Call to order.

1. Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance.

2. Consent agenda items which consist of ministerial or “housekeeping” items as required by law. Items may be removed from the consent agenda and discussed by majority vote of the Council.
   a. Minutes – Regular Meeting Minutes: October 12, 2017
   b. Current Invoices
   c. Correspondence

3. Adoption of Ordinance 17-812 temporarily altering the Prima Facie speed limits established for vehicles upon certain streets and highways, or parts thereof, within the Corporate Limits of the City of Humble as set out in this Ordinance; providing an effective date and sunset date; and providing a penalty of a fine not to exceed $400 for the violation of this ordinance.


5. Approval of Change Order No. 1 for the Northshire Lift Station Upgrade, New Force Main, New Gravity Sewer and Other Associated Improvements Project between the City of Humble and Klotz Associates, Inc., dba RPS Klotz Associates in the amount of $30,360.00.

6. Approval of an Amendment to the contract between the City of Humble and ARKK Engineers to provide engineering services for the Isaacks Road Extension Project in an amount not to exceed $85,650.00
7. Approval of a Variance Request made by Harry Gendel Architects on behalf of Aspen Manufacturing, LLC pursuant to Chapter 12, Article XI, Section 500, Subsection f allowing for decorative metal paneling to be utilized in lieu of masonry as required by Chapter 12, Article XI, Section 500, Subsection C, et. seq.

8. Approval of a Subdivision Plat of Park Air 59, being a replat and subdivision of 36.069 acres of land situated in the W. Adams Survey, Abstract No. 95, Harris County, Texas; 1 block, 3 reserves.

9. Approval of a Development Plat of Park Air 59, being a development of 36.069 acres of land situated in the W. Adams Survey, Abstract No. 95, Harris County, Texas; 1 block, 3 reserves.

10. Approval of the Insurance Committee Recommendations for the 2018 City of Humble Group Insurance plan year.

Notice is hereby given that a Regular Meeting of the City Council of the City of Humble, Texas will be held on Thursday, October 26, 2017 at 6:30 P.M. at the City Hall Council Chamber, 114 West Higgins, Humble, Texas. The following subjects will be discussed, to wit: See Agenda.

Posted this 23rd day of October, 2017 at 5:00 P.M.

City Secretary

I, the undersigned, do hereby certify that the above Notice of Meeting of the Governing Body of the City of Humble, Texas, is a true and correct copy of said Notice and that I posted a true and correct copy of said notice on the bulletin board at City Hall, 114 West Higgins, Humble, Texas and the City’s website, www.cityofhumble.com. The Agenda and Notice are readily accessible to the general public at all times. Said Notice and Agenda were posted on October 23, 2017 at 5:00 P.M. and remained so posted continuously for at least 72 hours proceeding the scheduled time of said meeting.

This public notice was removed from the official posting board at the Humble City Hall on the following date and time: ______________________ by ______________________

Subscribed and sworn to before me on this the ____, day of _________________, 2017.

Notary Public – Harris County, Texas
COUNCIL MEETING
10-26-2017

AGENDA ITEM #2A

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
OCTOBER 12, 2017
Mayor Aaron called the regular meeting of the Humble City Council to order with a quorum present at 6:30 P.M.

1. INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.

   Council Member Funderburk offered the invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.
2. **CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS WHICH CONSIST OF MINISTERIAL OR “HOUSEKEEPING” ITEMS AS REQUIRED BY LAW. ITEMS MAY BE REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA AND DISCUSSED BY MAJORITY VOTE OF THE COUNCIL.**
   
b. Financial Statement
c. Current Invoices
d. Government Finance Officers Association Certificate of Achievement
e. Monthly Department Reports
f. Correspondence

Upon a motion by Council Member Funderburk, the City Council voted six (6) for and none (0) opposed to approve the Consent Agenda.

3. **ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 17-786 DESIGNATING A REPRESENTATIVE AND ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE TO THE HOUSTON-GALVESTON AREA COUNCIL 2018 GENERAL ASSEMBLY.**

Upon a motion by Council Member Steagall the City Council voted six (6) for and none (0) opposed to adopt Resolution 17-787 naming Council Member Funderburk as the Representative and Mayor Aaron as the Alternate Representative to the Houston-Galveston Area Council 2018 General Assembly.

4. **ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 17-787 ESTABLISHING A POLICY FOR THE REQUEST, EVALUATION AND INSTALLATION OF TRAFFIC CALMING DEVICES ON CITY OF HUMBLE RIGHTS-OF-WAY.**

City Manager Boeske stated that the City used to follow the City of Houston’s speed hump policy, but that it was recently abandoned; this necessitated staff develop a policy for the City of Humble that was workable.

Upon a motion by Council Member Steagall the City Council voted six (6) for and none (0) opposed to adopt Resolution 17-787 establishing a policy for the request, evaluation and installation of traffic calming devices.

5. **APPROVAL OF CHANGE ORDER NO. 2 FOR THE 2016 CONCRETE PAVEMENT IMPROVEMENTS CONTRACT BETWEEN THE CITY OF HUMBLE, TEXAS AND TRIPLE B CONSTRUCTION IN THE AMOUNT OF $64,281.69 TO ADD ADDITIONAL QUANTITIES AND PAY ITEMS FOR 12” WATER LINE REPLACEMENT ON INVERLOCH WAY.**

Upon a motion by Council Member Funderburk, the City Council voted six (6) for and none (0) opposed to approve Change Order #2 for the 2016 Concrete Pavement Improvements Contract in the amount of $64,281.69.

6. **APPROVAL OF A SUBDIVISION PLAT OF SHOPS ON TOWSEN BLVD. A SUBDIVISION OF 9.0478 ACRES OF LAND IN THE WHERRY B. ADAMS SURVEY, ABSTRACT NO. 95, CITY OF HUMBLE, HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS; 1 RESERVE, 1 BLOCK.**

City Manager Boeske stated the plat met the City’s specifications.
Upon a motion by Council Member Steagall, the City Council voted six (6) for and none (0) opposed to approve the Shops on Townsen Blvd. Subdivision Plat.

7. **APPROVAL OF AN APPLICATION FOR ASSEMBLY PERMIT MADE BY THE FIRST UNITED METHODIST CHURCH OF HUMBLE TO HOLD A FESTIVAL ON OCTOBER 29, 2017 AND CLOSING AVENUE G BETWEEN GRANBERRY AND MAIN STREET FROM 4:30 P.M. UNTIL 9:00 P.M.**

Upon a motion by Council Member Pierce, the City Council voted six (6) for and none (0) opposed to approve the Assembly Permit Application made by First United Methodist Church of Humble.

There being no further business before the City Council, Mayor Aaron adjourned the Regular Meeting of the City Council at 6:35 P.M. on Thursday, October 12, 2017.

______________________________
Merle Aaron
Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
Jason Stuebe
City Secretary
COUNCIL MEETING
10-26-2017
AGENDA ITEM #2B

CURRENT INVOICES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Operating</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Account Payable Checks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$270,154.63</td>
<td>$263,440.34</td>
<td>$38,985</td>
<td>$37,686.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$37,686.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$38,985</td>
<td>2/7/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11,418.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,850.42</td>
<td>2/11/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>$23,850.42</td>
<td>23,850.42</td>
<td>11/15/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Check No.</td>
<td>Vendor Name</td>
<td>Vendor City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/97</td>
<td>966.00</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>THE PRODUCTIVITY CENTER INC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/22/97</td>
<td>462.27</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>STANDARD INSURANCE COMPANY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/13/97</td>
<td>219.76</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>DOMIERINS INC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/23/97</td>
<td>81.57</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>AMERICAN REGISTRATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/29/97</td>
<td>96.89</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>ALKON MONITORING SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/12/97</td>
<td>186.47</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>ADT SECURITY SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/43/97</td>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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AGENDA ITEM #2C

CORRESPONDENCE
Post Session Update: Cities Must Report Hotel Occupancy Tax Information

During the 2017 regular session, the legislature passed S.B. 1221, which aims to improve transparency about the hotel occupancy tax by requiring cities to file an annual report with the comptroller that includes the city’s hotel occupancy tax rate, the amount of revenue generated by the tax, and the amount and percentage of the revenue spent for each of the following purposes:

- Convention or information centers
- Convention delegates registration
- Advertising to attract tourists
- Arts promotion and improvement
- Historical restoration and preservation projects
- Signage directing the public to sights and attractions

Cities may decide to post this information on their own websites. If they pursue this option, the city must provide the comptroller with a direct link to the posted information in lieu of submitting the information. The comptroller provides an optional format template for online posting.

