AMENDMENT NUMBER 1 TO AGREEMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES BETWEEN URS CORPORATION GREAT LAKES AND THE CITY OF ANN ARBOR

The City of Ann Arbor, a Michigan municipal corporation, with offices at 301 E. Huron St. Ann Arbor, Michigan 48107-8647 ("City") and URS Corporation Great Lakes, a Michigan corporation with its address at 27777 Franklin Road, Suite 2000, Southfield, Michigan 48034 ("Consultant") agree to amend the professional services agreement for the project Ann Arbor Station Environmental Review executed by the parties dated December 10, 2013 as follows:

1) Article III.A. Services, is amended to read as follows:

The Consultant agrees to provide professional engineering services ("Services") in connection with the Project as described in Exhibit A **and Exhibit A-1**. The City retains the right to make changes to the quantities of service within the general scope of the Agreement at any time by a written order. If the changes add to or deduct from the extent of the services, the contract sum shall be adjusted accordingly. All such changes shall be executed under the conditions of the original Agreement.

2) Article IV.A. Compensation of Consultant is amended to read as follows:

The Consultant shall be paid in the manner set forth in Exhibit B **and Exhibit B-1.** Payment shall be made monthly, unless another payment term is specified in Exhibit B, following receipt of invoices submitted by the Consultant, and approved by the Contract Administrator. Total compensation payable for all Services performed during the term of this Agreement shall not exceed \$951,673.86

All terms, conditions, and provisions of the original agreement between the parties executed December 10, 2013, unless specifically amended above, are to apply to this amendment and are made a part of this amendment as though expressly rewritten, incorporated, and included herein.

3) The Agreement Exhibits are amended to add Exhibit A-1 (Additional Work Plan) and Exhibit B-1 (Additional Fee Schedule) attached to this amendment.

This amendment to the agreement between successors and assigns of the parties.	ween the parties shall be binding on the heirs,
Dated this, 2016.	
For Contractor	For City of Ann Arbor
By Its:	By Christopher Taylor, Mayor
	By Jacqueline Beaudry, City Clerk
Approved as to form and content	Approved as to substance
By Stephen K. Postema, City Attorney	By Howard Lazurus, City Administrator
	By Craig Hupy, Public Services Area Administrator

AGREEMENT EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT A-1 Additional Scope of Work

ADDITIONAL WORK PLAN ITEMS

The URS Team proposes the following work plan for this study, based on project activities since early 2014. The Work Plan has been updated to reflect additional scope items to be performed at the request of the granting party, the Federal Railroad Administration.

Task 2 Public Participation

2.1 Stakeholder and Public Meeting Structure and Schedule

Three rounds of stakeholder and public meetings were identified in the initial Scope of Work. To date, the Consultant Team has participated in three meetings with the Leadership Advisory Group (LAG), five meetings with the Citizen Working Group (CWG), two public meetings, and a stakeholder site tour. An additional round of LAG and CWG meetings and associated project update materials will be required prior to release of the Environmental Assessment (EA). Informational materials will be distributed to key stakeholders and media outlets prior to the round of meetings.

The additional round of meetings with the LAG and CWG will include:

- An update on project developments since May 2015;
- Notification that an environmental analysis will be performed for four alternatives emerging from the AA;
- Presentations to the LAG and CWG on information regarding the EA and a Preferred Alternative; and
- Collection of feedback regarding the EA.

Upon completion and release of the EA, a formal public hearing will be conducted.

The URS Team will:

- Assist in determining meeting locations.
- Assist in setting meeting agenda and developing presentation materials.
- Assist in facilitating meetings.
- Audio / video document each meeting to provide a record of events.
- Create and facilitate interactive sessions if needed.
- Report on meeting results and providing meeting notes.

Task 2 Deliverables

- Support materials for all Project-related meetings.
- Contribution of materials for the AAS webpage on the City's website.
- Project update newsletter and FAQ sheet (web-based and 200 hard copies).
- Other public involvement tools and programs as needed.
- One additional round of meetings conducted with the Leadership Advisory Group and Citizen Working Group.
- Up to three presentations to policy bodies as requested by staff.
- Public Hearing upon release of the EA.

