

REQUEST FOR LEGAL SERVICES

TO: COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE (AT01)

ATTENTION: Noah Milov
(CHECK ONE) Heather Bryan

FROM: Jose Fernandez (863) 535-2310 DATE: 04/24/2026
(Name and Phone Number)

RETURN TO: Jose Fernandez (TR01) DIVISION: Roads & Drainage

BOARD AGENDA DATE: 06/02/2026 COUNTY MANAGER ITEM:

PROJECT: Kraft Road Bridge 164121 Replacement

CSA/CONTRACT NUMBER: 22-090-05

MODIFICATION NUMBER: CHANGE ORDER NUMBER:

TYPE OF AGREEMENT: CSA

NAME OF CONSULTANT/CONTRACTOR: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Please indicate any time limits and attach all necessary documentation.

REQUEST IN DETAIL:

Please review attachments for the Board Agenda date indicated and return APPROVED documents at your earliest convenience. THANK YOU.

County Attorney

For CAO Use Only:

MAY 08 2026

Assigned Staff: Noah Log-In Date: _____

CAO Project Number: 2026-315 Log-Out Date: 5/15/26

CONSULTANT APPROVAL FORM

CPO: If Consultant fee is under \$50,000 & construction is under \$250,000

CSA: If Construction is under \$7,500,000;

OR for study activity if consultant fee is under \$500,000- (FS 287.055 CCNA)

CPO/CSA#: 2022-090-05 (Assigned by Procurement)

To be completed by the requesting Division:

Date: 04/24/2026 Division: Roads and Drainage

Project Manager's Name: Jose Fernandez (TR01) Phone #: 535-2310

Project Name: Kraft Road Bridge 164121 Replacement

Total Project Budget: \$ 200,000.00 Project #: 5400264

Estimate of Construction Cost: \$3,000,000.00

Proposed Consultant: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. Fee: \$144,658.40

Master Consultant Agreement #: 22-090

Attach Scope of Services Proposed by the Consultant (Exhibit "A")

Approved By: [Signature] Date 5/4/26
Division Director/Designee

Procurement Division

Date Received: 5/6/26 Date Reviewed by Analyst: 5/7/26

Approved by: [Signature]
(Procurement Director/Designee)

County Attorney's Office (Required for all CSA's)

Date Received: 5/15/26 Date Reviewed: 5/15/26

Approved by: [Signature]
(County Attorney Office Signature)

County Manager's Office (Required if consultant fee is greater than \$100,000)

Date Received: [Signature] Date Reviewed: 5/18/26

Approved by: [Signature]
(County Manager Office Signature)

Additional Attachments: number of days to complete project, not to exceed/lump sum amount, justification for consultant selected, fee schedule, and Professional Liability COI (COI applicable to CSA only, description field must be project specific (contract requirement)).

Selection Procedure for Consultants with Continuing Contracts CCNA Continuing Contracts Justification Form

Please submit this form along with any Original CSA/CPO Consultant Approval Form

Division: Roads & Drainage
Project Manager: Jose Fernandez

Step 1:

Review list for appropriate Expertise, Experience, and Personnel (List all consultants awarded a master agreement under the RFP)

Consultant	Expertise	Experience	Personnel	Local (Y/N)	Elevated for Consideration (Y/N)
AECOM	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
AIM Engineering & Survey	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Burgess and Niple	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
CONSOR Engineers	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Dewberry Engineers	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
DRMP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
HDR Engineering	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
HNTB	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Jacobs Engineering Group	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Kissinger Campo & Associates	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Kimley-Horn and Associates	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Mott MacDonald Florida	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
NV5	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Patel, Greene, and Associates	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rummel, Klepper & Kahl	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WSP USA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Step 2:

Past performance on similar projects satisfactory (List all consultants elevated from Step 1)

Consultant	Has past performance been satisfactory (Y/N)	Elevated for Consideration(Y/N)
AECOM	Y	Y
AIM Engineering & Survey	Y	Y
Burgess and Niple	Y	Y
CONSOR Engineers	Y	Y
Dewberry Engineers	Y	Y
DRMP	Y	Y
HDR Engineering	Y	Y
HNTB	Y	Y
Jacobs Engineering Group	Y	Y
Kissinger Campo & Associates	Y	Y
Kimley-Horn and Associates	Y	Y
Mott MacDonald Florida	Y	Y
NV5	Y	Y
Patel, Greene, and Associates	Y	Y
Rummel, Klepper & Kahl	Y	Y
WSP USA	Y	Y

State justification for each firm NOT elevated and why:

Step 3:

Total amount of money the County has contracted with each Consultant elevated to Step 2 during the last 24 months.