The 50-day reporting window opens on January 1st and closes February 20th each year.

For more information, see the comptroller’s hotel occupancy tax reporting webpage. City officials with questions about the new requirements can also contact the comptroller’s transparency team by email at transparency@cpa.texas.gov or (844) 519-5676.
Payday Lending Clearinghouse Updates

The League’s “Payday Lending Clearinghouse” webpage, available at https://www.tml.org/payday-updates, includes information related to the regulation of payday and auto title lenders. It is updated from time-to-time to reflect recent developments. Interested city officials should note that the federal Consumer Finance Protection Bureau has issued its final rule regulating payday lending nationwide. For more information, visit the clearinghouse page.

TML member cities may use the material herein for any purpose. No other person or entity may reproduce, duplicate, or distribute any part of this document without the written authorization of the Texas Municipal League.
Months of Fuzzy Math Hid State’s Property Tax Shift

For nearly two decades, proponents of revenue caps have been pushing for legislation that would lower city rollback rates and require mandatory property tax rate elections. That push became more intense than ever in the last several months.

Beginning with the appointment of the interim Senate Select Committee on Property Tax Reform and Relief in 2016, and culminating (for now) with Senate leadership deciding not to concur with a modified revenue cap bill adopted by the House of Representatives during the special legislative session, legislators advocating for revenue caps have recently shown a disturbing willingness to use misleading (and even outright faulty) data to attempt to bolster their position.

Let’s take a look at some of the more notable examples of statistical malpractice from the past several months.

Total Property Tax Levy vs. Median Household Income

Last interim, the Senate Select Committee on Property Tax Reform and Relief held several hearings around the state. The committee displayed charts showing that the total amount of city property taxes levied statewide increased 60 percent from 2005 to 2014, while median household income increased 26 percent.
As it turned out, that comparison proved meaningless. The total increase in city tax levies should not be compared with the average increase in household income. Why not? Put simply, there’s no relationship between median household income and the growth in total tax collections caused, in large part, by new construction. Texas continues to lead the nation in population growth. With population and economic growth comes new construction, and along with it come higher total tax levies. Trying to compare a total to an average is an “apples to oranges” comparison.

In addition to understanding that the total levy figure includes new growth, the total levy figure also encompasses property taxes collected on single-family property, multi-family property, commercial property, industrial property, vacant property, oil and gas production property, and other types of taxable property. For the committee to compare a ten-year increase in total property tax levy from all of those sources with median household income in order to argue that individual homeowners are being taxed out of their homes was absolutely misleading because the tax burden doesn’t fall wholly on residential homeowners.

On January 30, the Dallas Morning News ran an article written by Data and Enterprise Reporter David McSwane. The article points out these misleading arguments used by proponents of revenue caps. For his article, McSwane interviewed independent economists and fiscal analysts. They called the committee’s comparison “fallacious” and “worse than meaningless.” The article also includes a true “apples to apples” comparison using federal
data showing that personal income has actually outpaced property tax bills in Texas (see chart below). The article is a must-read for city officials.

**Taxes vs. Income since 2005**

The growth of personal income has slightly outpaced property tax growth.

[Graph showing personal income and property tax growth from 2005 to 2015.]

**Texas’ Tax Burden Compared to Other States**

The interim property tax committee also cited a map during its many hearings showing that Texas ranked high in local property taxes compared to all other states. That is absolutely true. Most surveys show Texas ranking from sixth to 13th in a state ranking of property taxes. But it leaves out a very important fact: Most surveys show Texas ranking in the bottom half (some as low as 46th) in a ranking of total state and local tax burden.

Making a big deal about one component of the tax burden is misleading at best. In fact, it misses the point that Texas, more than any other state, relies on local governments to provide services. And the legislature has chosen the property tax as the primary means of paying for those services, particularly with regard to the public school system.

**Overstated Tax Relief from Revenue Caps**

In the waning days of the regular legislative session, a revenue cap proponent made the statement that revenue cap legislation would “save the average homeowner in Texas $20,000 a year over the next 20 years or so.” His staff later claimed that he actually meant $20,000 cumulatively over the next 20 years.

Either way, Politifact Texas concluded that the statement was not only false, but “ridiculous.” According to the article, even the revised statement about cumulative savings contained “major flaws” and is “at best, a wild guess.” The statement earned the label of “Pants on
Fire,” which is reserved for only the most outrageously false claims. Essentially, the statement assumed that cities would be raising property tax rates to the rollback rate every year, an assumption that isn’t supported by historical data. Comptroller data shows that in recent years over 60 percent of Texas cities have not adopted tax rates that would exceed the lowered proposed rollback rate of five percent.

Growth in City Property Taxes versus School Property Taxes

During the 2017 special legislative session last summer, the author of S.B. 1 (the revenue cap bill) repeatedly stated that school property taxes have only increased 39.5 percent from 2005 to 2015, while city property taxes have increased by 71 percent over the same period. Here is the chart he showed to justify that statement:

![Chart showing growth in property taxes](chart.png)

What’s interesting is that he begins measuring the increase in property taxes in 2005. Conveniently for him, 2005 was the year before the legislature significantly overhauled school finance by revamping the state franchise tax to fund public education. This opened the door for local school districts to lower their maintenance and operations tax rates significantly as that revenue was replaced by the new “margins tax.” In 2006, as intended, school property taxes dropped significantly because of action taken by the legislature. To include this artificial and anomalous drop in school tax levy in the comparison to city property tax levies over the same time period significantly skews the numbers. Doing so
makes it deceptively appear as though city taxes were and are increasing at a much faster rate.

Using a more appropriate comparison of property tax levies from 2007 to 2015 paints a very different picture. During that time frame, school district property taxes increased by 49 percent, and city property taxes increased by 42 percent. In other words, an “apples to apples” comparison shows that school district property taxes have increased faster than city property taxes:

**Total Property Tax Levies (in millions of dollars)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$18,874.2</td>
<td>$5,890.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$21,233.5</td>
<td>$6,451.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$21,780.1</td>
<td>$6,593.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$21,558.3</td>
<td>$6,755.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$22,001.6</td>
<td>$6,810.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$23,072.8</td>
<td>$7,055.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$24,854.7</td>
<td>$7,324.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$26,792.7</td>
<td>$7,828.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$28,176.5</td>
<td>$8,380.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Increase

- **School District**: $9,302.3 (49.3%)
- **City**: $2,490.1 (42.3%)

Source: Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts

School district property taxes are thus increasing faster than city property taxes on a percentage basis. But comparing real dollar amounts, as opposed to percentages, makes the increase in school district property taxes compared to city property taxes even more stark.

In real taxpayer dollars, the 49 percent increase in school district property taxes from 2007 to 2015 collectively cost Texas taxpayers $9.3 billion. The 42 percent increase in total city property tax levies over the same period cost Texas taxpayers $2.4 billion. In real dollar figures, school district property taxes have increased over three times as much city property taxes.

The heavily reliance on misinformation over the last several months begs the question – why have some legislators and state officials been willing to embrace these faulty figures? And why now?

To answer those questions, one needs to look no further than the state’s budget. The state budget bill, S.B. 1, anticipates an estimated $6.9 billion increase in local school district property taxes during the 2018-2019 biennium to fund the Foundation School Program. Because the local school districts’ share of funding increases so dramatically, the state will decrease the amount of state funds it allocates towards the Foundation School Program by $800 million over the same time frame.
The chart below tracks the state’s share of funding as compared to funding from local property taxes. By 2019, the state’s share of funding the Foundation School Program is estimated to reach a low of 38.2 percent. A decade ago, the state picked up 46 percent of the tab for local schools. In short, the state is essentially forcing local school districts to increase property taxes to make up for the portion of school finance the state is no longer funding.