Task 3 Concept Plan & Report

The Concept Plan and Report identified in the Scope of Work was delivered as the Phase I and Phase II Alternatives Analysis memoranda.

3.3 Draft Revised Concept Plan and Report

With two sites and four Build Alternatives being carried forward into the NEPA process, the URS Team will develop an initial Concept Plan that provides both illustrative and narrative descriptions of the remaining sites and station designs. This plan has been presented as the Phase II Alternatives Analysis memorandum.

As a part of the additional work scope, the Consultant Team will develop one additional site design concept for inclusion in the Phase II Alternatives Analysis memorandum. This will be an enhancement of the Build Alternative 2C (Michigan Central Depot) option from the current sketch (approximately 5% design level) to the same level of development (approximately 20% design level) as the other alternatives studied to date. The Consultant Team assumes that this concept will be relatively complex given our investigations to date, and our work will entail coordination between Consultant Team members and the Project Team. In addition to the concept design, we will also produce a planning level construction cost opinion. Concept Site Plans will present concepts of the structures, access drives, landscape areas, pedestrian, vehicular and railroad circulation as well as utility locations and building leads. Concept Plans will be developed at a scale of 1" = 40', and will define space sizes as well as preliminary outlines of the facility options.

Task 3 Deliverables

 One additional 20% site plan for Build Alternative 2C (Michigan Central Depot), to documented in the Final Phase II memorandum

Task 4 Environmental Review

The URS Team proposes to complete the Environmental Review according to the schedule provided below. Our schedule is flexible to accommodate NEPA requirements for a successful project. The Alternatives Analysis (AA) was originally anticipated to reduce the alternatives to a single Preferred Alternative prior to the EA. Rather, per recent FRA direction, an environmental analysis of the four remaining Build Alternatives, to be documented in the EA, will assist in screening alternatives and complete the Alternatives Analysis process. The four remaining Build Alternatives are:

- Build Alternative 2A (Depot Street/Existing Amtrak with station building north of the tracks)
- Build Alternative 2B (Depot Street/Existing Amtrak with station building elevated above the tracks)
- Build Alternative 2C (Depot Street/Existing Amtrak using Michigan Central Depot/Gandy Dancer Restaurant as a station building)
- Build Alternative 3A (Fuller Road—West, with most station improvements within the limits
 of the rail right-of-way and existing parking lot)

4.1 Section 4(f) Evaluation

The URS Team will do a complete 4(f) evaluation for the remaining four Build Alternatives that will affect the following 4(f) properties: Fuller Park and the Michigan Central Depot. The team will work to get a final determination from FRA on 4(f) properties for the EA. The team includes a national 4(f) expert who has the experience to work through this process and related NEPA requirements.

4.3 Section 106 Evaluation

The URS Team will coordinate with FRA and the State Historical Preservation Office (SHPO) to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). This includes research into the historical and cultural status of properties in the study area, i.e. properties that are listed on the National Register for Historic Places (NRHP), or those properties that are eligible to be listed on the NRHP. The Section 106 evaluation will be documented in the EA and will ultimately determine whether there is no effect to historic and cultural resources or if they will be adversely affected. If they are adversely affected, the EA will identify how those effects can be minimized or mitigated. Our team has expertise in historic and archeological sites research to guide us through the Section 106 process and related NEPA requirements.

4.4 Environmental Documentation, Review, Presentation and Report

The URS Team will prepare a comprehensive NEPA-compliant Environmental Assessment (EA) document showing the evaluation of the remaining Build Alternatives in terms of how well they meet the Purpose of, and Need for the project. The alternative sites will also be evaluated by impacts to recreational, historical and cultural elements addressed above, as well as to other resources expected to be addressed in this document including:

- Wetlands/Water Resources
- Hazardous Materials
- Threatened and Endangered Species
- Noise and Vibration
- Air Quality
- Floodplains
- Stormwater
- Traffic
- Socio-economic Factors
- Utilities

These resources will be considered for the remaining two alternative sites and four Build Alternatives for a new station. These will be compared to use of the existing Amtrak station without improvements (no-build). The environmental document will be developed both as a written document as well as a presentation delivered to a special session of the City Council prior to FRA approval.

