\$0.00
Courthouse Fees	Actual cost			\$0.00	\$0.00
Storm Sewer Cleaning and Televising	Actual cost (Requires 2-3 quotes with IDOT approval)			\$0.00	\$0.00
Traffic Control and Protection	Actual cost (Requires 2-3 quotes with IDOT approval)			\$0.00	\$0.00
Aerial Photography and Mapping	Actual cost (Requires 2-3 quotes with IDOT approval)			\$0.00	\$0.00
Utility Exploratory Trenching	Actual cost (Requires 2-3 quotes with IDOT approval)			\$0.00	\$0.00
Testing of Soil Samples*	Actual cost		1	\$0.00	\$0.00
Lab Services*	Actual cost (Provide breakdown of each cost)		1	\$3,511.00	\$3,511.00
Equipment and/or Specialized Equipment Rental*	Actual cost (Requires 2-3 quotes with IDOT approval)			\$0.00	\$0.00
Geotechnical Drilling (70' borings)			4	\$8,500.00	\$34,000.00
TIF eligibility services			1	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00
Housing Impact Analysis			1	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00
Appraisal and ROW services			1	\$20,000.00	\$20,000.00
				\$0.00	\$0.00
				\$0.00	\$0.00
				\$0.00	\$0.00
				\$0.00	\$0.00
				\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>TOTAL DIRECT COST</b>					<b>\$138,058.50</b>

\*If other allowable costs are needed and not listed, please add in the above spaces provided.

**LEGEND**

W.O. = Work Order

J.S. = Job Specific

## REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

## AECOM CLARIFICATIONS

### A. Overall corridor wide aesthetic treatments

Develop aesthetic concepts for treatments for expanded bridge decking and for aesthetic enhancements to other bridges over I-290 in Oak Park. Corridor aesthetic concept shall include how potential noise wall aesthetics and materials fit within these concepts.

Home Avenue Bridge will be part of a separate phase I study. As such the only proposed scope at Home Avenue Bridge included in the feasibility study is related to item A for evaluating potential designs for how they relate to the overall corridor aesthetic.

AECOM will review the project area with the Village and its stakeholders, making initial assessments and noting adjacent projects and ongoing planning efforts. We will listen to preliminary programming ideas identifying goals, challenges and key milestones in conjunction with structural analysis and economic opportunities early on in the design process. Development of concepts will build upon technical and stakeholder / community feedback.

### B. Community coordination

i. The Consultant shall work with the Village's Community Design Commission to refine aesthetic treatment options, as well as through public open houses, and ultimately Village Board meetings for aesthetic treatments

AECOM understands that the Oak Park community is active and engaged in public interests. Collaborating with the Oak Park Community Design Commission, East Avenue stakeholders and the Oak Park community at large will be a priority of the project. The Village will assist in scheduling and facilitating all meetings, as well as provide a meeting venue. The cost of facility rental to host meetings is not included in this estimate. AECOM will conduct a design charrette with the Community Design Commission, working closely with this group to develop criteria for the establishment of design options and solicit feedback on conceptual ideas. This effort includes meeting presentation materials for up to five (5) meetings with the Community Design Commission.

ii. The Consultant shall work with a stakeholder group for East Ave decking after preferred usage is identified

Attendance and presentation at up to five (5) meetings each with the Community Design Commission and the East Avenue Stakeholder Group are assumed.

iii. The Consultant shall host public open house meetings to gather input from the community about the project

Up to three (3) public open house meetings of up to four (4) hours duration each are assumed. AECOM's work will include preparation and printing of meeting exhibits and materials.

iv. The Consultant shall attend Village Board meetings to present proposed concepts and gather Board input and to present the final feasibility study

AECOM will attend up to three (3) Village Board meetings to present the work and solicit feedback.

## REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

### C. **Oak Park and East Avenue Decking**

The Oak Park Avenue and East Avenue expanded decking locations shall be studied for necessary information to determine the feasibility of construction, the best use, and community benefits. The feasibility study at both locations shall include the following elements:

- i. Incorporating CTA blue line station into decking concepts as part of the Blue Line Vision Study and coordinate study with CTA
- ii. Incorporating aesthetic treatments on bridge into any expanded decking options. Conceptual ideas for treatments, or level of investment, were identified in the LOI with IDOT.
- iii. Incorporating environmental sustainability concepts into design and/or creating a net neutral building/amenities
- iv. Preparing topographic surveys of areas

## AECOM CLARIFICATIONS

The primary deliverable will be a comprehensive feasibility study summarizing engineering challenges, architectural/aesthetic, economic, capital and operating cost, and next steps to proceed with the effort. The effort for compiling this document is included within the various work tasks. A draft study will be submitted to the Village of Oak Park for review, followed by a final study addressing or incorporating review comments. With the effort developed in coordination with Village stakeholder groups, only one round of review/comment is anticipated.

AECOM will review current plans for the Blue Line Vision and meet with CTA to integrate the Blue Line Vision Study into design concepts for proposed improvements.

AECOM anticipates developing design concepts for comprehensive, integrated treatments involving the bridge, the CTA station, and proposed development/commercial building options and/or athletic field/park space.

General concepts for incorporating green infrastructure will be incorporated into the concepts. The detailed design of these systems is not included in the work.

Survey efforts will be led by Environmental Design International (EDI). Survey control will be horizontally based on Illinois State Plane Coordinate System, NAD '83 (2011) East Zone, vertically based on NAVD 88 from NGS Published Data. EDI will conduct route surveys to locate physical features including pavement differentiated by type and usage, traffic signals, signs and street lighting, as well as public and private utilities. Roadway cross sections will be taken at 50-foot intervals.

#### Oak Park Avenue Cap Survey

- Oak Park Avenue survey limits: approximately 500 linear feet north of Harrison Street and 500 linear feet south of Garfield including the structure over I-290.
- Harrison Street survey limits: 500 linear feet east and west of S. Oak Park Avenue
- Garfield Street survey limits: 650 linear feet east of and 500 linear feet west of S. Oak Park Avenue.
- S. Grove Avenue and S. Euclid Avenue survey limits: 200 linear feet north of Harrison and 200 linear feet south of Garfield
- Alleys within the limits will be surveyed to 50 feet of the adjacent streets.
- The deck of the S. Oak Park Avenue structure over I-290.

## REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

## AECOM CLARIFICATIONS

### East Avenue Cap Survey

- East Avenue survey limits: approximately 500 linear feet north of Harrison Street and 500 linear feet south of Garfield including the structure over I-290.
- Harrison Street and Garfield Street survey limits: 500 linear feet west of S. East Avenue to 1,000 linear feet east of S. East Avenue (the east line of S. Elmwood Avenue extended) including the IDOT Traffic Control Center between Harrison and I-290.
- S. Grove Avenue, S. Euclid Avenue, and S. Elmwood Avenue will be surveyed 200 linear feet north of Harrison and 200 linear feet south of Garfield.
- Alleys within the limits will be surveyed to 50 feet of the adjacent streets.
- The deck of the East Avenue structure over I-290.

### I-290 and adjacent CTA and rail facilities

EDI plans to utilize LiDAR scanning technology to gather feasibility stage existing conditions of the I-290 mainline, limited structural elements, medians, and rail facilities.

- v. Geotechnical investigation for subsurface structural soil conditions

The new caps will span over active lanes of I-290 (EB and WB) and CTA right-of-way (ROW), which includes four tracks. At the time this estimate was created, it is assumed that the caps will be supported on deep foundations (steel piles or drilled shafts). We assume that preliminarily, piers will be located along the shoulders of I-290, in the median between the EB and WB lanes of I-290, and in the median space between CTA tracks 3 and 4. Based on IDOT geotechnical investigation standards, a boring would normally be advanced at each substructure location.