Consultant	Contracted Amount	Elevated (Y/N)
AECOM	\$693,480.00	N
AIM Engineering & Survey	\$581,142.04	N
Burgess and Niple	\$427,370.36	N
CONSOR Engineers	\$791,220.29	N
Dewberry Engineers	\$551,405.23	N
DRMP	\$150,195.00	N
HDR Engineering	\$418,742.23	N
HNTB	\$750,849.81	N
Jacobs Engineering Group	\$807,821.00	N
Kissinger Campo & Associates	\$387,198.31	N
Kimley-Horn and Associates	\$451,746.40	Y
Mott MacDonald Florida	\$78,015.05	N
NVS	\$554,584.26	N
Patel, Greene, and Associates	\$479,271.76	N
Rummel, Klepper & Kahl	\$689,101.27	N
WSP USA	\$189,475.05	N

Step 4:

State justification, if the chosen consultant does not have the least amount of contract obligation.
Negotiation with these firms is on-going for work related to different project.

Consultant Services Authorization

Firm Name:	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
Master Agreement No.:	22-090
CSA No.:	22-090-05
Project Name:	Kraft Rd Bridge 164121 Replacement
Project Description:	To prepare initial engineering documents and evaluation of two bridge alternatives required to replace bridge No. 164121 along Kraft Rd crossing over Foods Canal.
Project Exhibits and Attachments	Exhibit "A"- Scope of Services for this CSA Exhibit "B"- Current Fee Schedule (Master Agreement) Exhibit "C"- Reimbursable Cost Schedule Exhibit "D"- Professional Liability (Project Specific)
Duration (in days)	Through completion of all related work
Compensation (Lump sum or Not to exceed to be identified in Exhibit "A")	\$144,658.40
Liquidated Damages (if applicable)	\$0.00/Per Day
Budget Source/Availability	10104.540541095.5666000.5400264

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this CSA on this _____ day of _____, 20__.

Attest:

STACY M. BUTTERFIELD

By: _____

Deputy Clerk

Date Approved by County: _____

POLK COUNTY, a political subdivision
of the State of Florida

By: _____

_____, Chairman
Board of County Commissioners

Review as to form and legal sufficiency

Norah Miller 5/15/26

County Attorney's Office Date

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

CONSULTANT COMPANY NAME

[Signature]

Authorized Corporate Officer

Hao Chau Vice-President 04/30/2026

[Printed Name and Title] Date

Attest:

[Signature]

Corporate Secretary

Date *5/11/26*

SEAL





April 01, 2026

Jose Fernandez E.I.
Project Manager, Roads & Drainage
Polk County – Roads and Drainage Division
3000 Sheffield Road
Winter Haven, FL 33880

INDIVIDUAL PROJECT ORDER NUMBER 05

MSA 22-090-05 ALTERNATIVES STUDY- KRAFT ROAD BRIDGE OVER FOODS CANAL #164121 BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

Describing a specific agreement between Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. (the Consultant), and Polk County Roads and Drainage (the Client) in accordance with the terms of the Master Consultant Agreement for Professional Engineering Services (MSA 22-090) dated October 4th, 2022 which is incorporated herein by reference.

Identification of Project:

Project Name: Alternatives Study – Kraft Road Bridge over Food Canal Bridge Replacement
KH Project Manager: Joseph A. Roberts Jr.