4.5 Finding of No Significant Impacts (FONSI)

The Consultant Team will assist in the preparation of the FONSI documentation including working with the City, MDOT and the FRA to prepare responses to comments that will be included in the (FONSI).

Task 4 Deliverables

- Technical memoranda (e.g., traffic, wetlands, etc.) sufficient for support of the environmental documentation process for the remaining four Build Alternatives
- Environmental documentation covering all applicable environmental regulations relevant for the City, State and Federal government
- A presentation version of the environmental documentation for presentation to the City Council and other key stakeholders
- Response to comments on the EA, for the FONSI.

Project Schedule (Detailed Graphic Schedule To Be Provided)

The proposed schedule for remaining task assumes FRA acceptance of the Phase II Alternatives Analysis memo and notice to proceed in mid-March, 2016:

- Finalization of the Phase II Alternatives Analysis memorandum (June 2016)
- Distribution of the Phase II Alternatives Analysis memo to key stakeholders and on the project website (July 2016)
- Environmental Field Work (June and July, 2016)
- Development of the EA (July September, 2016)
- Presentation of EA findings and a Preferred Concept to MDOT, FRA and stakeholder groups (September 2016)
- Release of the EA and Public Hearing (late September, 2016)
- 30-Day Comment Period (October November, 2016)
- FRA Coordination and FONSI Preparation(August November 2016)
- FRA Releases FONSI December 2016

• •EXHIBIT B-1 Additional Fee Schedule

ANN AF	RBOR	R STATIO	N ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW		
COST ES	MIT	ATE SUM	IMARY		
COST ES	STIM	ATE SUM	1MARY		
					NOT-TO-EXCEED
				Total Hours	TASK COST
			Billing Rate (includes Overhead)*		
Task 1:	Proj	ect Initia	ation	0	\$0.00
Task 2:	Pub	lic Partic	ipation	164	\$23,092.56
	2.1.	Public In	volvement Plan	0	\$0.00
	2.2.	Stakehol	ders	104	\$14,622.84
	2.3.	Public M	eeting Structure and Schedule	0	\$0.00
	2.4.	Project V	Vebsite	0	\$0.00
	2.5.	Citizen W	orking Groups	60	\$8,469.72
	2.6.	Surveys	(x 4)	0	\$0.00
	2.7.	Focus Gr	oup Sessions (x 2)	0	\$0.00
	2.8.	Site Toui	rs (One day, up to four sites)	0	\$0.00
	2.9	Public He	earing	0	\$0.00
Task 3:	Con	cept Pla	ո & Report	176	\$17,813.64
	3.1.	Develop	ment/Consideration of Alternatives	0	\$0.00
	3.2.	Definitio	n of the Preferred AAS Concept	0	\$0.00
	3.3.	Draft Rev	vised Concept Plan and Report	0	\$0.00
		3.3.1.	AAS Conceptual Design	0	\$0.00
		3.3.2.	Site Conceptual Design	126	\$12,624.82
	3.4.	Final Con	cept Plan and Report	50	\$5,188.82
Task 4:	Envi	ronmen	tal Review	840	\$102,321.68
	4.1.	Section 4	l(f) Evaluation	130	\$22,312.80
	4.2.	Section 6	6(f) Evaluation	0	\$0.00
	4.3.	Section 1	.06 Evaluation	100	\$10,037.00
	4.4.	Environn	nental Presentation and Report	610	\$69,971.88
Task 5:	Proj	ect Man	agement	175	\$28,055.50
			TOTAL LABOR	1,355	\$171,283.38
			10% Fee		\$17,128.34
			Direct Expenses		\$3,032.00
		TOTA	HOURS AND VALUE: ADDITIONAL ITEMS	1,355	\$191,443.72
			SUBCONSULTANT REDUCTIONS		-\$64,645.00
			TOTAL AMENDMENT		\$126,798.72