**State and Local Share of Foundation School Program Entitlement and State Share Percentage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Local ($Billions)</th>
<th>State ($Billions)</th>
<th>Total ($Billions)</th>
<th>% State Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$19.7</td>
<td>$16.5</td>
<td>$36.2</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$20.3</td>
<td>$17.7</td>
<td>$38.0</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$20.2</td>
<td>$18.6</td>
<td>$38.8</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$20.5</td>
<td>$17.4</td>
<td>$37.9</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$21.4</td>
<td>$17.4</td>
<td>$38.8</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$22.8</td>
<td>$18.8</td>
<td>$41.6</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$24.4</td>
<td>$18.8</td>
<td>$43.2</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$25.6</td>
<td>$19.8</td>
<td>$45.4</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$27.0</td>
<td>$19.4</td>
<td>$46.4</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$28.8</td>
<td>$19.4</td>
<td>$48.2</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$30.7</td>
<td>$19.0</td>
<td>$49.7</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Center for Public Policy Priorities using Legislative Budget Board data and Comptroller’s 2017 Certification Revenue Estimate, Table A-10, Foundation School Program

The following is actual language on public education funding from the state budget bill that was passed by the Legislature in May:

“Property values, and the estimates of local tax collections on which they are based, shall be increased by 7.04 percent for tax year 2017 and by 6.77 percent for tax year 2018.”

To make up for reduced state money going to school funding, the legislature passed, and the governor signed, a budget essentially requiring that property values – and the school property taxes derived from them – go up by almost fourteen percent over the next two years.

The recent reliance on questionable math to blame cities for property tax increases serves as a shiny object to divert attention away from the mounting evidence that the state legislature’s inaction on funding public education is the driving force behind property tax increases in Texas. Politically, it’s much easier for some in the legislature to blame cities for high property taxes and tap into voters’ perpetual distaste for taxes by skewing data to fit that narrative.
The legislature came closer to passing a revenue cap bill in 2017 than ever before. Different versions of revenue cap legislation passed both chambers during both the regular and special legislative sessions. Ultimately the House and Senate couldn’t agree on the details.

On the surface, it’s somewhat surprising that, when presented with the House version of revenue caps in the special session, the Senate proponents of revenue caps decided not to just concur and declare victory after years of pushing for the legislation. But given the reality behind the state legislature’s involvement in increasing school property taxes, the decision to reject the House’s legislation can best be analogized to the dog that finally catches the mail truck.

After all, once it was conclusively established that state-mandated limitations on city property taxes would not lower property taxes overall, who would those legislators then have to blame?
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ORDINANCE 17-812

TEMPORARY SPEED LIMIT
IH-69
CITY OF HUMBLE

ORDINANCE NO. 17-812

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF HUMBLE, TEXAS TEMPORARILY ALTERING THE PRIMA FACIE SPEED LIMITS ESTABLISHED FOR VEHICLES UPON CERTAIN STREETS AND HIGHWAYS, OR PARTS THEREOF, WITHIN THE CORPORATE LIMITS OF THE CITY OF HUMBLE AS SET OUT IN THIS ORDINANCE; PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE AND SUNSET DATE; AND PROVIDING A PENALTY OF A FINE NOT TO EXCEED $400 FOR THE VIOLATION OF THIS ORDINANCE.

WHEREAS, The Texas Department of Transportation has requested a temporary reduction of the Prima Facie speed limit in both directions of a segment of Interstate Highway 69 / U.S. Highway 59 to perform emergency repairs on the south bound bridge crossing the San Jacinto River;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF HUMBLE, TEXAS, THAT:

Section 1. the following temporary prima facie speed limits hereafter indicated for vehicles are hereby determined and declared to be reasonable and safe; and such speed limits are hereby fixed at the rate of speed indicated for vehicles traveling upon the named streets and highways, or parts thereof, described as follows:

Along Interstate Highway 69 / U.S. Highway 59, southbound lanes from the north city limit of the City of Humble to the intersection of Farm to Market Road 1960 Bypass, a distance of approximately 1.610 miles, the speed limit shall be 55 MPH.

Along Interstate Highway 69 / U.S. Highway 59, northbound lanes from the intersection of Farm to Market Road 1960 Bypass, to the north city limit of the City of Humble, a distance of approximately 1.610 miles, the speed limit shall be 55 MPH.

Section 2. any person violating any of the provisions of this ordinance shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not more than Four Hundred Dollars ($400).

Section 3. that this Ordinance shall go into effect upon the commencement of the construction project to the San Jacinto River bridge as determined by the Texas Department of Transportation Regional Office; this Ordinance shall sunset upon completion of the construction project to the San Jacinto River Bridge as determined by the Texas Department of Transportation Regional Office.
PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 26th day of October 2017.

Merle Aaron  
Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
Jason Stuebe  
City Secretary
**Request for Regulatory Construction Speed Zone**

**District:** Houston  
**Highway:** IH 69 Mainlanes  
**Contact Person:** Abraham M. Guzman, P.E.  
**Contact Phone Number:** 936-538-3302

**Type of work:**
- ☒ 2 - Lane closure w/ barrier  
- ☐ 4 - One-way traffic signal  
- ☐ 1 - Shoulder activity  
- ☐ 2 - Temporary diversion  
- ☐ 4 - Unpaved surface  
- ☐ 1 - Lane encroachment  
- ☐ 3 - Lane closure w/o barrier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Work</th>
<th>Posted Speed</th>
<th>Construction Speed Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>≥ 65 mph</td>
<td>May be 5 mph below posted speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 60 mph</td>
<td>May not be used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>≥ 80 mph</td>
<td>May be as low as 65 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= 75, 70 or 65 mph ≤ 60 mph</td>
<td>May be 10 mph below the posted speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 75 mph</td>
<td>May be 5 mph below the posted speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>≥ 80 mph</td>
<td>May be as low as 65 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 75 mph</td>
<td>May be 10 mph below the posted speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>≥ 55 mph</td>
<td>May be as low as 45 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 50 mph</td>
<td>May be 10 mph below the posted speed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Section 1</th>
<th>Section 2</th>
<th>Section 3</th>
<th>Section 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>IH 69</td>
<td>IH 69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Name (or Rural)</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>Humble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-construction Posted Speed</td>
<td>65 MPH</td>
<td>65 MPH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Construction Speed</td>
<td>55 MPH</td>
<td>55 MPH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control-Section-Job</td>
<td>6324-86-001</td>
<td>6324-86-001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Mile Point</td>
<td>490+00</td>
<td>491+00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Mile Point</td>
<td>491+00</td>
<td>492+00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>1.000 mi</td>
<td>1.000 mi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Emergency Contract No. 10171241</td>
<td>Emergency Contract No. 10171241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicate below whether or not your form submission includes attachment(s):
- ☐ YES  
  - ☑ NO
Instructions:

If you accessed this form from within the eForms System, once you have opened it, click the "Take Form Offline" icon (bottom, left) and save the form to your computer. If you accessed the form from a web page link, you can also use File>Save As on the top menu bar to save the form to your computer.

Once you have completed your form, you may save it and submit it by clicking the "Submit by E-mail" button on page 1. This opens your e-mail client and automatically attaches your completed form to a pre-addressed e-mail. Simply click "Send," and you're done.

