

BOS 1-24-17 Agenda Item #19, File #13-1194

I am requesting that spending of Tribal funds be prioritized and utilized to mitigate direct impacts resulting from the casino and other tribal projects. Currently, the most critical impact on the surrounding community is the Tribal gun range and the Tribe's upcoming commercial development that heavily impacts the Shingle Springs Drive neighborhood. To lessen the dangerous and invasive nature of this gun range, some kind of barrier between the tribal gun range, U. S. Highway 50 and the adjacent residents is desperately needed to reduce the apparent hazards, noise and the neighbors loss of enjoyment of their own properties. At a minimum, a protective sound wall would be a good beginning to ensure public health and safety. Cost estimates of such a wall are identified as a small fraction of the millions of dollars that the County receives each year from the Tribe.

The purpose of the original 2006 MOU between the County and the Tribe was "to mitigate the various expected impacts of the proposed casino." The MOU was amended in 2012 so that, "The use of those funds will no longer be limited to the Highway 50 HOV project but can be used by the County for any 'qualifying public improvement' projects located within the delineated geographic area near the casino, which will allow the County to mitigate the impacts of the casino more broadly than the original MOU."

The County receives far more than just an annual \$2.6 million from the Tribe. As part of the MOU, the County received between 2009 and 2016 an amount of \$2,000,000 annually for discretionary spending for a combined total of \$14,000,000; how was this \$14,000,000 spent?

Starting this next year, the County will receive \$3.8 million per year from the Tribe, in addition to the \$2.6 million for public improvements. Please, it is time for the County Supervisors and the community to stand up for the affected Shingle Springs residents by demanding that a portion of that money be spent to protect the Tribe's neighbors from the negative impacts of Tribal development. It is rumored that the Tribe is disappointed that these funds have not been expended in the affected areas of Shingle Springs. Perhaps if the funds were spent as they were intended, the relationship between the Tribe and its neighbors would improve. Do the right thing and help the impacted neighbors.



Kim Dawson <kim.dawson@edcgov.us>

Fwd: Answers to Questions about Agenda item 19 on 1/24 BOS meeting

5 messages

Shiva Frentzen <shiva.frentzen@edcgov.us>

Tue, Jan 24, 2017 at 8:48 AM

To: kim.dawson@edcgov.us, Jim Mitrisin <jim.mitrisin@edcgov.us>

Shiva Frentzen

Begin forwarded message:

From: Bard Lower <bard.lower@edcgov.us>**Date:** January 23, 2017 at 5:23:47 PM PST**To:** The BOSTWO <bostwo@edcgov.us>, Shiva Frentzen <shiva.frentzen@edcgov.us>, Donald Ashton <don.ashton@edcgov.us>, Roger Niello <roger.niello@edcgov.us>, Creighton Avila <creighton.avila@edcgov.us>**Subject:** Answers to Questions about Agenda item 19 on 1/24 BOS meeting

Good Afternoon Supervisor Frentzen,

The reason for this contract amendment is that Transportation wants to make sure that our three year contract with Mark Thomas does not expire until the Diamond Springs Parkway project is complete. We are still working on Caltrans approvals to tie into Hwy 49.

The hourly rate for some of the positions for Mark Thomas and Company Inc. contract are going up by almost 20% and new titles are added to the list.

There are only a few positions that went up over 15%, see attached spreadsheet. We mostly use design and project engineers. Those types of positions went up from around 4 to 11% which isn't unusual since their original rates were submitted over three years ago and will last another two.

The list of titles in the Amended Fee Schedule contains all of Mark Thomas' available staff positions. We do not intend to use all of them, but we have all of them named. If the position isn't listed and someone with that title works on the project we cannot pay Mark Thomas for the work completed without amending the contract.

I need information on the original RFPs?

Mark Thomas was selected for this project off the CDA's RFQ list; they ranked high on road design and PM. They also did a previous study of this area for the EDCTC. Mark Thomas and their traffic engineering sub were already very familiar with area and the project. Rates are negotiated after selection and before the contract is put into place.