Project Understanding

The County has requested a proposal for engineering services for an alternatives study of the Kraft Road bridge crossing over Foods Canal located approximately 0.26 miles north of US 92 within Section 20, Township 28 south, and Range 23 East. The intent of the project is to determine feasible crossing alternatives and identify their impacts to the surrounding area, the cost of feasible alternatives and provide a recommendation for the replacement of the existing structure. The project will analyze the required hydraulic opening of the crossing, determine wetland impacts of the feasible alternatives, identify roadway modifications necessary to meet current standards and provide preliminary structural analysis of the crossings in order to determine structural costs.

General topographic survey will be performed by Polk County.



Scope of Services

1. Project Management

The Consultant shall provide project management, coordination, and administration throughout the duration of the project.

Services shall include:

- Conduct a project kickoff meeting with the County
- Develop and maintain a project schedule
- Monthly coordination with the County and project team
- Subconsultant coordination, as applicable
- Quality control reviews in accordance with the Consultant's QA/QC procedures
- Preparation of monthly invoices
- Coordination with regulatory agencies, as required

Deliverables:

- Meeting minutes
- Project schedule updates

2. Roadway Analysis

The Consultant shall evaluate existing roadway conditions and identify modifications required to accommodate proposed crossing alternatives.

Services shall include:

- Review County-provided survey, aerials, and available roadway data
- Evaluate existing horizontal and vertical geometry of Kraft Road
- Develop conceptual typical sections consistent with current design criteria
- Identify roadway alignment modifications necessary to meet current standards
- Evaluate tie-ins to existing roadway and maintenance of traffic considerations
- Identify potential right-of-way constraints

Design shall be consistent with applicable FDOT Design Manual (FDM) criteria, as appropriate for the facility classification.

Deliverables:

- Conceptual typical sections
- Preliminary roadway alignment exhibits
- Roadway analysis memorandum

3. Hydraulic Analysis

The Consultant shall perform hydraulic analyses to determine the required opening for the crossing and evaluate impacts of proposed alternatives.

3.1 Data Collection, Coordination and Field Review

Kimley-Horn will obtain and review hydrologic data and boundary conditions from existing FEMA FIS study models and available models from the County. The current fee for the Flood Insurance Study (FIS) Data Requests Form to FEMA Engineering Library is \$325. This fee will be paid by Kimley-Horn and billed to the County for reimbursement. Other potential submittal fees required by the County and FEMA are not included in this task and will be the responsibility of the County to pay directly.

Kimley-Horn will study this data using best available aerial photography or land plans. This data will be reviewed and compared to the current FEMA floodplain mapping and regional regression flow rates. Field visit will be performed to validate the best available model assumptions.

Consultant will provide the following modeling coordination services:

- Consultant will meet with County staff at the project kickoff meeting to identify available design information and record drawings. Consultant will coordinate with County staff to obtain copies of relevant readily available documents.
- Consultant will attend up to two meetings with the County staff to discuss the project.

3.2 Culvert Analysis (HEC-RAS)

Kimley-Horn will prepare a revised existing condition hydraulic model for this segment of the canal crossing under Kraft Road using the FEMA-effective model. Kimley-Horn will request any existing effective model and supporting digital data (Flood Insurance Study (FIS) Data Requests Form) to FEMA Engineering Library. If FEMA has an effective model on file (HEC-2 or HEC-RAS) that covers the project site, Kimley-Horn will create a Duplicate Effective Model that will be updated with the best available data and correct any errors that occur and will create a Corrected Effective Model that will work as the existing conditions hydrology and hydraulic (H&H) model.

3.3 Box Culvert Deck Drainage Analysis

Kimley-Horn will perform a drainage analysis of the box culvert deck to determine the placement of inlets along the roadway adjacent to the bridge. The analysis will consist of delineating basins, runoff calculations, and spread calculations.

3.4 Scour Analysis

A scour and hydraulics analysis will be performed by Kimley-Horn using the information provided by The Client, field review, construction plans, and scour countermeasure material analysis to recommend a means of scour protection around the box culvert headwalls.