### Types of Work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Shoulder Activity</th>
<th>Lane Encroachment</th>
<th>Lane Closure with Barrier</th>
<th>Temporary Diversion</th>
<th>Lane Closure w/o Barrier</th>
<th>One-Way Traffic Signal</th>
<th>Unpaved Surface</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity closer than 10 ft but not closer than 2 ft from the edge of the traveled way</td>
<td>Activity requires a lane closure with workers protected by a barrier</td>
<td>Activity requires a temporary diversion be constructed</td>
<td>Activity requires a lane closure with workers within 10 feet of travel way unprotected by barrier</td>
<td>Activity uses a one-way traffic signal to direct traffic through construction area</td>
<td>Activity requires traffic to travel on an unpaved surface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Factors

| Factors | 1, 2 | 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 | 3, 4, 6, 7 | 3, 4, 6, 8 | 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 | 3, 6, 8 | 5, 6 |

### Current Speed Limit (MPH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Construction Speeds (MPH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Note:

Buffer zones may be needed for speed transitions \( \geq 15 \) mph.

### Factors:

1. Workers present for extended periods within 10 feet of traveled way unprotected by barriers
2. Horizontal curvature that might increase vehicle encroachment rate
3. Lane width reduction of 1 foot or more with a resulting lane width less than 11 feet
4. Barrier, traffic control devices or pavement edge drop off within 2 feet of traveled way
5. Reduced design speed for stopping sight distance
6. Unexpected conditions
7. Traffic congestion created by lane closure
8. Reduced design speed for detour roadway or transitions
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RESOLUTION 17-788

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION MANUALS
AMENDMENT
CITY OF HUMBLE

RESOLUTION NO. 17-788

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF HUMBLE, TEXAS, AMENDING THE CITY OF HUMBLE DESIGN CRITERIA MANUAL FOR WASTEWATER COLLECTION SYSTEMS, WATER LINES, STORM DRAINAGE, AND STREET PAVING; AND THE CITY OF HUMBLE STANDARD CONSTRUCTION SPECIFICATIONS FOR WASTEWATER COLLECTION SYSTEMS, WATER LINES, STORM DRAINAGE, AND STREET PAVING; AND PROVIDING OTHER MATTERS RELATING TO THE SUBJECT.

BE IT RESOLVED, BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF HUMBLE TEXAS THAT:


Section 2: Sections 02604, 02626, 02627, 02645, 02665, 02675, 02676 of The City of Humble Design Criteria Manual for Wastewater Collection Systems, Water Lines, Storm Drainage and Street Paving and the City of Humble Standard Construction Specifications for Wastewater Collection Systems, Water Lines, Storm Drainage, and Street Paving are hereby approved and amended as attached to this resolution, being a true and correct copy and for all things made a part hereof.

Section 4: In the event any clause, phrase, provision, sentence, or part of this Resolution or the Design Criteria Manual, or the Standard Construction Specifications adopted hereby, or the application of the same to any person or circumstance shall for any reason be adjudged invalid or held unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, it shall not affect, impair, or invalidate this Resolution or said Design Criteria Manual, or said Standard Construction Specifications as a whole or any part of provision hereof other than the part declared to be invalid or unconstitutional; and the City Council of the City of Humble, Texas declares that it would have passed each and every part of the same notwithstanding the omission of any such part thus declared to be invalid or unconstitutional, whether there be one or more parts.

Section 2: That this amended Section shall go into effect immediately on and from the date of passage of this Resolution.
PASSED, APPROVED, AND RESOLVED this the 26th day of October, 2017.

APPROVED:

______________________________
Merle Aaron
Mayor

ATTEST:

Jason Stuebe
City Secretary
## CITY OF HUMBLE
### SUMMARY OF REVISIONS TO CITY STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPEC SECTION</th>
<th>SPEC TITLE</th>
<th>DATE REVISED</th>
<th>BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF REVISIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 02604        | Valve Boxes, Meter Boxes and Meter Vaults       | 8/1/2017     | Updated meter box and lid models (DFW Plastics)  
Updated section for precast meter vaults; removed section for cast-in-place meter vaults                                |
| 02626        | Tapping Sleeves and Valves                      | 8/1/2017     | Update allowable tapping sleeve materials (All stainless steel or ductile iron only)  
Require ductile iron MJ sleeve for AC pipe and size on size taps                                                      |
| 02627        | Water Meters                                    | 8/1/2017     | Add allowable meter models for 1" and smaller meters (Sensus); add requirement for compound type meter on larger meters                                           |
| 02645        | Fire Hydrant Assembly                           | 8/1/2017     | Update color requirement for hydrant barrel (OSHA Safety Blue)  
Clarify installation requirement for fire hydrant grade (safety flange 2" to 6" above finished grade)           |
| 02665        | Water Tape and Service Line Installation        | 8/1/2017     | Added statement to prohibit the use of "quick joint" or "grip joint" fittings  |
| 02675        | Disinfection of Water Lines                     | 8/1/2017     | Added statement for contractor to coordinate chlorination operations with the City prior to starting disinfection                                   |
| 02676        | Hydrostatic Testing of Pipelines                | 8/1/2017     | Clarified minimum test pressure to be 150 psi; added statement to start testing by 9:00 AM                                                                  |
COUNCIL MEETING
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WASTEWATER SYSTEMS IMPROVEMENT
PROJECT CHANGE ORDER #1
This is EXHIBIT K, consisting of 2 pages, referred to in and part of the Agreement between Owner and Engineer for Professional Services dated May 25, 2017.

AMENDMENT TO OWNER-ENGINEER AGREEMENT
Amendment No. 1

The Effective Date of this Amendment is: ____________________________.

Background Data

Effective Date of Owner-Engineer Agreement: May 25, 2017

Owner: City of Humble

Engineer: Klotz Associates, Inc. dba RPS Klotz Associates

Project: Northshire Lift Station Upgrade, New Force Main, New Gravity Sewer and Other Associated Improvements

Nature of Amendment: [Check those that are applicable and delete those that are inapplicable.]

X Additional Services to be performed by Engineer

_____ Modifications to services of Engineer

_____ Modifications to responsibilities of Owner

_____ Modifications of payment to Engineer

_____ Modifications to time(s) for rendering services

_____ Modifications to other terms and conditions of the Agreement

Description of Modifications:

See Attached Exhibits A-1, A-2, and A-3

Agreement Summary:

Original agreement amount: $983,630.00

Net change for prior amendments: $0.00

This amendment amount: $30,360.00

Adjusted Agreement amount: $1,013,990.00

Change in time for services (days or date, as applicable): N/A
The foregoing Agreement Summary is for reference only and does not alter the terms of the Agreement, including those set forth in Exhibit C.

Owner and Engineer hereby agree to modify the above-referenced Agreement as set forth in this Amendment. All provisions of the Agreement not modified by this or previous Amendments remain in effect.

OWNER: City of Humble

By:                                             
Print name:                                     
Title:                                         
Date Signed:                                   

ENGINEER: Klotz Associates, Inc. dba RPS Klotz Associates

By: 
Print name: Bart C. Standley, P.E. 
Title: Vice President 
Date Signed: 9/26/2017
ADDITIONAL SERVICES REQUEST NO. 1
CITY OF HUMBLE WASTEWATER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS
HUMBLE, TEXAS

Task
Provide limited site clearing to access Borings B-6, B-7, and B-23 to B-27. This task will be provided on a subcontract basis under our direct supervision.

Cost
Add $15,700 lump sum.

Assumptions
Site clearing materials will be left onsite.
Landowner permission to be provided by others.

Submitted By
Tolunay-Wong Engineers, Inc.

[Signature]
William R. Tobin, P.E.
Professional Services Agreement

RPS Klotz Associates  
1160 Dairy Ashford, Suite 500, Houston TX 77079  
P 281-589-7257  E Monica.Stiggins@klotz.com

Proposal Date  
June 06, 2017

When accepted by RPS Klotz Associates ("Customer"), this proposal shall constitute an agreement between Customer and Landpoint, LLC (d/b/a Town and Country Surveyors - A Landpoint Company) ("Landpoint").