The expenditure for the last three years of the contract including the break down for different positions/titles?

This contract is for \$250,000 to assist with the Diamond Springs Parkway project and Caltrans approvals. We have obligated \$183,000 with the single original task order and have been billed \$66,000 to date. We can provide a copy of our invoice tracking that compares tasks billed to budget.

Attached you will find a breakdown of expenditures by consultant staff title. As stated above the most often used positions are Senior Project Engineer (3%) and Design Engineer (4%).

What is the ongoing rate for similar positions/titles in the market, and whether there is a policy to cap the percentage increase of hourly rates for existing contracts?

This is somewhat of a unique contract so it would be difficult to provide an straight forward comparison. If this contract was for bridge design where we have quite a few contract it would be an easier question to answer

There is not a cap on hourly rate increases that is written into the contract. The consultant needs to request rate adjustments and this is the first update to their rates they have requested. It helps the consultant's accounting if they can bill agencies the same rates.

Please note that this isn't a request to increase the budget, just to add two years to the contract so we can keep a consistent consultant through this one project. The cost to complete tasks assigned to date has not gone up. The intent is for them to stay within budget, but use their current rates for billing.

If you have any futher questions tonight give me a call 530-457-7232.

Bard

Bard R. Lower
Director

County of El Dorado
Community Development Agency
Transportation Division
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
(530) 621-7533 / FAX (530)-626-0387
bard.lower@edcgov.us

2 attachments

Invoice Tracker TO 13-53776-01.pdf

Task Order: 13-53776-01

Project Support Services for Diamond Springs Parkway Phase 1A - SR49 & 1B and Its Underground Utility District

Consultant

Subconsultant: Fehr & Peers Transportation Consultants

Items of Work	26118			26118 Current Invoice	Available Balance	Consul. Progress %	26118			Sub. Progress %	Task Order Progress %		
	Budget	Invoiced To Date	Available				Budget	Invoiced To Date	Available				
1.1	\$6,904.00	\$6,116.50	\$787.50	\$101.00	\$686.50	90.1%			\$0.00	\$0.00	#DIV/0!	90.1%	
1.2	\$12,412.00	\$1,328.50	\$11,083.50		\$11,083.50	10.7%			\$0.00	\$0.00	#DIV/0!	10.7%	
1.3	\$12,412.00	\$1,989.50	\$10,422.50		\$10,422.50	16.0%			\$0.00	\$0.00	#DIV/0!	16.0%	
2.1	\$19,372.00	\$4,640.00	\$14,732.00		\$14,732.00	24.0%			\$0.00	\$0.00	#DIV/0!	24.0%	
2.2	\$6,068.00		\$6,068.00		\$6,068.00	0.0%			\$0.00	\$0.00	#DIV/0!	0.0%	
2.3	\$1,628.00		\$1,628.00		\$1,628.00	0.0%	\$52,280.00	\$51,763.15	\$516.85	\$516.85	99.0%	96.0%	
2.4	\$2,852.00		\$2,852.00		\$2,852.00	0.0%			\$0.00	\$0.00	#DIV/0!	0.0%	
2.5	\$6,936.00		\$6,936.00		\$6,936.00	0.0%			\$0.00	\$0.00	#DIV/0!	0.0%	
2.6	\$2,852.00		\$2,852.00		\$2,852.00	0.0%			\$0.00	\$0.00	#DIV/0!	0.0%	
2.7	\$12,788.00		\$12,788.00		\$12,788.00	0.0%			\$0.00	\$0.00	#DIV/0!	0.0%	
2.8	\$16,872.00		\$16,872.00		\$16,872.00	0.0%			\$0.00	\$0.00	#DIV/0!	0.0%	
3.1	\$6,704.00		\$6,704.00		\$6,704.00	0.0%			\$0.00	\$0.00	#DIV/0!	0.0%	
3.2	\$7,736.00		\$7,736.00		\$7,736.00	0.0%			\$0.00	\$0.00	#DIV/0!	0.0%	
3.3	\$15,228.00		\$15,228.00		\$15,228.00	0.0%			\$0.00	\$0.00	#DIV/0!	0.0%	
ODC	\$550.00		\$550.00		\$550.00	0.0%			\$0.00	\$0.00	#DIV/0!	0.0%	
Totals	\$131,314.00	\$14,074.50	\$117,239.50	\$101.00	\$117,138.50	10.8%	\$52,280.00	\$51,763.15	\$516.85	\$0.00	\$516.85	99.0%	35.9%