**However, as this is a feasibility-level study, we understand that a full geotechnical investigation is not required at this time. For this reason, we have only included borings at the abutments of the two structures.**

- Our drilling subcontractor will obtain public utility clearance through a Joint Underground Locating Information for Excavators (JULIE) request at the proposed boring locations. Our drilling subcontractor will also coordinate with the Village of Oak Park personnel to obtain the appropriate drilling permits and identify if any existing onsite utilities and other below grade structures that might interfere with the selected boring locations are present.
- Mobilize a truck-mounted drill rig to the site to complete four (4) borings, with two (2) borings being completed at each structure location. We anticipate that at each cap location, two of the borings will be located at the abutments on opposite ends of the span on the shoulders of Harrison Street and Garfield Street. Our subcontractor drillers will coordinate with the Village of Oak Park to obtain any needed permits and



## REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

## AECOM CLARIFICATIONS

give notification in advance of the soil borings performed. We do not anticipate needing any IDOT permits to perform this work. After boring locations have been approved, we will have an AECOM representative from our Chicago office (or a representative of the drilling subcontractor) field locate each boring prior to the start of drilling operations.

- Advance each of the four borings to a minimum depth of 70 ft or practical refusal, whichever occurs first. Per IDOT requirements, bridge borings should be advanced to a minimum depth suitable to achieve a minimum Nominal Driven Bearing capacity of 500 kips for a 14 in. diameter metal shell pile (per the side resistance and end bearing given in Tables C.3-1 through C.3-9 in Appendix C.3 of the IDOT Geotechnical Manual). (If design loading values are known at the time of drilling, deviation from the 500 kip value is permitted). Borings deeper than the depths noted above may be required to ascertain foundation bearing capacities in accordance with project requirements if suitable bearing soils are not encountered, or the minimum estimated Nominal Driven Bearing capacities are not achieved, prior to the proposed termination depths. If suitable bearing soils are not encountered prior to the proposed termination depths, then the borings will be advanced a minimum of 5 additional feet until suitable bearing soils are encountered, or the minimum estimated Nominal Driven Bearing capacities are achieved. If rock is encountered prior to the termination depths listed, rock coring will be completed in up to two (2) of the boreholes. The price for rock coring is not included in the estimate.
- Obtain representative soil samples at 2.5-foot intervals in the upper 30 feet and at 5-foot intervals thereafter to the planned termination depths of the borings, in accordance with IDOT requirements. Soil samples will be obtained using split-spoon sampling techniques in general accordance with ASTM Standard D 1586. A field geologist or engineer will classify and log the recovered samples. Hand penetrometer and Rimac tests will be performed on the recovered samples in the field.
- Observe soil and groundwater conditions while drilling and sampling and prepare field logs documenting drilling methods, SPT results, soil condition observations, and groundwater measurements.
- Backfill and abandon the boreholes in accordance with Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA) regulations after completion. The surface of any existing asphalt will be restored with cold asphalt patch.

## REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

## AECOM CLARIFICATIONS

- Review and classify the retained samples in general accordance with the Unified Soil Classification System (USCS). Routine visual classification and moisture content tests will be performed on representative samples obtained from the borings, as necessary, and boring logs prepared.
- Prepare a combined Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering letter report that covers both structures, under the direction of a Professional Engineer registered in the State of Illinois. The geotechnical report will describe the subsurface exploration program and provide geologic characterizations of the soil and groundwater conditions encountered in the borings and those expected during construction. The geotechnical report will also include preliminary recommendations for the design of the structure foundations in accordance with the AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, 7th edition, published 2014, with 2016 updates, and IDOT requirements. The preliminary recommendations are summarized as follows:
  - a. Bearing capacity (compression and uplift) and settlement estimates for deep foundations;
  - b. Lateral pile analyses (LPILE) parameters for deep foundations;
  - c. Design depths for frost protection;
  - d. Lateral earth pressure parameters and coefficient of sliding friction for design of below grade structures;
  - e. Subgrade preparation procedures;
  - f. Slope stability recommendations;
  - g. Backfill materials recommendations, including placement and compaction requirements, as well as recommendations for the potential re-use of on-site materials as compacted fill;
  - h. Seismic site classification in accordance with the International Building Code; and
  - i. Construction considerations based on the soil and conditions encountered during drilling operations

We do not anticipate any IDOT drilling permits being required for the four abutment borings. Permits for drilling within Oak Park typically take between 1 and 2 weeks. The lead time required for scheduling a drilling subcontractor is approximately 3 weeks at this time. However, these items can be done concurrently. We would start the scheduling and permitting process upon receiving a notice to proceed. At least a 2 day notice is required to obtain JULIE clearance. It should take us approximately 4 working days to complete the field portion and one week to perform the laboratory portion of work for the base scope of services. Preliminary verbal recommendations can be provided as the results of our field and laboratory test programs become available.

## REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

## AECOM CLARIFICATIONS

This proposal and cost estimate was developed with the following assumptions:

- The boring locations are accessible via a truck-mounted drill rig and overhead utilities or other structures will not impede the implementation of the scope of work presented within this proposal.
- Per the descriptions above, a boring will not be completed at each proposed substructure location.
- Pricing includes an allowance for drilling permits within Oak Park. No IDOT permits, interstate lane closures, or movement of traffic barriers is included.
- Pricing includes a roadway flagger for drilling along public streets.
- We assume that no environmental impacts will be encountered during our subsurface exploration program.
- Restoration activities other than backfilling the boring, pavement patching, and general cleanup around the drilling site have not been included in the cost to perform the work.
- Subsurface utilities that are present within the work area will be located through JULIE.
- AECOM and its subcontractor will not be responsible for damage to unmarked utilities.
- No soil or water disposal is included in the scope of work. Cuttings and spoils from the drilling activities will be placed in steel drums as needed, and AECOM assumes that these can remain on site.
- No mark-ups have been included for subcontractors.

- vi. Structural analysis to investigate structure type, abutment and pier locations, and develop draft TS&L. This shall be coordinated with IDOT's I-290 reconstruction project to determine opportunities for synergy, construction planning, and avoiding conflicts.

The cap at the East Ave is proposed to be 415' long while the cap at Oak Park Ave is proposed to be 150' in length. The caps are anticipated to support a variety of aesthetic features, including landscaping, recreational and moderate one story commercial establishments. AECOM will perform a feasibility study to determine potential structural solutions for the caps. Due to the large span and anticipated loads, it will be supported on multiple rows of substructure units. The caps will span over active lanes of I-290 (EB and WB) and CTA tracks. We anticipate that piers can be located along the shoulders of I-290, median between EB and WB lanes and median space between CTA tracks 3 and 4. Substructure design will include feasible types and locations of piers/abutments and deep foundations (steel piles or drilled shafts). Crash walls are anticipated to protect the piers adjacent to CTA tracks. AECOM will investigate the possibility of existing retaining walls along the north and south of the expressway to support partial loads from the caps, though separate foundations are more likely. Existing bridge elements most likely will not be utilized to provide any supports to the caps; rather an independent substructure will be proposed. Superstructure options will consider the requirement of minimum vertical clearance over the Expressway and CTA. This feasibility study will

## REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

## AECOM CLARIFICATIONS

include preliminary structural analysis to determine superstructure elements that will meet the desired clearances while providing the ability to connect to the existing bridge sidewalks. Substructure elements will have to be selected to keep the footprints as small as possible to minimize impacts to traffic below during construction.

### Exclusions:

- Existing bridges at East and Oak Park Avenues and retaining walls along the north and south of the expressway will receive a cursory inspection only. Detailed inspection and load rating/repairs of existing bridge elements are not included in the scope.
- Draft Type, Size and Location (TSL) Plans for the caps will include general plan, elevation and section through critical areas to identify key design elements and minimum vertical clearances. AECOM will coordinate with IDOT, CTA and other affected agencies to obtain their initial input and incorporate their comments; final approvals from these agencies is anticipated to be obtained at a later stage during the Final TSL preparation and not for this feasibility study.

- vii. Determine any right-of-way (ROW) acquisition needed by researching historical title records (including air rights research), performing ALTA surveys, and estimating cost for any ROW acquisition needed.