Scope of Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Line clearing for the topographic survey portion of the City of Humble Wastewater System improvements, this is a add on since the clearing was initially proposed to have been done by the City of Humble. prior to the topographic surveys commencement.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverables</td>
<td>Enough line will be cleared to survey in a single line along the proposed pipeline location.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Description of Work:

The work will be done for the survey crew to run control through the woods for the topographic survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated-Fixed Cost</th>
<th>$10,000.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line Cutting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professional Services Agreement

RPS Group
1160 Dairy Ashford, Suite 500, Houston TX 77079
P 281-589-7257 E Alex.Kuzokov@rpsgroup.com

Job # 17-1069 Proposal Date September 22, 2017

When accepted by RPS Klotz Associates ("Customer"), this proposal shall constitute an agreement between Customer and Landpoint, LLC (d/b/a Town and Country Surveyors – A Landpoint Company) ("Landpoint").

Scope of Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Union Pacific Railroad Right of Way – Flag Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Location</td>
<td>Humble, TX – Union Pacific right of way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverables</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Description of Work:

- RailPros Field Services flag personnel will be contracted to provide to flagging services for survey crews within Union Pacific railroad right of way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated-Fixed Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flag Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 2, 2017

Russel Ginsel
Landpoint Surveying
832-941-0257
rginsel@landpoint.net

Subject: Quote for Flagger in Charge Services

Dear Mr. Ginsel,

Thank you for contacting RailPros Field Services, Inc. (RPFS) to provide a qualified Flagger in Charge. RPFS provides associates with extensive railroad experience, all qualified in GCOR, Maintenance-of-Way, and On-track safety. All of our Flaggers in Charge are dedicated to safety on the job-site and have an acute understanding of railroad rules.

RPFS charges a daily rate which includes an 8-hour on-site work day, mobilization, and Per Diem costs. Our services are billed for the Flagger in Charge’s (FIC’s) time on site, to include any time setting up and taking down track protection, if applicable. Any time beyond the FIC’s 8 hours will be charged at an hourly overtime rate.

The rates for our services are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Work Day:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 8 hour day</td>
<td>$950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtime rate per hour after 8 hours</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nights, Weekends, and Holidays:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 8 hour day</td>
<td>$1,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtime rate per hour after 8 hours</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the event of cancellation, if RailPros UP Management is given less than twenty-four hours’ notice, it is considered a billable day. Cancellations must be made in writing to UPFlag@RailProsFS.com.

This quote is based on RailPros Field Services standard labor rates and does not take into any account prevailing wage requirements. If prevailing wages are applicable for this project, RPFS will re-quote with the prevailing wage requirement.

Invoices are submitted upon completion of the job or at month’s end. On-going jobs are billed on a monthly basis. Payments of invoices are due upon receipt. Invoices are subject to a 1% fee for every 30 days the payment is delinquent. We offer credit card payment processing for an additional 5% fee.

If you have any questions regarding this quote or would like further information, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you,

RAILPROS FIELD SERVICES, INC.

HEATHER MORRIS
Field Services Associate
877.315.0513 x116

AGREED TO AND ACCEPTED BY:

__________________________________________
Client Company Representative

__________________________________________
Printed Name

__________________________________________
Title

__________________________________________
Date
**Railroad:** UP  
**Project Information**

- **Date:** 08/21/2017  
- **RWIC Name:** WALKER, JESSE  
- **Project Location:** Humble, Texas  
- **Client:** Long pourr surveying  
- **Office Phone:** 9364023373  
- **DOT Crossing/Folder:** N/A  
- **RPFS Job #:** 7326  
- **RWIC Start Time:** 08:00  
- **RWIC End Time:** 16:00  
- **Total Hours:** 8.00  
- **Daily Mileage:** Per Diem  
- **Line:** No  
- **CLC:** No

**Work Zone Information**

- **Subdivision:** Lufkin  
- **Track Supervisor:** Landrum Heath  
- **MP Location:** 15.90 17.26  
- **Status of Job:** On-Going  
- **Type of Protection:** Watchman Lookout/Train Approach Warning

**Description of Work and Daily Itinerary / Notes:**

Survey over and around the railroad tracks for depth of pipe saw a sewer line how deep under the railroad tracks along the streets job briefing 09.15 began working 0925 for people in job briefing stop working at that location milepost 15.90 went down to FM 1960 business milepost 17 -21 another job briefing for that location at 11 00 began working 11.10 work stops 15.15 left premises 1513

**Signatures**

- **RWIC Signature:**  
- **Date:** 08/21/2017  
- **Client Signature:**  
- **Client Name:** Terry Bjorck  
- **Client Number:** 2814658730  
- **Date:** 08/21/2017

*Every section must be completely filled out. Daily contractor signature REQUIRED. NO EXCEPTIONS.*

Submit completed DWRs via email to dwr@railprofsfs.com or via fax (866)762-7619

**Day Classification:** Billable Day
# Project Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>08/23/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWIC Name</td>
<td>WALKER, JESSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Humble, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client</td>
<td>Land point survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Phone</td>
<td>9364023373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOT Crossing/Folder</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPFS Job #</td>
<td>7326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWIC Start Time</td>
<td>08:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWIC End Time</td>
<td>16:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hours</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Mileage</td>
<td>Per Diem No CLC No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Work Zone Information

- **Subdivision:** Lufkin
- **Track Supervisor:** Landrum Heath
- **MP Location:** 18.45
- **Status of Job:** Complete
- **Type of Protection:** Watchman Lookout/Train Approach Warning

**Description of Work and Daily Itinerary / Notes:**

Surveying on and over the railroad track finding depth for sewer lines and pipe job briefing 08.05 work begun. 09.15, at mp 18.45 went to another job site 17.0 another job briefing that at 13.30 survey for pipe and sewer line work stop 14.50 left job site 1500

---

**Signatures**

- **RWIC Signature:**
  - Signature:
  - Date: 08/23/2017

- **Client Signature:**
  - Signature:
  - Client Name: Terry Bjorck
  - Client Number: 8327916274
  - Date: 08/23/2017

*Every section must be completely filled out. Daily contractor signature REQUIRED. NO EXCEPTIONS.*

Submit completed DWRs via email to dwr@railprosfs.com or via fax (866)762-7619

**Day Classification:** Billable Day
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount with Markup</th>
<th>Markup</th>
<th>Consultant Amount W/O Markup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$30,360.00</td>
<td>$27,600.00</td>
<td>$2,760.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,900.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$17,270.00</td>
<td>$35,700.00</td>
<td>$3,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Flight personnel for the RR crossing line cutting
- Limited cleaning to provide access to drains
Alex Kuzovkov

Subject: FW: Drawings

From: Barry Brock [mailto:bbrock@cityofhumble.net]
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 9:51 AM
To: Monica Stiggins
Cc: Darrell Boeske
Subject: [EXT] RE: Drawings

Monica,

I have found the original plans for the sewer line along the RR tracks from Will Clayton to Carpenter Road. The line has been rehab in several spots since the installation of the original line. We may need to video the line to determine the condition. Please let me know your thoughts.

As for the Maintenance Building, I am unable to find any drawings.

Barry

From: Monica Stiggins [mailto:Monica.Stiggins@rpsgroup.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 05, 2017 12:55 PM
To: Barry Brock <bbrock@cityofhumble.net>
Cc: Alex Kuzovkov <Alex.Kuzovkov@rpsgroup.com>
Subject: Drawings

Barry

We are preparing to walk the alignment for the force main project and were wondering if you could get us the following drawings:

1. Drawings for the maintenance building that runs parallel to the RR track. We would really like to know what the foundation looks like.

2. Drawings for the gravity sewer line that we will be pipe-bursting.

See attached for illustration.
Darrell,

Based on our yesterday’s discussion attached is the revised 16-inch sewer line alignment around the cemetery. Please confirm, and we’ll instruct survey, environmental, and geotechnical consultants about this matter. Please let me know if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Thank you,

Alexander Kuzovkov, P.E.
Deputy Practice Manager
RPS | Infrastructure
1160 N Dairy Ashford, Suite 600,
Houston, Texas 77079
USA
T +1 281 589 7257
F +1 281 589 7300
M +1 678 654 2063
E Alex.Kuzovkov@rpsonline.com
W www.rpsgroup.com/usa
Formerly Klotz Associates

Gentlemen,

I appreciate you taking time to meet us yesterday. I believe it was a productive discussion that will lead to the positive results. Please let us know when you schedule a meeting with the Grace Church folks, and we’ll be there. Also, as we discussed yesterday attached are exhibits for Abercrombie Company and Campbell Concrete properties in regards to the new force main and sanitary sewer improvements.