Services shall include:

- Review available hydrologic and hydraulic data for Foods Canal
- Develop hydraulic models to determine required conveyance capacity
- Evaluate existing and proposed crossing conditions
- Determine required hydraulic opening for each alternative



- Assess potential impacts to upstream and downstream conditions
- Coordinate findings with environmental considerations

Analyses shall be performed in accordance with applicable FDOT Drainage Manual and local criteria.

Deliverables:

- Hydraulic analysis report
- Supporting calculations and model output
- Summary of required hydraulic opening for each alternative

4. Structural Analysis

The Consultant shall perform preliminary structural evaluations for feasible bridge crossing alternatives. Services shall include:

- Review available information for the existing structure
- Develop conceptual bridge alternatives (e.g., single-span, multi-span, culvert options if applicable)
- Evaluate span arrangements and structural systems
- Perform preliminary structural sizing and layout
- Identify foundation considerations based on available information
- Develop planning-level construction cost estimates for each alternative
- Evaluate constructability considerations

Structural concepts shall be consistent with the AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications and FDOT Structures Design Guidelines.

Deliverables:

- Conceptual structure layouts
- Preliminary structural cost estimates
- Structural evaluation memorandum

5. Natural Resources Assessment

Consultant shall conduct a Natural Resources Assessment to identify wetlands and surface waters and upland habitats (including potential sensitive habitats) in the project area and shall evaluate the potential for usage by endangered and threatened species (listed species). In preparing this assessment, the Consultant shall conduct the following tasks:

1. Review readily available natural resource documentation, previous environmental studies, soils map, Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) maps and listed species information.
2. Request information from the Florida Natural Areas Inventory (FNAI), Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC), and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) regarding known occurrences of listed species on and in the vicinity of the subject property.
3. Map habitat types, including wetlands, on an aerial photograph.
4. Research wetland mitigation options including banks servicing the area and mitigation costs.
5. Summarize the anticipated regulatory permit requirements.

This task does not include site reconnaissance.



6. Cultural Resources

Kimley-Horn shall conduct a Cultural Resource desktop analysis to identify and evaluate cultural resources within a project's Area of Potential Effect (APE). In preparing this assessment, the CONSULTANT shall conduct the following objectives:

Task 6.1 Records Review

This task consists of the following:

1. Record Search – obtain available Cultural Resource Assessment Survey (CRAS) reports recorded in the Florida Master Site File available from the Florida Division of Historic Resources.
2. Aerial Photography Review – obtain and examine readily available historical aerial photographs of the site and surrounding vicinity to assess the potential for unrecorded historic properties. Aerial photographs will be researched to the earliest data that is reasonably obtainable.
3. Review of Historical Maps – obtain and examine readily available fire insurance maps and historical topographic maps.
4. Other Historical Sources – obtain and examine other historical sources relevant to the completion of the desktop review and analysis.

Task 6.2 Data Analysis

This task consists of the following:

1. Recorded Cultural Resources Analysis – conduct a desktop review of existing Cultural Resources and spatial datasets available through a Geographic Information System (GIS) framework identify existing surveys and resources.
2. Possible Unrecorded Cultural Resources Analysis – conduct a desktop review of historical sources and spatial environmental datasets to identify the potential for unrecorded cultural resources to be impacted by the proposed project.

Task 6.3 Report Preparation

Upon completion of the tasks, Kimley-Horn will prepare a summary report of the results of the desktop analysis and literature review. The report will focus on the following objectives:

1. Summarize data to identify potential known constraints.
2. Recommend additional CRAS survey needed to support the federal and state permit applications to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, Florida Statutes (F.S.) 267 and 373 and adhere to standards set forth in Florida Rule Chapter 1A-46.

Cultural Resources work will not include:

1. The preparation of a CRAS for concurrence from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO).
2. New historic resource evaluations or updated evaluations to previously recorded resources
3. The preparation of FMSF resource forms



7. Geotechnical Analysis

See attached scope and provided by Ardaman and Associates.

8. Alternatives Analysis

The Consultant shall develop and evaluate feasible crossing alternatives and recommend a preferred alternative.