ANN ARBOR STATION ENVIRONMENTAL RE	/IEW																									
URS CORPORATION																										
COST ESTIMATE																										
*Billing rates are based on 2013 contract rates calcul	atd through 2016 has	ed on assumption of	an annual 3% escalation																							
		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,																								
				-							HO	IRS BY EMPLOYEE CLA	SIFICATION													
		Deputy Project							Illustrations /								Wetlands /									
	Project Manager - E	. Manager - P.			Concept Task Lead;	Emileo Po	outourload .	Railroad / MDOT /	Renderings -	Section 4(f)/6(f)	Historical Resources	Noise/Vibration - No	ise/Vibration - N	Noise/Vibration -	E 18146	er Quality - F	loodplain / T&E	Socioecon / GIS -	Transport. / Traffic	- Transport. / Tra	offic. Trans	sport. / Traffic - S. Tr	person / Troffic	GIS / Data Coll	ect / Total	lours TASK COST
	Gorski	Voorhees	Principal	na/nc	Site Eval		Cooper	FRA Coord	P. Burge	K. Horne	C. Leary	P. Burze	Storm	Theller		DeVaun	G. Hendrix	H. Kelley	M. Klawon	N. LaCroix		Frazier	D. Witeneer	Magging - E. D		lours TASK COST
Billing Rate (includes Overhead	1* Hrs S 185.9		Hrs 5 231.43	Hrs 5 158.49	Hrs 5 212.95		5 143.02	Hrs 5 165.93		Hrs 5 229.4		Hrs 5 198.53	Hrs 5 162.4				Hrs S 119.09						Hrs S 65.00			
ask 2: Public Participation					,		,					,					,									8 \$15,440,76
2.1. Public Involvement Plan	Sn.	00 50.00	0 50.00	50.0	0 50.00	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	SO O	so.	00 50.0	\$0.00	50.0	00	S0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	Sn r	o so.	on .	\$0.00	\$0.00	Son	0	\$0.00	
2.2. Stakeholders	16 52.974			50.0			52,288,32	\$0.00	\$0.00	SO			SOJ		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.0			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.0	0	\$0.00 4	
2.3. Public Meeting Structure and Schedule	50.	00 50.00	0 S0.00	50.0	0 50.00	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	SO	00 50.0	\$0.00	SO		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.0	o 50.	.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.0	0	\$0.00	. s
2.4. Project Website	\$0.	00 \$0.00	0 \$0.00	\$0.0	0 \$0.00	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	00 \$0.0	\$0.00	\$0.0	00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.0	0 \$0.	.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.0	0	\$0.00	\$
Citizen Working Groups (including Public																										
2.5. Hearing)	16 \$2,974.		2 \$0.00	\$0.0			\$3,146.44	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0		\$0.00	\$0.0		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.0	0 50.		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.0	0		0 \$8,46
2.6. Surveys (x 4)	\$0.			\$0.0			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00				\$0.0		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00				\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.0		\$0.00	
2.7. Focus Group Sessions (x 2)	\$0.			\$0.0			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0			\$0.0		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00		0 50.		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.0		\$0.00	
2.8. Site Tours (One day, up to four sites)	\$0: \$0:			\$0.0 \$0.0			\$0.00 \$0.00	\$0.00 \$0.00	\$0.00 \$0.00	50 S0			\$0.0 \$0.0		\$0.00 \$0.00	\$0.00 \$0.00	\$0.00 \$0.00				\$0.00	\$0.00 \$0.00	\$0.0		\$0.00	
2.9. Public Hearing	\$0.	00 50.00	0 50.00	\$0.0	0 50.00	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	50	50.0	\$0.00	50.1	00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.0	o so.	.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.0	0	\$0.00	
Task 3: Concept Plan & Report						-			Sn or						_											
