



NEW ORLEANS CORPORATE

4298 Elysian Fields Ave, Ste. B
New Orleans, LA 70122
P: 504.283.9400
F: 504.283.9001

BATON ROUGE OFFICE

14635 S. Harrell's Ferry Road, Ste. 6D
Baton Rouge, LA 70816
P: 225.751.4643
F: 225.448.3480

LAFAYETTE OFFICE

1231 Camellia Blvd.
Lafayette, LA 70508
P: 337.456.5351
F: 337.456.5356

August 23, 2021

Regional Transit Authority

Attn: John DiLosa

2817 Canal Street

New Orleans Louisiana 70119

Sent Via Email: jdilosa@rtaforward.org

**Subject: RTA Canal Street Ferry Terminal
Change Order Request #025
Recommendation for Approval**

Dear John:

Royal Engineers & Consultants LLC (Royal) in conjunction with Dupont LeCorne Construction Consultants (DLCC) have reviewed the above referenced Change Order Request from Woodward APC and recommend acceptance of this Change Order Request for \$657,443.16.

Summary:

This change order request revision 3 is for the new and revised scope of work outlined in RFP#003 received 04/08/2021. These documents affect the permanent ferry boarding barge.

Engineer's Review:

Infinity Engineering Consultants (Infinity) provided RFP#003 for pricing and both Infinity and Mino have reviewed the COR for accurate quantities.

Cost Review:

Royal and DLCC have reviewed the costs and recommend approval based on their unit price estimate. We have verified that this change order meets the minimum criteria for approval set by the RTA including:

1. That the Change Order does not include any apparent errors
2. That all back-up is included where appropriate
3. That insurances, overhead, and profit are reasonable

Woodward APC submitted the initial COR 025 on May 4, 2021, for \$700,681.16. After review of the COR Royal/DLCC made the following comments and requests for revisions based on the itemized breakdown provided on July 1, 2021:

1. *NOI – Please provide the original estimated values and unit prices were for the various components they listed, including the tonnage, SF, and erection manhours.*
2. *NOI unit pricing for the components notes seems reasonable as presented.*
3. *FEC – OK as presented*
4. *APC – Shackle no-divers, OK as presented*
5. *Conrad – We should receive supporting detail that looks like the other subs. They should show the original estimate and new estimate to show the delta. They know how their data is assembled and should be able to present it. If they are concerned about proprietary data, then let them know I can come to their office. If time is of the essence then we can release on a CCD with their number as a GMAX and if we agree to the lump sum them we can convert to a fixed price CO. I went thru several of the items and how are we to know what are the items that drive the various cost that make up the various items. I.e., the add for the handrails, the coating system, the ballast system the sewage system. What did they estimate for handrails versus now, the cost of the paint versus now, the cost of pumps/pits versus now. It is not something that will pass the scrutiny of an objective reviewer.*

Based on the review comments from Royal/DLCC, Woodward APC submitted additional backup information on July 19, 2021. Royal/DLCC reviewed the information and DLCC brought on Chris Lebure, who's background is in barge maintenance and repair, to assist in the COR review. Following a line by line review from Chris and DLCC, Royal provided the following additional comments to Woodward APC on August 5, 2021:

1. *New Orleans Iron – The steel appears more expensive than the shipyard for similar work on steel per ton, is there an explanation for this? Will NOIW also request to update their steel price?*
2. *FEC – OK as submitted. Their rates are based on difficult.*
3. *APC – Ok, however please confirm the chain pricing they are getting is competitive.*
4. *Grating – Are we planning to resolve this prior to final COR? Whose court is this in?*
5. *Fenders - ok*
6. *Item 103 – Confirm Bitt pricing is competitive*
7. *Item 112 – Coating Systems - The primary issue is why is the coverage for certain coatings with the cheaper paint is less? It should be equal or more. Generally, a cheaper paint has fewer solids to allow a cheaper price which increases coverage and reduces millage. In addition, there does appear to be some input errors on a couple of lines that make a difference as well. We should first ask the design team if they increased the millage requirements on the coats from the original base bid documents. It may also be related to the paint, but usually cheaper paint spreads thinner.*
8. *Item 113 – Believe that some of the labor rates are excessive and should be reduce per notes on the attached sheets.*

On August 9, 2021, Woodward APC provided responses to each of the items requiring responses, agreeing to reduce manhours in Item 103, revise the quantities for Item 112, and to reduce manhours for Item 113. Woodward APC was instructed to provide a revised COR that removed steel escalation costs in this COR for a final COR for approval. Woodward APC submitted the revised COR025 R3 on August 20, 2021 for

\$657,443.16. DLCC reviewed the final changes and recommended approval of this COR. Note that the final COR 025 R3 does not include steel escalation pricing, which was agreed to be handled in a separate COR.

Outcome of Review:

We recommend approval based on the criteria above. From the initial COR 025 submitted May 4, 2021, for \$700,681.16 to the final COR025 R3 on August 20, 2021 for \$657,443.16, there has been a reduction of \$43,238.00.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

ROYAL ENGINEERS & CONSULTANTS, LLC



Imbrie Packard
Lead Architect and Project Manager