Services shall include:

- Develop multiple conceptual crossing alternatives
- Evaluate alternatives based on:
 - Hydraulic performance
 - Environmental impacts (including wetlands)
 - Roadway modifications
 - Structural feasibility
 - Constructability
 - Planning-level cost estimates
- Prepare comparative evaluation matrix
- Conduct coordination meeting(s) with the County to review alternatives
- Refine alternatives based on County input
- Identify and recommend a preferred alternative

Deliverables:

- Alternatives analysis report
- Concept exhibits for each alternative
- Comparative evaluation matrix
- Recommended preferred alternative

Scope Assumptions

- Topographic survey will be provided by Polk County
- Analyses are planning-level and intended to support alternative selection
- No permitting or final design is included



Information Provided By Client

Kimley-Horn will provide a survey graphic and description of the following to the Client requesting the topographic survey to be completed by the County for this project. Kimley-Horn will rely on this information for design.

- Available right of way and easement data
- Available record or as-built plans for existing roadway and/or development construction plans
- Topographic Survey
 - Design-level B Boundary, Topographic Survey by a registered surveyor
 - Locate the existing right-of-way
 - Information, locations and elevations of crown lines, centerlines, edges of pavement, pavement markings, above ground utilities, visible features of underground utilities, identification and designation of existing utilities, existing drainage structures (including inverts, and sizes along the entire project corridor), and establishment of roadway baselines with reference points.
 - Vertical Datum to be in NAVD 1988. Deliverables will include:
 - Topographic Survey in either MicroStation DGN format or AutoCAD DWG format.
 - Accurate Digital terrain model (DTM) or surface for use in MicroStation or AutoCAD
 - Signed and sealed survey in PDF format for inclusion in the Plan set.

Schedule

We will provide our services as expeditiously as practicable with the goal of meeting a mutually agreed upon schedule.

Fee and Expenses

Kimley-Horn will perform the services in Tasks 1 – 8 for the total not to exceed fee below. Individual task amounts are informational only. All permitting, application, and similar project fees will be paid directly by the County.

Task	Not To Exceed Fee
Task 1: Project Management	\$6,600.00
Task 2: Roadway Analysis	\$ 24,900.00
Task 3: Drainage Analysis	\$ 34,350.00
Task 4: Structural Analysis	\$29,225.00
Task 5: Natural Resources Assessment	\$5,050.00
Task 6: Cultural Resources	\$5,955.00
Task 7: Geotechnical Evaluation	\$ 29,678.40
Task 8: Alternatives Analysis Report	\$ 8,900.00
Total Not to Exceed Fee	\$144,658.40

Not to exceed fees will be invoiced monthly based upon the overall percentage of services performed.



Closure

We appreciate the opportunity to provide these services. Please contact me at (407) 427-1661 or joseph.roberts@kimley-horn.com if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC.

By: Joseph A. Roberts Jr., P.E.
Associate

By: Hao Chau, P.E.
Vice-President



Appendix A
Geotechnical Evaluation



Ardaman & Associates, Inc.

Geotechnical, Environmental and
Materials Consultants

March 16, 2026
Revised April 8, 2026
Proposal File No. 26-60-067

Kimley-Horn
189 South Orange Avenue, Suite 1000
Orlando, Florida 32801

Attention: Mr. Joseph Roberts, P.E.

Subject: Proposal for Preliminary Subsurface Soil Exploration and
Geotechnical Engineering Evaluation
Proposed Bridge Replacement
Kraft Road over Kraft Canal (Structure No. 164121)
Polk County, Florida

Dear Mr. Roberts:

As requested, we are pleased to present this proposal for conducting a preliminary subsurface soil exploration and preliminary geotechnical engineering evaluation for the subject project. Based on information provided by you, the project may consist of replacing an existing bridge located on Kraft Road. We understand that the bridge may be replaced by a single span structure; however, the County may also consider a culvert crossing alternative. In addition, roadway improvements will likely be required for the bridge approaches.