3.1. Development/Consideration of Alternatives 3.2. Definition of the Preferred AAS Concept	\$0: \$0:			\$0.0 \$0.0			\$0.00 \$0.00	0 \$0.00 0 \$0.00	\$0.00 \$0.00	50 50			\$0.0 \$0.0		\$0.00 \$0.00	\$0.00 \$0.00	\$0.00 \$0.00				\$0.00 \$0.00	\$0.00 \$0.00	\$0.0 \$0.0		\$0.00	
3.2. Definition of the Preferred AAS concept 3.3. Draft Revised Concept Plan and Report	50.			\$0.0			\$0.00	0 50.00	50.00 50.00	90		50.00	\$0.0 \$0.0		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00 \$0.00		0 S0.		\$0.00	\$0.00 \$0.00	\$0.0		\$0.00	
3.3.1 AAS Concept ual Design	50. 50.			\$0.0 \$0.0			\$0.00	50.00	\$0.00	50			S0.1		S0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00				\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.0		\$0.00	
3.3.2 Site Conceptual Design	50.			50.0			\$0.00	50.00	50.00 S0.00				S0.		\$0.00	\$0.00	50.00				\$0.00	50.00	\$0.0		\$0.00	3
3.4. Final Concept Plan and Report	SO.			SOO			\$0.00	\$0.00	50.00				\$0.0		S0.00	\$0.00	50.00				\$0.00	\$0.00	Son		50.00	
Task 4: Environmental Review		,,,,,						7		-					72.03	12.10	1				,,,,,,		-		8	
4.1. Section 4(f) Evaluation	SO.	00 50.00	0 50.00	50.0	0 50.00	0 80	\$11,441,60	\$0.00	50.00	40 59.176	00 50.0	\$0.00	50.0	00	S0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	50.0	o so.	on .	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.0	0	50.00 1	
4.2. Section 6(f) Evaluation	SO.			50.0			\$0.00	\$0.00	50.00	40 33,250			50.		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	50.0	0 S0.		\$0.00	\$0.00	50.0		\$0.00	
4.3. Section 106 Evaluation	50.			S0.0			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	SO			SOJ		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00				\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.0		50.00 1	0 \$10.03
4.4. Environmental Presentation and Report	16 \$2,974.	56 40 \$4,270.40	0 \$0.00	\$0.0	0 \$0.00	0 100	\$14,302.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	8 \$1,835	20 \$0.0	2 \$397.06	8 \$1,299.	76 20 \$1,6	696.00 10	\$1,046.20	36 \$4,287.24	20 \$1,405.0	0 18 \$3,255.	.66 114 \$14,	250.00	144 \$12,960.00	24 \$1,560.0	0 40 \$2,	737.60 6	0 \$68,27
Task 5: Project Management																									1	0 \$17,220.00
Project Management & QA/QC	50 \$9,295.	50 \$0.00	0 \$0.00	50 \$7,924.5	0 \$0.00	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	Şū	00 50.0	\$0.00	\$0.0	00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.0	0 50.	.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.0	0	\$0.00 1	0 \$17,22
TOTA	LS 98 \$18,219.18	78 \$8,327.28	0 \$0.00 5	0 \$7,924.50	0 \$0.00	218	\$31,178.36	0 \$0.00	0 \$0.00	48 \$11,011.2	100 \$10,037.00	2 \$397.06	8 \$1,299.76	20 \$1,696	6.00 10	\$1,046.20	36 \$4,287.24	20 \$1,405.00	18 \$3,255.66	114 \$14,25	50.00 144	4 \$12,960.00	24 \$1,560.00	40 \$2,7	37.60 10	28 \$131,592.04
																						DIRECT EXPE	ISES	Units Mea	sure Cost	Unit Cost
																							ooper 1 trip for			
																							aring and ociated meetings	4700	\$50	1.00 \$ 50
													_								Have	1 200	ociated meetings	11110	\$50	30 30
																						c.	endrix Wetlands	Field	Visit	
																					Field \	Visits Flo	odolain field visit	2 evne		1.00 S 30
																							ise & Vibration	-	720	
																					Field \		ld visit	1 Field	Visit \$30	1.00 S 30
																								Field		
																					Field \	Visits Tra	ffic Field Visits	1 expe	nses \$1,6	2.00 \$ 1,66
															_						TOTAL	L DIRECT EXPENSES				\$ 2,76
																					FIXED					10% \$ 13,15
																						L URS PROJECT COST			\neg	\$147,51
																					SUBCC	ONSULTANT COSTS				
																						Power Marketing	Research			\$
																						DLZ				\$ 43,93
						-																Legat			_	
																						L SUBCONSULTANT CO AL PROJECT COST	ST			\$ 43,93 \$ 191,443