EDI will survey up to ten (10) parcels for boundary/Right of Way and development of ALTA/NSPS Land Title Surveys, including the IDOT Traffic Control Center between Harrison and I-290. EDI will acquire Title Commitments to base the surveys on. Parent tracts will be surveyed, and Land Acquisition documents including Legal Descriptions will be developed in conformance with Illinois Standards of Practice for Boundary Surveys and signed and sealed by an Illinois Professional Land Surveyor.

Additional budget has been included for ROW acquisition consultation and appraisals (limited by available budget) by Mathewson Right-of-Way Company. ROW acquisition services and negotiation are not anticipated for this effort.

- viii. Determining potential environmental impacts from expanded decking according to NEPA guidelines

EDI will perform an Environmental Survey (Records Phase) in compliance with the Illinois Bureau of Design and Environment Manual Section 24-2.03. A cursory evaluation will be performed to identify the implementation "roadmap" going forward but will not consist of formal NEPA documentation or processing.

- ix. Determining any recommended changes to geometry of adjacent local street network from expanded decking

This assessment will focus on tying in adjacent roadways to proposed improvements and is not anticipated to include substantial roadway corridor concept design more than 500' beyond the anticipated caps.

- x. Determining parking and traffic impacts, needs, and opportunities

AECOM will utilize existing traffic data as available, using ITE trip generation methodology to perform a cursory assessment on the

## REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

## AECOM CLARIFICATIONS

from decking and usages	operational capacity of intersections and roadways directly adjacent to the caps. Sophisticated traffic projections and Travel Demand Modeling on a network basis are not anticipated, nor is the preparation of a formal Traffic Impact Study for a potential development.
xi. Determine utility impacts of expanded decking including public and private utility relocation and coordination (such as Village's water and sewer, ComEd, ATT, Nicor, etc.)	EDI will conduct a utility survey collecting rim and invert elevations of public utilities and correlated them with available records. The work will involve identifying utility conflicts and suggesting potential relocations, but will not include the design of, coordinating with or resolution of utility conflicts for future construction.
xii. Determine potential impacts to proposed noise walls along I-290	AECOM anticipates integrating noise wall considerations and aesthetics into the design of Oak Park and East Ave. cap concepts in-kind as designed by the I-290 consultant. This work is not anticipated to include a new noise analysis.
xiii. Economic analysis to provide information about benefits and impacts to surrounding community from planned use	<p>As the AECOM team moves into the analysis of infrastructure and design issues that result in the development of order of magnitude construction costs, AECOM can begin to identify more specific economic and fiscal impacts associated with the project.</p> <p><i>Construction Period Impacts</i></p> <p>Using standard industry benchmarks tied to input-output models such as IMPLAN, we can estimate construction period spending and the number of construction jobs created over the duration of the project.</p> <p><i>Operating Period Impacts &amp; Fiscal Benefits</i></p> <p>Based on real estate market analysis findings associated with analysis of the core study area surrounding the Oak Park / East Avenue area conducted during task D.iii, the team will define a series of potential impacts (economic and fiscal) associated with the project. The nature of these impacts will link with decisions made in task D.i regarding preferred revenue streams that might be accessed. Quantification or monetization of potential benefits in a benefit-cost framework in conformance with USDOT grant application guidance (e.g., TIGER grants) is not included but can be prepared upon request.</p>
xiv. Developing detailed architectural renderings of proposed improvements	Renderings will be a combination of 3D images as well as colored plans.
xv. Determining potential long term operating costs	
xvi. Determine preliminary cost estimates for each deck including	

## REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

## AECOM CLARIFICATIONS

design engineering, land acquisition, construction, etc.

### D. Oak Park Avenue Expanded Decking

(in addition to items A & B above)

- i. Identifying potential funding mechanisms for construction including evaluating options to create a TIF or public/private partnership

AECOM will work with Village Staff to evaluate fiscal implications associated with additional funding mechanisms and revenue streams that could sustain project construction, which based on experience could include:

- Parking Revenue
- Tax Increment Financing
- Special Assessment Districts
- Storm water impact fee
- Advertising, Sponsorship, and Naming Rights
- Tax on off-street parking
- Event permitting revenue
- Sales Tax / Food & beverage tax
- Zoning and density bonuses
- Rents collected on commercial space developed within the project
- Public-private partnerships
- Other taxes under consideration by Village officials

Discussion of these revenue streams would be tied to broader policy discussions with Village Staff, linked with analysis of Village Comprehensive Annual Financial Statements.