The scope of our work will include determining if the soil characteristics are suitable to construct the proposed bridge and associated roadway improvements. We have assumed that on the order of 0 to 2 feet of fill will be required for the new approach embankment or raising of the grades proposed. Preliminary data for the optional box culvert crossing will also be provided. In addition, we understand that a temporary bridge will not be required to manage traffic during the construction of the permanent new structure. We will also perform a corrosivity test series (i.e., pH, sulfate, chloride and resistivity) on a soil sample and surface water sample obtained at the crossing location.

The following summarizes our proposed scope of work and associated fees for conducting the subject exploration.

FIELD EXPLORATION

The field exploration program will include the following:

Description	Number of Borings	Depth Below Ground Surface (feet)
Bridge	2 SPT	130
Roadway	4 Auger	7
	2 SPT	20

We note that the SPT borings may terminate at depth shallower than 130 feet if very dense and/or hard soils are encountered.

The location of the SPT borings will be based on accessibility for our truck-mounted drilling equipment but will be in close proximity to the existing bridge. We note that 2 days of MOT will be required to perform for the borings.

The SPT borings will be drilled using a procedure similar to the Standard Penetration Test outlined in ASTM D-1586. The borings will be sampled at 18-inch intervals to 10 feet deep and at 5-foot intervals below 10 feet. The auger borings will be drilled using a 4-inch diameter truck-mounted continuous flight auger. Each sample will be removed from the sampler or auger in the field and then examined and visually classified by our crew chief. Representative portions will be sealed and packaged for transportation to our laboratory for further analysis as required. Water level observations will be made in the borehole during the drilling operation.

We note that in the event that we are requested to drill the two bridge SPT borings at 2.5-foot sampling intervals (i.e., standard FDOT protocol for bridge projects) rather than 5-foot sampling intervals, additional charges of \$48.00, \$57.00 and \$64.00 will apply for each additional SPT split spoon sample collected between 0-50 feet, 50-100 feet and 100-150 feet respectively. This correlates to a total additional charge of \$2,772.00 assuming both bridge borings are drilled to a total depth of 130 feet below the existing ground surface.

Muck probes will be conducted at selected locations within the canal to preliminarily measure the depth of soft organic soils. These probes are performed by hand-pushing slender steel rod into the ground until penetration is refused. The depth is recorded as the assumed depth of muck. We have budgeted a total of 16 hours of muck probing, an 8-hour day with a two-person crew, into this proposal.

Pavement cores will be obtained using a 6-inch diameter core barrel from two locations specified by you. We will measure the thickness of the asphalt and base and observe the base type at each core location. The coreholes will be backfilled with cold-patch asphalt upon completion. We note that maintenance of traffic (MOT) will be required for this.



LABORATORY PROGRAM

Routine laboratory visual classification will be performed along with specific classification tests deemed necessary (i.e., sieve analysis, organic content and Atterberg limits). The results of the sieve analysis tests will be used to determine the D₅₀ size of soils obtained within the depth of potential scour. In addition, two corrosion series tests (pH, sulfate, chloride and resistivity) will be performed on one soil sample and one surface water sample.

PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING ANALYSIS AND REPORT

Engineering analysis of all data obtained will be made to evaluate general subsurface conditions and to provide engineering recommendations relative to bridge foundation support. Specifically, we will perform static pile capacity analyses using the FB-Deep program for square concrete piles. We will also provide the D₅₀ results from the sieve analysis tests for use by others in determining scour depths. For the optional box culvert, soil design parameters will be provided. In addition, we will provide the results of the muck probing operations.

Our recommendations, along with all data developed during the exploration will be submitted in a written report upon conclusion of the study.

COST ESTIMATE

The costs associated with the aforementioned tasks are estimated as follows. The total cost will not be exceeded without prior authorization.