				нс	OURS BY EMPLOYEE	CLASS	IFICATION										
			ransit Planner - Funkhouser	Planne	er/Section (4(f) 6(f) - Butch	Conce	ptual Site Design - Sherman		Conceptual Site	Total Hours	TASK COS	т					
Billing Ra	ate (includes overhead and FCC, but not profit/fixed fee)*	Hrs	\$ 141.31	Hrs	\$ 169.52	Hrs	\$ 94.38	Hrs	\$ 122.59								
Task 1: Proje	ect Initiation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-						
Task 2: Publ	ic Participation																
2.1.	Public Involvement Plan									C	-						
2.2.	Stakeholders	12	1,695.72	24	4,068.48	20	1,887.60	0	-	56	7,651.80)					
2.3.	Public Meeting Structure and Schedule		-		-		-		-	c	-						
2.4.	Project Website		-		-		-		-	C	-						
2.5.	Citizen Working Groups		-		-		-		-	C	-						
2.6.	Site Tours		=		-		-		-	C	=						
Task 3: Conc	ept Plan & Report																
3.1.	Development/Consideration of Alternatives		=		=		-		-	С	-						
3.2.	Definition of the Preferred AAS Concept		-		-		-		-	C	-						
3.3.	Draft Revised Concept Plan and Report						-		-	C	-						
	3.3.1. AAS Conceptual Design		-		-		-		-	C	-						
	3.3.2. Site Conceptual Design		-	6	1,017.12	110	10,381.80	10	1,225.90	126							
			-	4	678.08	40	3,775.20	6	735.54	50	5,188.82	2					
	ronmental Review																
4.1.	Section 4(f) Evaluation		-	10	1,695.20		-		-	10	1,695.20)					
4.2.	Section 6(f) Evaluation		=		=		-		-	C	=						
4.3.	Section 106 Evaluation		-		-		-		-	c	-						
4.4.	Environmental Presentation and Report		-	10	1,695.20		-		-	10	1,695.20						
Task 5: Proje	ect Management		-	50	8,476.00	25	2,359.50		-	75	10,835.50						
	TOTALS	12	1,695.72	104	17,630.08	195	18,404.10	16	1,961.44	327	\$ 39,691.34	ı					
* Billing rates are	e actual 2016 wage rates with a 2.6 multiplier applied (base	d on DI	Z's audited FAR over	head rat	te and ECC). We are a	ssumin	g that all work will	he done	in 2016.			DIRECT EXPEN	SES	Units N	Measure	Cost/Unit	Cost
												М	ileage		Miles 5	\$ 0.540	\$ 270.0
													r Fare		Trips		\$ -
													er Diem		Days		\$ -
													otel		Nights		\$ -
													r Rental		Days		\$ -
													cords Search elivery		Search		\$ -
													ileage		Miles		\$ -
																	المراجع المراجع
												TOTAL DIRECT E	XPENSES				\$ 270.0
												TOTAL LABOR	COST				\$ 39,691.3
												FIXED FEE				10%	\$ 3,969.1