Please let me know if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Thank you,
COUNCIL MEETING
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ARKK ENGINEERS
CONTRACT AMENDMENT
October 23, 2017

Mr. Barry K. Brock  
Director of Public Works  
City of Humble  
102 Granberry  
Humble, Texas 77338

Re: Contract Amendment Proposal for Engineering Services for the Isaacks Road Extension Project

Dear Mr. Brock:

ARKK Engineers, LLC (ARKK) is pleased to submit this proposal for performing engineering services for the above referenced project. This proposal is based on our understanding of the project as per our previous meetings and conversations.

Isaacks Road on the west side of S. Houston Avenue is currently a dead-end road that ends approximately 500 feet west of the intersection at S. Houston Avenue. The existing road consists of concrete pavement and curbs with underground storm sewer. This project involves extending Isaacks Road an additional 50 feet to the west along the north side of the Deer Springs Apartments, and will include a cul-de-sac at the end of the road. The proposed road extension will include new underground storm sewer and outfall into the City’s detention pond, which is located approximately 350 feet north of Isaacks Road.

As part of the proposed Isaacks Road extension, the City will need to acquire the 1.3 acre tract currently owned by Ramshur Investments III, LLC as public right-of-way. In addition, a small piece out of the larger 6.38 acre tract (also owned by Ramshur Investments III, LLC) will need to be acquired in order to construct the proposed cul-de-sac on the west end of the road. This proposal includes special surveying services needed to prepare the necessary easement documents. However, the right-of-way/easement acquisition costs are not included.

There is an existing 6” AC water line on the south side of the existing concrete pavement section that is connected to the 12” PVC water line at S. Houston. This proposal also includes replacing the 6” AC line with a new 8” PVC water line. The new 8” PVC water line will also continue along the south side of the proposed road extension and end with an automatic flushing device. This project does not include sanitary sewer improvements.

There is an existing 6” sanitary sewer on the north side of the road that serves Focused Care At Humble on the north side of Isaacks Rd. This line is proposed to be replaced in order to upsize this line to an 8” line and to install it deeper so that it can be extended in the future to serve the property west of the current end of the roadway.
The estimated construction cost for the paving, drainage, water and sewer improvements is approximately $420,000. This cost does not include any right-of-way/easement acquisition costs.

**SCOPE OF SERVICES**

**A. Design Phase Basic Services**

- Research and gather existing data on the project such as existing utility information and as-built drawings on the existing facilities.

- Plot survey data of the proposed utility alignment and evaluate potential alignment alternatives.

- Examine geotechnical information to determine potential soil conditions and potential impact on construction methodology and costs.

- Compile and review other existing information such as environmental assessments, right-of-way, easements, and traffic control requirements.

- Provide estimated construction costs.

- Coordinate with the City of Humble and apprise the City of ARKK’s findings and analysis, and obtain input from the City.

- Meet with the City at the 30% design completion phase. At the 30% design meeting, the following items will be discussed:
  - Construction Cost Estimates.
  - Items which will affect the project cost and time during construction.
  - Information and coordination with other governmental and utility agencies, and data on any required permitting.

- Prepare final engineering design drawings and specifications.

- Prepare final cost estimate for the project.

- Complete coordination with other governmental entities or utility agencies in regard to the project. Assist the City in obtaining and/or securing approvals required by all governmental authorities with jurisdiction over the design and/or the operation of the project and all public and private utilities including pipeline transmission companies affected by this project. This assistance will involve the usual expected coordination and approval process. When the process involves work beyond the expected, such as; special submittals, designs, appearances at special meetings, coordination of utility/pipeline excavation efforts, permitting applications, etc., such work would be considered under the Additional Services portion of this proposal.
• Coordinate with the City of Humble during the final design process and provide draft documents for the City to review and comment upon. Incorporate appropriate comments with the final bid documents.

• Furnish three (3) sets of construction documents to the City.

B. Special Design Phase Services

Surveying Services

• Obtain topographical survey for the right-of-way in the project area. The approximate length of survey for this project is 800 feet.

• The survey shall locate right-of-way iron rods and property corners at periodic locations to aid in locating the right-of-way. A CAD file showing the apparent right-of-way line on the topographical survey will be provided based on the located right-of-way iron rods. Perform “measure downs” and provide vertical elevation information on the existing sanitary sewer, and other utilities in the project area.

• Prepare boundary surveys and metes and bounds descriptions associated with easement documents for obtaining a Drainage Easement and easement for the cul-de-sac at the end of the existing road.

Geotechnical Investigation Services

• Field Exploration: 2 borings are anticipated to be drilled to a combined depth of 20 feet along the project alignment to evaluate subsurface conditions. The borings will be drilled at approximate 500 feet spacing.

• Laboratory Testing - Soil mechanics laboratory testing will be performed to measure physical and engineering properties of selected representative soil samples.

• Geotechnical Report - The geotechnical report will provide recommendations and construction criteria for the project area.

Traffic Control Plan

• Prepare a Traffic Control Plan for the project.

Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan

• Prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for the project.

C. Construction Phase Services

This phase will be entered into after the acceptance of the final engineering design drawings
and documents by the City of Humble.

- Prepare the Change Order Documents to add this work into the existing Contract with Triple B Services, LLC.

- Evaluate and negotiate prices for items that were not in the original bid.

- Act as the City’s Project Representative during the construction phase.

- Review and respond accordingly to all submittals as required by the contract specifications.

- Prepare change orders necessitated by field conditions.

- Review the contractor’s pay estimates, evaluate the completion of work, and make payment recommendations to the City.

- Visit the site at intervals appropriate to the various stages of construction to observe the progress and quality of executed work and to determine in general if such work is proceeding in accordance with the Contract Documents. Full time site representation is not included as part of this proposal.

- ARKK will not be responsible for the means, methods, techniques, sequences or procedures of construction selected by the Contractor(s) or the safety precautions and programs incident to the work of the Contractor(s). ARKK’s effort will be directed toward providing a greater degree of confidence for the City of Humble that the completed work of Contractor(s) will conform to the Contract Documents, but ARKK will not be responsible for the failure of Contractor(s) to perform the work in accordance with the Contract Documents. During site visits ARKK shall keep the City informed of the progress of the work, shall endeavor to guard the City against defects and deficiencies in such work and may disapprove or reject work failing to conform to the Contract Documents.

- Conduct a final review of the Project and make a recommendation for Final Payment on the Project.

- Engineer shall provide one set of reproducible record plans based on the drawings provided to the Engineer by the Contractor(s).
D. Additional Services

Additional services are those services that are beyond the services provided for in the scope portion of this proposal.

Additional services may be required and may be identified as the project progresses. Such services are to be performed only when authorized by the City. Potential Additional services include:

1. Right-of-way research, deed research, and abstracting.
2. Site Easement and Right of Way Acquisition work such as: preparation of metes and bounds; verification of ownership of property; preparation and submittal of title report or title commitment.
3. Environmental Site Assessments.
4. Extra Construction Phase Services in the event the project extends beyond its designated contract period.
5. Securing any special licenses, permits or approvals (railroad crossings, State permits or approvals, pipelines, etc.) which may be required for the completion of the project, it being understood by the parties of this agreement that the fees for said special licenses and permits will be paid by the City.
6. The provision of a construction site representative and associated supervision and administration services.
7. Coordination with utility pipeline field location efforts and special meetings with pipeline companies.
FEE

The fee is separated into Design Phase and Construction Phase:

**Design Phase Services**

**Basic Services Fees are:**
- Engineering Design: the lump sum of: $45,200.00

**Special Services Fees are:**
- Topographic Surveying (Cost plus 10%) $3,850.00
- Prepare Easement Descriptions (Cost plus 10%) $6,600.00
- Geotechnical (Cost plus 10%)* $5,500.00
- Traffic Control Plan: The lump sum amount of $5,000.00
- Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan: The lump sum amount of $2,500.00
- Reproduction: (Cost plus 10%)* $1,000.00

**Total Design Phase Amount:** $69,650.00

**Construction Phase Services**
- Construction Administration: (Hourly and cost plus 10%) $8,000.00
- Construction Site Visits: (Hourly and cost plus 10%) $8,000.00

**Total Construction Phase Amount:** $16,000.00

*At this time the magnitude of these tasks is not known. Therefore budgetary amounts are provided. These figures may increase or decrease depending upon actual work required. If an increase becomes necessary it can be accomplished by utilizing available funds from other line items that have under run, or by contract amendment.