As noted in task C.xiii, AECOM can develop order of magnitude estimates of potential revenue generation associated with the preferred alternative.

Ehlers will perform a TIF eligibility study for a TIF District in the vicinity of the Oak Park Avenue CTA Blue Line Station including feasibility analysis, preparation of redevelopment plan, and adoption of project. Additional budget has been included for Ehlers to perform a Housing Impact Statement/Study if necessary for this project.

- ii. Determine potential uses of expanded decking including commercial building and/or public plaza type spaces

AECOM will review demographic, land use and residential and commercial real estate market trends for a defined study area around the Oak Park & East Avenue site, put in context with Village-wide and regional trends. The intent of the analysis will be to clarify:

- iii. Evaluating economic viability and demand for a development on expanded decking including building size, usage, potential marketability and leasing of commercial spaces

- Local market demographic drivers and income levels
- Trends regarding lease rates and land & building values for residential and commercial uses
- Indications regarding condition and occupancy for existing retail, residential, and commercial buildings.
- Estimation of baseline assessed real estate values within the

## REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

## AECOM CLARIFICATIONS

---

core study area, in context with Village-wide data; trends over time will be studied.

This focused market analysis will produce real estate performance metrics that will drive subsequent feasibility and impact analysis. AECOM will support team efforts to:

- Determine potential uses of expanded decking including commercial building and/or public plaza type spaces
- Evaluate economic viability and demand for a development on expanded decking including building size, usage, potential marketability and leasing of commercial spaces
- Provide conceptual plans, elevations and 3D sketches of commercial building options.

Outcomes from this task will drive understanding of the order of magnitude program requirements and the need for offsetting revenue streams.

**E. East Avenue Expanded Decking** (in addition to items A & B above)

- i. Determine potential uses of expanded decking including track and field type usage or other athletic fields and park spaces.
- ii. Identifying potential partnerships for funding and maintaining amenities on surface of deck such as school districts, private schools, or park district for such usages as track and field or athletic fields. Work with these potential stakeholders in the planning process of the expanded decking.
- iii. Conceptual design of preferred alternate of athletic field/park space
- iv. Evaluate if expanded decking would create a tunnel condition with I-290 and determine infrastructure necessary for a tunnel and impacts to IDOT's design of I-290 reconstruction project
- v. Determine opportunities for acquiring ROW from adjacent properties on south side of Harrison Street east of site for

Placement of athletic fields in an assortment of locations and options for Olympics sports such as softball, track, soccer, etc. Includes plan and 3D sketches, sections.

A cursory evaluation based on anticipated tunnel length will be performed with key infrastructure needs identified but not designed.

This proposal includes effort for ROW consultation and appraisal services by Mathewson ROW Company, limited by available budget

## REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

## AECOM CLARIFICATIONS

incorporating into proposed concepts

**F. Other Bridge enhancements at Harlem, Ridgeland, Lombard, & Austin** (in addition to items A & B above)

- i. Identify aesthetic enhancements to bridges which fit with the surrounding community and the overall I-290 corridor. Conceptual ideas for treatments, or level of investment, were identified in the LOI with IDOT in exhibit 6. (applies to Ridgeland and Lombard)
- ii. Determining potential long term operating and maintenance costs of bridge aesthetic enhancements
- iii. Determine preliminary cost estimates for each bridge aesthetic enhancement including design engineering, land acquisition, construction, etc.
- iv. Determine feasibility, best land usage, and conceptual level cost estimates (per square foot type estimate) for expanded decking opportunities at Ridgeland and Lombard identified in LOI in exhibit 2 to determine if these locations should be considered for further study and development. No subsurface investigation, surveying, or engineering studies at these two locations are included in this scope.
- v. Determine opportunities for utilizing expanded decking opportunities at the Harlem Ave and Austin Blvd bridges identified in exhibit 2 of LOI. Potential options could include solar farms or prairie planting type spaces.