Stake Borings and Coordinate Utility Locations with Sunshine State One-Call by Assistant Project Engineer; 8 hours @ \$155.00/hour	\$1,240.00
Mobilize Drilling Crew and Equipment; 1 mobilization @ \$600.00/mob.	\$600.00
SPT Borings; 2 borings x 130 l.f., 2 borings x 20 l.f. (0 - 50 l.f.) 140 l.f. @ \$20.25/l.f.	\$2,835.00
(50 - 100 l.f.) 100 l.f. @ \$24.25/l.f.	\$2,425.00
(100 - 150 l.f.) 60 l.f. @ \$33.00/l.f.	\$1,980.00
Grout Boreholes; 300 l.f. @ \$6.75/l.f.	\$2,025.00
Auger Borings; 28 l.f. @ \$15.50/l.f.	\$434.00
Asphalt Cores; 2 cores @ \$98.00/each	\$196.00
Moving Between Boreholes; 2 drill-crew hours @ \$295.00/hour	\$590.00
Maintenance-of-Traffic estimate; lump sum	\$5,000.00



Muck Probes by Senior Technicians; 16 hours @ \$98.50/hour	\$1,576.00
Laboratory Classification Testing;	
Percent Fines; 4 tests @ \$49.25/each	\$197.00
Sieve Analysis; 10 tests @ \$83.00/each	\$830.00
Atterberg Limits; 4 tests @ \$155.00/each	\$620.00
Natural Moisture Content; 8 tests @ \$19.70/each	\$157.60
Organic Content; 4 tests @ \$47.20/each	\$188.80
Corrosion Series Testing; 2 tests @ \$247.00/each	\$494.00
Senior Project Engineer; 8 hours @ \$196.00/hour	\$1,568.00
Project Engineer; 30 hours @ \$176.00/hour	\$5,280.00
CADD Draftsperson; 12 hours @ \$96.00/hour	\$1,152.00
Technical Secretary; 4 hours @ \$72.50/hour	<u>\$290.00</u>
TOTAL	\$29,678.40

If temporary casing is needed to prevent borehole collapse during drilling, a cost of \$14.00 per linear foot of casing installed between 0 and 50 feet deep (\$17.25 per linear foot between 51 and 100 feet deep) will be added to the above total.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

This proposal is subject to the following terms and conditions: (1) access to boring locations is to be readily available to our truck-mounted drilling equipment, (2) the proposed number of borings and the boring depths will be adequate, (3) undisturbed samples and consolidation tests on fine grained soils are not budgeted into the total cost, (4) Ardaman & Associates will not take responsibility for damages to underground structures and/or services that are not located by Sunshine State One-Call; their locations are to be provided by the client prior to commencement of the field work, (5) exploration or evaluation of the environmental (ecological or hazardous/toxic material related) condition of the site and subsurface is not included, (6) the maintenance of traffic budget will suffice to perform the field work, (7) this proposed exploration is a relatively shallow exploration and is not intended to be an evaluation for sinkhole potential, and (8) this is a preliminary level study. Additional field exploration, laboratory testing and engineering evaluation will be required prior to final design. Ardaman will be glad to provide a proposal for any needed supplemental services as the project design progresses.

CLOSURE

We appreciate the opportunity to submit this proposal and look forward to working with you on this project. If this proposal meets with your approval, please provide authorization to proceed. Please call if you have any questions or require additional information.

Very truly yours,
ARDAMAN & ASSOCIATES, INC.



Colin T. Jewsbury, P.E.
Orlando Branch Manager



Alexandra G. Aydelotte, P.E.
Senior Project Engineer

CTJ/AGA/bls/lms

26-60-067 REV Kimley-Horn - Bridge Replacement, Kraft Road over Kraft Canal, Polk County.docx (2026PP)