ARKK will submit monthly progress invoices for all work completed to invoice date. The total contract amendment authorization amount is not-to-exceed **$85,650.00**.

Time and materials charges and additional services beyond those described in the Scope of Services will be invoiced on the basis of direct labor costs times a factor of 2.99 and direct cost plus 10%. Mileage will be charged at the current IRS prevailing rate. No additional services will be performed or invoiced without prior authorization form the City of Humble.

ARKK appreciates the opportunity to submit this proposal and we look forward to continuing our work with the City of Humble.

Sincerely,

ARKK ENGINEERS, LLC

[Signature]
John D. Rudloff, P.E.
Principal/Senior Project Manager
## ISAACKS ROAD EXTENSION
City of Humble, Texas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>ITEM DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>QUAN.</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>TOTAL AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Paving &amp; Drainage Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Traffic Control and Regulation</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Clearing and Grubbing</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6&quot; thick reinforced concrete pavement</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>$44.50</td>
<td>$55,775.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8&quot; minimum thickness cement stabilized subgrade</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td>$4,628.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cement slurry for cement stabilized subgrade (6% minimum by dry weight)</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$190.00</td>
<td>$5,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6&quot; concrete curb</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$2,060.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Concrete pavement header</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Roadway excavation</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$8,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Remove existing driveway and replace with 6&quot; thick concrete driveway</td>
<td>S.Y.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$73.00</td>
<td>$14,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8&quot; Concrete Pavement Point Repair</td>
<td>S.Y.</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>$85.00</td>
<td>$10,625.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>24&quot; RCP, ASTM C76, Class III storm sewer</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$115.00</td>
<td>$3,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>30&quot; RCP, ASTM C76, Class III storm sewer</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Type &quot;BB&quot; Inlet</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$3,470.00</td>
<td>$6,940.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Storm sewer manhole</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$3,375.00</td>
<td>$6,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SWPPP</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL PAVING &amp; DRAINAGE ITEMS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$219,228.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Water Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8&quot; PVC (AWWA C-900) Class 235 (DR 18) water line</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$28,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8&quot; gate valves</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1,370.00</td>
<td>$8,220.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Fire hydrant assembly</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3,950.00</td>
<td>$3,950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>8&quot; Wet Connection</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>$2,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Cut and plug existing 8&quot; water line to be abandoned</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$1,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1&quot; long side service reconnection</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,180.00</td>
<td>$3,540.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2&quot; long side service reconnection</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3&quot; short side service reconnection</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Automatic flushing device</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$4,500.00</td>
<td>$4,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL WATER ITEMS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$56,910.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sanitary Sewer Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Television inspection of existing sanitary sewer</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Remove and dispose of existing sanitary sewer manhole</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$1,040.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Remove and dispose of existing sanitary sewer</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$9.70</td>
<td>$4,850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Plug existing sanitary sewer</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>8&quot; PVC SDR 26 sanitary sewer by open cut construction</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>$73.00</td>
<td>$43,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4&quot; diameter precast sanitary sewer manhole</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$3,355.00</td>
<td>$13,420.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Core existing manhole and connect proposed 8&quot; PVC sanitary sewer</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,550.00</td>
<td>$1,550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>6&quot; service reconnections by excavation</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,020.00</td>
<td>$3,060.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Additional length of service line</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$2,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Trench safety for all sanitary sewers greater than 5' deep</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL WATER ITEMS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$71,895.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL PAVING, DRAINAGE &amp; WATER ITEMS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$348,033.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Miscellaneous Items (20%)**

**TOTAL Construction Cost:**

Engineering

Special Services (Survey, Geotechnical, Traffic Control, SWPPP, etc.):

Construction

**TOTAL Project Cost:**

$503,290.50
COUNCIL MEETING
10-26-2017
AGENDA ITEM #7

VARIANCE REQUEST

ASPEN MANUFACTURING
Mr. Stuebe,

We are in the process of developing construction drawings for an expansion to the existing Aspen Manufacturing facility located at 373 Atascocita Road. The existing facility was built in the year 2001. The design includes decorative metal panels on all sides of the office portion of the facility, including a decorative wall by the entrance to the office.

The expansion of the facility will require the new construction and the existing street facing exterior walls meet the exterior construction requirements found in Section 12-500 of the City of Humble Code of Ordinances. We are requesting a variance to allow the existing decorative metal panel design to be expanded in lieu of using masonry. The proposed design for the Aspen Manufacturing building addition will expand the use of decorative metal panels to provide an attractive design which will meet the spirit of the standards imposed by the ordinance. The proposed design will also be more attractive than the surrounding developed properties which are primarily metal buildings with little or no decorative elements.

City of Humble, Code of Ordinances

1. Sec. 12-500(c)(2), item g: Requirements for large industrial buildings.
   100,001 sq. Ft. and larger - 25 percent brick or stone veneer on front facade and side facade if siding on a public street.

   Based on our discussions during the June 27, 2017 meeting with the City of Humble, we propose providing:

   a. Horizontally applied decorative "m" and "s" profile metal panels (galvalume finish) covering a minimum of 25 percent of the west, south, and east elevations of the building in lieu of masonry. See the proposed elevations on drawing A3.1.
   b. The existing office area's wall finish is horizontally applied decorative "s" profile metal panels and an aluminum and glass storefront system. The office area will be expanded as part of this project. The same horizontally applied decorative "s" profile metal panels will be applied to the expanded office area. The existing decorative metal wall at the office entrance will be rebuilt at the new entrance to the expanded office area.
2. Sec. 12-500(c)(2), item c: Each building elevation shall provide architectural features such as columns, reveals and articulations to break up long facades exceeding 50 feet.

We propose providing:

a. Reveals shall be located between the decorative metal panels at intervals not to exceed 50 feet. Existing and new intake fans and existing and new building downspouts will be located in the reveals between the decorative panels. These elements will serve to further break up the long facades.

b. The decorative metal panels will alternate between two different panel profiles at intervals not to exceed 50’. The panel change will add visual interest to the façade as well as help break up the long facade.

3. Sec. 12-500(d): Service area design requirements.

We propose providing:

a. Screening will be provided at the existing HVAC equipment and air compressor lean-to located at the southeast corner of the building and at the relocated water treatment tank on the west side of the building expansion. The proposed screening will match the proposed horizontally applied decorative “m” and “s” profile metal panels on the building.

In summary, we feel that while the proposed design uses different materials than required by the exterior construction requirements ordinance, the completed project will accomplish the goal of the ordinance and become another attractive project in the City of Humble.

The following pages are attached to this document:

1. Renderings of the proposed facility and images of the existing office showing the proposed decorative metal in lieu of masonry (30” x 42” sheet).

2. Existing and proposed site plans, cut sheets for the proposed decorative metal, a text description of how we would like to use the proposed decorative metal sheets in lieu of masonry, including references to sections of the Humble Code of Ordinances (30” x 42” sheet).