Renderings will be a combination of 3D images as well as colored plans.

This task will leverage the real estate market analysis work conducted in Tasks D.ii and D.iii as a basis for concept development in these locations.



Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone \_\_\_\_\_

TIN Number \_\_\_\_\_

Local Agency \_\_\_\_\_  
 Section Number \_\_\_\_\_  
 Project Number \_\_\_\_\_  
 Job Number \_\_\_\_\_

[illegible]

Date \_\_\_\_\_

For information about IDOTs collection and use of confidential information review the department's [Identity Protection Policy](#).

# Exhibit C

## Federal Qualification Based Selection (QBS) Checklist

Local Public Agency \_\_\_\_\_  
 Section Number \_\_\_\_\_  
 Project Number \_\_\_\_\_  
 Job Number \_\_\_\_\_

The LPA must complete Exhibit C, if federal funds are used for this engineering agreement and the value will exceed \$25,000. The LPA must follow federal small purchase procedures, if federal funds are used and the engineering agreement has a value less than \$25,000.

☐ Form Not Applicable (engineering services less than \$25,000)

1.	Do the written QBS policies and procedures discuss the initial administration (procurement, management, and administration) concerning engineering and design related consultant services? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No																				
2.	Do the written QBS policies and procedures follow the requirements as outlined in Section 5-5 and specifically Section 5-5.06(e) of the <i>BLRS Manual</i> ? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If no, IDOT's approval date: _____																				
3.	Was the scope of services for this project clearly defined? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No																				
4.	Was public notice given for this project? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Due date of submittal: _____ Method(s) used for advertisement and dates of advertisement: _____																				
5.	Do the written QBS policies and procedures cover conflicts of interest? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No																				
6.	Do the written QBS policies and procedures use covered methods of verification for suspension and debarment? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No																				
7.	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 45%;">           Do the written QBS policies and procedures discuss the method of evaluation? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No         </div> <div style="width: 45%; text-align: right;"> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No         </div> </div> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 40%; text-align: left;">Criteria for this project</th> <th style="width: 10%; text-align: center;">Weighting</th> <th style="width: 40%; text-align: left;">Criteria for this project</th> <th style="width: 10%; text-align: center;">Weighting</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>_____</td> <td style="text-align: center;">%</td> <td>_____</td> <td style="text-align: center;">%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>_____</td> <td style="text-align: center;">%</td> <td>_____</td> <td style="text-align: center;">%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>_____</td> <td style="text-align: center;">%</td> <td>_____</td> <td style="text-align: center;">%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>_____</td> <td style="text-align: center;">%</td> <td>_____</td> <td style="text-align: center;">%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Criteria for this project	Weighting	Criteria for this project	Weighting	_____	%	_____	%	_____	%	_____	%	_____	%	_____	%	_____	%	_____	%
Criteria for this project	Weighting	Criteria for this project	Weighting																		
_____	%	_____	%																		
_____	%	_____	%																		
_____	%	_____	%																		
_____	%	_____	%																		
8.	Do the written QBS policies and procedures discuss the method of selection? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Selection committee (titles) for this project: _____ _____ Top three consultants selected for this project in order: 1) _____ 2) _____ 3) _____ If less than 3 responses were received, IDOT's approval date: _____																				
9.	Was an estimated cost of engineering for this project developed in-house prior to contract negotiation? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No																				
10.	Were negotiations for this project performed in accordance with federal requirements? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No																				
11.	Were acceptable costs for this project verified? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> LPA will rely on IDOT review and approval of costs.																				
12.	Do the written QBS policies and procedures cover review and approving for payment, before forwarding the request for reimbursement to IDOT for further review and approval? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No																				
13.	Do the written QBS policies and procedures cover ongoing and finalizing administration of the project (monitoring, evaluation, closing-out a contract, record retention, responsibility, remedies to violations or breaches to a contract, and resolution of disputes)? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No																				