Appendix B
Staff Hour Estimation

Kraft Road Bridge - Staff Hour Estimation - Polk County Continuing Services

Classification		Chief Engineer 2	Chief Engineer 1	Senior Engineer 2	Senior Engineer 1	Engineer 2	Engineer 1	Engineering Intern	Engineering Tech	Design Intern	Chief Designer	Chief Planner	Senior Planner	Land Planner	Chief Scientist	Senior Env. Specialist	Env. Specialist	Senior Specialist	Secretary Clerical	Prime Fee Subtotal	Subconsultant Fee Subtotal
Task	Description/Rate	\$ 340.00	\$ 300.00	\$ 265.00	\$ 235.00	\$ 205.00	\$ 170.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 115.00	\$ 73.00	\$ 215.00	\$ 300.00	\$ 225.00	\$ 170.00	\$ 225.00	\$ 165.00	\$ 125.00	\$ 178.00	\$ 95.00		
1	Project Management				20														20	\$ 6,600.00	\$ -
2	Roadway Analysis			10	10	20	40	60												\$ 24,900.00	\$ -
3	Drainage Analysis			10	20	40	40	80												\$ 34,350.00	\$ -
4	Structural Analysis			15		30	50	40	40											\$ 29,225.00	\$ -
5	Natural Resources Assessment														4	10	20			\$ 5,050.00	\$ -
6	Cultural Resources				5			20										10		\$ 5,955.00	\$ -
7	Geotechnical Evaluation																			\$ -	\$ 29,678.40
8	Alternatives Analysis Report			5	5		20	20												\$ 8,900.00	\$ -
	Subtotal Hours	0	0	40	60	90	150	220	40	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	20	10	20	\$ 114,980.00	\$ 29,678.40

Project Total \$ 144,658.40



Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Polk County

RFP No. 22-242

Classification	Rates
Chief Engineer 2	\$320 - \$360
Chief Engineer 1	\$275 - \$325
Senior Engineer 2	\$240 - \$290
Senior Engineer 1	\$210 - \$260
Engineer 2	\$175 - \$230
Engineer 1	\$150 - \$190
Engineering Intern	\$120 - \$160
Engineering Technician	\$100 - \$125
Design Intern	\$69 - \$76
Chief Designer	\$190 - \$235
Chief Planner	\$255 - \$345
Senior Planner	\$185 - \$265
Land Planner	\$135 - \$205
Chief Scientist	\$200 - \$250
Senior Environmental Specialist	\$130 - \$200
Environmental Specialist	\$100 - \$150
Senior Landscape Architect	\$180 - \$345
Project Landscape Architect	\$150 - \$265
Landscape Architect	\$130 - \$260
Landscape Designer/Landscape Planner	\$110 - \$145
Landscape Architect Intern	\$95 - \$130
Senior Specialist	\$120 - \$235
Secretary/Clerical	\$70 - \$120

Rates based on 3.5 multiplier.

Fran McAskill
Director
Procurement Division



330 West Church Street
P.O. Box 9005, Drawer AS05
Bartow, Florida 33831-9005
Phone: (863) 534-6757
Fax: (863) 534-6789
www.polk-county.net

EXHIBIT C

Board of County Commissioners

REIMBURSABLE COST SCHEDULE

1. **Reproduction Cost**

	Single Side	Double Sided
A. Regular Copying		
8 ½ x 11 (black & white).....	\$ 0.15/page	\$ 0.25/sheet
8 ½ x 11 (color).....	\$ 0.30/page	\$ 0.40/sheet
8 ½ x 14 (black & white).....	\$ 0.15/page	\$ 0.25/sheet
8 ½ x 14 (color).....	\$ 0.30/page	\$.0.40/sheet
11 x 17 (black & white).....	\$ 0.25/page	\$ 0.35/sheet
11 x 17 (color).....	\$ 0.40/page	\$ 0.50/sheet
9 ½ x 24 Single Side Only.....	\$ 1.00/page	
17 x 22 Single Side Only.....	\$ 2.00/page	
18 x 24 Single Side Only.....	\$ 2.00/page	
24 x 36 Single Side Only.....	\$ 3.00/page	
30 x 30 Single Side Only.....	\$ 5.00/page	
32 x 34 Single Side Only.....	\$ 5.00/page	
Other sizes-per square inch.....	\$ 0.03/page	
Compact Digital Disk	\$ 6.00/disk	
B. Blueprint Copy.....		\$10.00/page

2. **Subcontractor Services (No markup permitted)** Actual Costs

3. **Special Consultants (No markup permitted)** Actual costs

4. **Computer Services** Non-reimbursable

5. **Travel Expenses** In accordance with Chapter 112.061, F.S.;
and further defined in the Polk County Employee Handbook.

6. **Postage, Fed Express, UPS** Actual Costs

7. **Pre-approved Equipment** Actual Costs
(includes purchase and rental of equipment used in project)