3. Proposed building elevations (30” x 42” sheet).

4. Pictures of surrounding developed commercial and industrial properties (11 pages).

5. Pictures of the existing decorative metal at Aspen’s existing office (3 pages).

Thank you,

Harry Gendel, AIA

cc:
K:\A - Projects\Aspen Manufacturing 2016\Documents\Memos\MEMO_01_HumbleVariance.wpd
via: e-mail
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Typical Metal Building
2. Grocery

Concrete and Metal Facade
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4. Truck Repair

- Truck Parking, Typical
- Metal Building
5. Manufacturing

- Typical Metal Building
6. Bar

Typical Metal Building
7. Auto Repair
    - Typical Metal Building
8. Office/Warehouse

Typical Metal Building,
Metal and Brick Facade
9. Industrial
   -
   Typical Metal Building
10. Industrial with Laydown Yard

Typical Metal Building, Metal and Brick Facade
Aspen Manufacturing - Office Entrance, Decorative Metal and Storefront Glazing

M-Panel  S-Panel
Aspen Manufacturing

Office Entrance, Decorative Metal and Storefront Glazing
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SUBDIVISION PLAT

PARK AIR 59
COUNCIL MEETING
10-26-2017
AGENDA ITEM #9

DEVELOPMENT PLAT

PARK AIR 59
COUNCIL MEETING
10-26-2017
AGENDA ITEM #10

2018 INSURANCE PLAN
APPROVAL
Dear Humble City Council,

The City of Humble Insurance Committee called a meeting on Wednesday, October 17, 2017 at 10:00 a.m. to discuss the 2018 City of Humble Employee Group Insurance Coverage and would like to make the following recommendations:

**Regarding Medical Coverage:**

We recommend the City remain with Aetna as our Medical Administrator but change our Stop Loss Administrator for the 2018 Plan Year to Optum and make the following plan changes:

- Increase the Stop/Loss Deductible to $135,000 from $120,000 resulting in a cost savings of $24,829 (7.1% below current) with an increased run off period of 24 months

Employee and retiree medical contribution rates will remain the same as 2017.

**Regarding Dental Coverage:**

We recommend the City move to Aetna as our Dental insurance provider. The plan design will remain the same as last year with a dual option of a Base and Buy-up Plan. There was a minimal increase of $4,953 annually in our transition to Aetna because we went with a 2-year rate guarantee, which means we will have no increase in 2019. We recommend increasing the City’s contribution from $20.80 to $21.86. This contribution will be applied to all coverage tiers. The remaining increase will be passed on to the employee’s portion of the contributions reducing the City’s cost to $2,812 annually. The contributions for both employees and retirees are shown in the attached exhibit.

**Regarding Vision Coverage:**

We recommend the City remain with Davis Vision and accept a 2-year rate guarantee that begins on 1/1/2018 and will expire on 12/31/2020. Employee/retiree contribution rates will remain the same per the attached exhibit.

**Regarding Life/AD&D Coverage:**

We recommend the City stay with Voya Financial for our Life and AD&D insurance coverage. The City is under a two-year rate guarantee for Basic Life/AD&D that expires
12/31/2020 and a one-year rate guarantee for Voluntary Life/AD&D that expires 12/31/2018. Employee/retiree contribution rates will remain the same per the attached exhibit.

Regarding Employee Assistance Program (EAP):

We recommend staying with our current EAP provider, Compsych, which provides services at no additional cost through Voya's Life and AD&D coverage.

**COBRA Administration**

We recommend staying with our current administrator Discovery Benefits as we have a 2-year rate guarantee with them that expires 12/31/2018.

Thank you for your consideration of the above recommendations.

City of Humble Insurance Committee
### CITY OF HUMBLE
#### 2018 RATE EXHIBIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Medical Employee</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Medical Employee</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Medical Employee</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Medical Employee</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Medical Employee</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total City</th>
<th>Medical Employee</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total City</th>
<th>Medical Employee</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$728.19</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$728.19</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$728.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$259.81</td>
<td>$1,168.95</td>
<td>$21.86</td>
<td>$21.86</td>
<td>$39.70</td>
<td>$21.86</td>
<td>$3.02</td>
<td>$3.02</td>
<td>$6.04</td>
<td>$6.04</td>
<td>$1,223.57</td>
<td>$369.61</td>
<td>$1,588.95</td>
<td>$1,223.57</td>
<td>$369.61</td>
<td>$1,588.95</td>
<td>$1,223.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$359.81</td>
<td>$1,088.95</td>
<td>$21.86</td>
<td>$21.86</td>
<td>$39.70</td>
<td>$21.86</td>
<td>$3.02</td>
<td>$3.02</td>
<td>$6.04</td>
<td>$6.04</td>
<td>$1,223.57</td>
<td>$369.61</td>
<td>$1,588.95</td>
<td>$1,223.57</td>
<td>$369.61</td>
<td>$1,588.95</td>
<td>$1,223.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$234.73</td>
<td>$1,059.56</td>
<td>$43.37</td>
<td>$21.86</td>
<td>$66.89</td>
<td>$21.86</td>
<td>$3.40</td>
<td>$3.40</td>
<td>$6.80</td>
<td>$6.80</td>
<td>$1,090.18</td>
<td>$284.11</td>
<td>$302.53</td>
<td>$1,090.18</td>
<td>$284.11</td>
<td>$302.53</td>
<td>$1,090.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$379.78</td>
<td>$1,675.08</td>
<td>$75.25</td>
<td>$21.86</td>
<td>$110.42</td>
<td>$21.86</td>
<td>$7.54</td>
<td>$7.54</td>
<td>$15.08</td>
<td>$15.08</td>
<td>$1,709.70</td>
<td>$429.74</td>
<td>$497.74</td>
<td>$1,709.70</td>
<td>$429.74</td>
<td>$497.74</td>
<td>$1,709.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$479.78</td>
<td>$1,575.08</td>
<td>$75.25</td>
<td>$21.86</td>
<td>$110.42</td>
<td>$21.86</td>
<td>$7.54</td>
<td>$7.54</td>
<td>$15.08</td>
<td>$15.08</td>
<td>$1,609.70</td>
<td>$562.57</td>
<td>$597.74</td>
<td>$1,609.70</td>
<td>$562.57</td>
<td>$597.74</td>
<td>$1,609.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Spousal Surcharge - $100 surcharge applied to medical coverage only for those employees who elect to cover their spouse on the City’s Medical Plan rather than on the spouse’s employer’s plan.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retiree</th>
<th>Medical Retiree</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Medical Retiree</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Medical Retiree</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Medical Retiree</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Medical Retiree</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total City</th>
<th>Medical Retiree</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total City</th>
<th>Medical Retiree</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$173.39</td>
<td>$520.18</td>
<td>$5.47</td>
<td>$16.40</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$0.94</td>
<td>$2.82</td>
<td>$1.88</td>
<td>$5.63</td>
<td>$192.27</td>
<td>$181.68</td>
<td>$545.02</td>
<td>$192.27</td>
<td>$181.68</td>
<td>$545.02</td>
<td>$192.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$928.58</td>
<td>$520.18</td>
<td>$26.74</td>
<td>$16.40</td>
<td>$45.16</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$3.96</td>
<td>$2.82</td>
<td>$1.88</td>
<td>$5.63</td>
<td>$979.57</td>
<td>$961.15</td>
<td>$545.02</td>
<td>$979.57</td>
<td>$961.15</td>
<td>$545.02</td>
<td>$979.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$770.11</td>
<td>$520.18</td>
<td>$48.83</td>
<td>$16.40</td>
<td>$72.35</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$4.34</td>
<td>$2.82</td>
<td>$1.88</td>
<td>$5.63</td>
<td>$848.67</td>
<td>$825.15</td>
<td>$545.02</td>
<td>$848.67</td>
<td>$825.15</td>
<td>$545.02</td>
<td>$848.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,534.68</td>
<td>$520.18</td>
<td>$80.71</td>
<td>$16.40</td>
<td>$115.88</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$8.48</td>
<td>$2.82</td>
<td>$1.88</td>
<td>$5.63</td>
<td>$1,660.92</td>
<td>$1,625.75</td>
<td>$545.02</td>
<td>$1,660.92</td>
<td>$1,625.75</td>
<td>$545.02</td>
<td>$1,660.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Rates are reflected on a total monthly cost in this exhibit.