Total Invoice: \$101.00

\$183,594.00 Budget
 \$65,938.65 Actual
 \$117,655.35 Balance

35.9%

Staff Budgets (hours)

Items of Work	Principal/Project Manager		Senior Project Manager		Senior Project Engineer		Project Engineer		Design Engineer		Engineering Technician		Classification	
	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual
1.1		5	16	3.75		13	24	12						
1.2		2	16			4.5	60							
1.3			16			11.5	60							
2.1	4		16			2	40		40	38	40			
2.2			4				20				20			
2.3			2				8							
2.4			2				16							
2.5			8				20		20					
2.6			2				16							
2.7			4				20		40		40			
2.8			16				60		20		20			
3.1			8				16				24			
3.2			8				40							
3.3			24		60	31	400	12	120	38	144	0	0	0
Totals	4	7	142	3.75	60	31	400	12	120	38	144	0	0	0

Rates/hr \$275.00 \$202.00 \$173.00 \$153.00 \$113.00 \$110.00 \$XXX.XX

Items of Work	Classification		Classification		Classification		Classification		Classification		Total Hours by Task		Task Order Progress %
	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	
1.1											40	33.75	84.4%
1.2											76	6.5	8.6%
1.3											76	11.5	15.1%
2.1											140	40	28.6%
2.2											44	0	0.0%
2.3											10	0	0.0%
2.4											18	0	0.0%
2.5											48	0	0.0%
2.6											18	0	0.0%
2.7											104	0	0.0%
2.8											116	0	0.0%
3.1											48	0	0.0%
3.2											48	0	0.0%
3.3											84	0	0.0%
Totals	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	870	91.75	10.5%

Rates/hr \$XXX.XX \$XXX.XX \$XXX.XX \$XXX.XX \$XXX.XX

870.00 Budget
 91.75 Actual
 778.25 Balance

10.5%

Notices to Proceed must be issued for all Items of Work prior to commencing work

03/25/15: Notice to Proceed issued for IOW 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2
 05/08/15: Notice to Proceed issued for IOW 2.3

New

Principal	\$325.00
Senior Engineering Manager	\$310.00
Engineering Manager	\$252.00
Structural Manager	\$278.00
Senior Project Manager	\$226.00
Senior Survey Manager	\$210.00
Project Manager	\$200.00
Survey Manager	\$200.00
Senior Project Engineer	\$178.00
Project Engineer	\$168.00
Senior Design Engineer	\$158.00
Design Engineer	\$118.00
Project Surveyor	\$145.00
Sr. Engineering/Survey/CADD Technician	\$126.00
Engineering/Survey/CADD Technician	\$110.00
Inspector	\$121.00
Technical Writer	\$105.00
Design (Tech Assistant)	\$68.00
Survey (Tech Assistant)	\$68.00
Senior Project Coordinator	\$108.00
Project Coordinator	\$100.00
Senior Administrative	\$85.00
Administrative	\$80.00
Single Chief without Equipment	\$119.00
Single Chief with Equipment	\$170.00
Single Chainman	\$96.00
2 Person Field Party and Vehicle	\$270.00
3 Person Field Party and Vehicle	\$345.00
Landscape Architect"	\$200.00
Landscape Architect I	\$178.00
Expert Witness	\$375.00
Strategic Consulting (Principal)	\$375.00

Original

275 18%

230 10%

245 13%

202 12%

184 9%

189 6%

173 3%

153 10%

142 11%

113 4%

142 2%

110 0%

110 10%

89 18%

89 -24%

70 -3%

77 4%

103 16%

160 6%

84 14%

275 -2%

335 3%

368 2%

368 2%

6%